

The SIDO Performance Model for League of Legends

Amy X. Zhang Parth Naidu

2/2/24

League of Legends (LoL) has been a dominant esports for a decade, yet the inherent complexity of the game has stymied the creation of analytical measures of player skill and performance. Current industry standards are limited to easy-to-procure individual player statistics that are incomplete and lacking context as they do not take into account teamplay or game state. We present a unified performance model for League of Legends which blends together measures of a player’s contribution within the context of their team, insights from traditional sports metrics such as the Plus-Minus model, and the intricacies of LoL as a complex team invasion sport. Using hierarchical Bayesian models, we outline the use of gold and damage dealt as a measure of skill, detailing players’ impact on their own-, their allies’- and their enemies’ statistics throughout the course of the game. Our results showcase the model’s increased efficacy in separating professional players when compared to a Plus-Minus model and to current esports industry standards, while metric quality is rigorously assessed for discrimination, independence, and stability. Readers might also find additional qualitative analytics which explore champion proficiency and the impact of collaborative team-play. Future work is proposed to refine and expand the SIDO performance model, offering a comprehensive framework for esports analytics in team performance management, scouting and research realms.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Background	3
2.1	Performance metrics in traditional sports	3
2.2	League of Legends (LoL) as a complex team invasion sport	5
3	Industry standards	7

4	Related work	8
5	Data	10
5.1	Criteria for game inclusion	10
5.2	Summary of data	11
5.3	Game data	12
5.4	Linking Riot accounts to professional players	12
6	Methods	13
6.1	Gold and damage dealt as measures of player skill	15
6.2	Player model: Gold	16
6.3	Player model: Damage dealt	18
6.4	Ally models	19
6.5	Enemy models	20
6.6	Champion proficiency heuristic	20
7	Results	21
7.1	Separation of pro players	21
7.1.1	Gold models	21
7.1.2	Damage models	22
7.1.3	SIDO model t-tests	23
7.2	Metric quality	25
7.2.1	Discrimination	26
7.2.2	Independence	28
7.2.3	Stability	28
7.3	Qualitative analysis and examples	31
7.3.1	Champion prioritization	31
7.3.2	Collaborative teamplay	34
8	Discussion	36
9	Future work	40
10	References	41
11	Appendix	44
11.1	League of Legends Glossary	44
11.2	Player skills	48
11.3	Meta-metric tables	49
11.3.1	Discrimination	49
11.3.2	Independence	52
11.3.3	Stability	54

1 Introduction

League of Legends, a seminal multiplayer online battle arena (MOBA) game, has taken the world by storm, driving the rapid and explosive growth of professional esports. Over the past decade, competitive gaming has evolved from a niche hobby to a global phenomenon with stadiums filled to capacity, millions of viewers tuning in online, and players competing at the highest level for substantial prizes. As the esports ecosystem continues to expand, the pursuit of excellence in competitive gaming becomes increasingly paramount.

Despite the meteoric rise of competitive gaming, the longevity and multigenerational status of League of Legends and other similar titles is still up for debate and hinges on our ability to develop efficient learning, training, and performance methods to sustainably engage every part of the ecosystem. Achieving this goal requires a twofold approach: the practical implementation of programs catering to players of all skill levels and a continuous commitment to pioneering research. Innovation in both practical training programs and academic research is essential for advancing the esports industry and cultivating talent that can compete at the highest echelons of competitive gaming.

Yet, a significant roadblock stands in the way of progress—the field of esports analytics remains in its infancy, particularly concerning the critical domain of player performance analysis. While traditional sports have benefited from decades of statistical modeling and performance metrics, the world of esports is only beginning to scratch the surface of what can be achieved through data-driven insights. The lack of a standardized and quantifiable model for player performance hampers not only research efforts but also the exploration of alternative training methodologies.

A robust quantitative model of player performance is required to build a more informed and innovative future for competitive gaming. This paper presents first steps towards bridging the gap by holistically considering a player’s total contribution to their team, not just their individual performance. This is similar in concept to a Plus-Minus model from traditional sports, and we compare our method to both a Plus-Minus model and to a simple average model. We hope to provide a foundation for the evolution of esports analytics and the optimization of player performance in League of Legends and beyond.

2 Background

2.1 Performance metrics in traditional sports

The application of statistical analysis to sports has transformed how teams evaluate player performance and make strategic decisions. One prominent example that has left an indelible mark on the world of sports analytics is “Moneyball” (Lewis 2004). This famous approach,

popularized by the book and subsequent film, showcases how statistical analysis can revolutionize the understanding of player contributions in sports.

Moneyball's origins are in baseball, an atomistic sport that offers a rich array of individual statistics for precise player assessment, such as On-Base Percentage (OBP). OBP measures a player's ability to reach base safely, including through hits, walks, and hit-by-pitches, relative to their total plate appearances. Precise metrics like OBP allow teams to quantify and compare player contributions accurately, fostering strategic decisions in player recruitment and game tactics.

In contrast, complex team invasion sports, like football or basketball, present several challenges (Gerrard 2007):

- **Complexity:** These sports involve a wide range of player actions, making it challenging to isolate individual contributions.
- **Interdependence:** Player actions are highly interdependent, with cascading effects on their teammates, making it hard to attribute success solely to individuals.
- **Joint Actions:** Players often collaborate on actions like tackling, further complicating individual attribution.
- **Continuity:** Some sports have continuous play (e.g., soccer), while others are segmented (e.g., American football), impacting the analysis of player actions.
- **Specialization:** Players' roles vary widely, from all-around players in soccer to highly specialized units in American football.

To perform detailed player performance analysis in these complex invasion sports, two key measurement problems must be addressed (Gerrard 2007):

- **Attribution Problem:** Correctly allocating individual contributions to joint and interdependent actions. Deciding how much credit each player receives for shared actions is a challenge.
- **Weighting Problem:** Determining the significance of each player action in influencing the overall match outcome. Different approaches, either subjective based on expert judgment or statistical based on regression analysis, can be used to assign weights.

However, the hierarchical structure of complex invasion sports introduces complexity in assigning weights, as higher-level actions (e.g., scoring) depend on lower-level actions (e.g., ball possession and passing). This hierarchical structure requires expert judgment to determine relative weightings between different levels.

2.2 League of Legends (LoL) as a complex team invasion sport

In League of Legends (LoL), gameplay centers around strategic team-based competition within a virtual battlefield called the Summoner's Rift. Two teams, each consisting of five players, engage in intense battles with the primary objective of destroying the enemy team's Nexus, located within their base, while defending their own. This marks LoL as a team invasion sport, with traditional sports analogues such as basketball and football.

Players control one of 160+ unique characters known as *champions*, each possessing different abilities and belonging to distinct types such as tanks, damage dealers, and support characters. Players also select which role in the game they play, designated as *top*, *middle*, *bot*, *support*, or *jungle*. These roles correspond both to a high-level playstyle (for example, bot players typically play fragile damage dealers) and to a zone of the battlefield the player is responsible for. The combination of different player roles and champion types allows for diverse team compositions and strategies.

Players enhance their champions' power by purchasing *items* using the gold they earn. Effective communication, teamwork, and strategic decision-making are essential for success. Champions' abilities must be utilized wisely and players must work together to outmaneuver opponents and gain control of the battlefield.

While there are no set rules for gameplay at any time point of the game, the game is colloquially often split into the early game, mid-game, and late-game. Each of these game phases is typified by different styles of play, based on the state of the battlefield, or game map.

In the early game, all players start with equal gold and resources and, for the most part, adhere to a standardized set of actions. This is due to the state of the map in the early game—each team must defend the boundaries of their territory by protecting defensive *towers* placed along lanes on the map. This results in the top, middle, bot, and support players facing off against their lane opponents in the middle of the map, between two sets of opposing towers. The only significant variation at this stage comes from the jungle role, the only role which does not go to a tower at the beginning of the game and instead roams in the jungle area between lanes. The jungler's decisions about pathing and map impact introduce some unpredictability. During this period, the focus is primarily on individual performance, with players striving to gain personal advantages over their lane opponents. This is also often called the *laning phase* of the game.

The middle phase of the game introduces more complexity and a wider range of decisions due to three key developments:

1. Tower dynamics: Protective barriers (*tower plates*) around towers are reduced, which opens up more strategic options for players in those lanes. Towers may also have been destroyed, which alters the initial lane setups.
2. Player strength disparity: As the game progresses, disparities in player strength emerge across different roles, influenced by how players have fared against their counterparts.

3. Neutral objectives: This period also sees the appearance of the *herald*, a neutral objective that can provide a significant advantage. Securing the herald aids in obtaining tower plates and enhances map control.

While laning (i.e., directly facing your lane opponent in an isolated position on the map like in the early game) is often present during the mid game, this phase serves as a transition to broader map strategies, with players balancing the acquisition of resources for themselves and their team. Skirmishes become more common, typically involving smaller groups and occurring more sporadically.

By late game, the laning phase has concluded and all tower plates have been removed. The choices available to players now are influenced by the outcomes of the previous phases. This stage is characterized by more extensive *teamfights* focused around major objectives. Teamfights tend to involve all players, who typically operate in closer proximity to one another, making strategic decisions with the entire team's interests in mind.

LoL is a prime example of a complex team invasion sport, with inherent complexities that extend beyond those found in typical invasion sports:

1. Diversity of champions and items: LoL boasts a staggering roster of over 160 champions, each with unique abilities and roles. Additionally, the game features more than 200 items that players can use to enhance their champions' abilities or adapt to the evolving match circumstances. This diversity results in an astronomical number of potential team compositions and strategic choices. In essence, the myriad of champions and items adds an extra layer of complexity, making it challenging to analyze and attribute individual player contributions accurately.
2. Continuity and game state dependency: Unlike traditional sports, where each game state starts from a relatively clean slate, LoL's continuity means that every game state is intricately linked to the one preceding it. Each player accrues gold and resources at different rates based on their decisions and the events of previous moments in the game. This interdependence between game states and the cumulative nature of resources and advantages earned over time introduces significant complexities in assessing individual player contributions. Actions in the early stages can have a profound impact on the late-game, further complicating the analysis.
3. Frequent game changes: Riot Games, the developer of LoL, introduces regular updates and changes to the game, including champions, items, and game mechanics. These adjustments occur every few weeks, creating a dynamic and evolving gaming environment. While these updates keep the game fresh and exciting, they pose a significant challenge for creating and training statistical models. The frequent changes make it difficult to establish stable and consistent datasets over extended periods. This, in turn, hampers the ability to analyze trends, making long-term statistical analysis and prediction more complex.

A glossary of terms is provided in the Appendix, Section [11.1](#).

3 Industry standards

A number of issues currently exist within the industry for evaluating player contributions. This is in part because of the complexity of data collection and analysis, as well as the intricate nature of the game—the vast pool of champions to select from, frequent game changes, and continuity of game states. The issues are:

- **Simplified metrics:** Data aggregation platforms such as Oracle’s Elixir and Gol.gg provide average statistics like damage dealt, gold earned per minute, and creep score (CS) differentials. These metrics are often discussed and used to gauge player performance. However, these numbers are typically presented in isolation, without comprehensive consideration of various contextual factors such as game length, team compositions, match-ups, and significant in-game events.
- **Selective use of metrics:** Due to the recognition that these simple metrics do not fully encapsulate a player’s performance, they are only used selectively. Analysts and enthusiasts in the League of Legends community recognize the limitations of these statistics and the need to contextualize them within the broader scope of the game (MissFortuneDaBes 2022; Hajir 2021; Baker 2018; LoL Esports 2017). This selective approach to metric usage reflects a consensus that individual performance in League of Legends cannot be distilled down to a few basic numbers.
- **Perception of player performance:** Given the high attribution problem in League of Legends, separating individual performances from match outcomes can be challenging. As a result, the perception of a player’s performance is often influenced by the team’s overall success. Analysts and viewers are more inclined to view players from winning teams as performing better. This trend is particularly evident during post-season awards, where there is a notable correlation between the team with the most regular-season wins and the number of representatives from that team who receive recognition as top performers in their respective roles. In the the summer of 2023, Korean teams KT and GenG had the first and second most regular season wins, respectively, and each of their players were voted first and second in their role¹. Far from an anomaly, this is part of a long-standing trend in post-season awards.

In essence, the industry’s approach to evaluating player performance in League of Legends is a pragmatic one. Recognizing the complexities involved in attributing individual contributions to match outcomes, the community has adopted simplified metrics as a starting point. However, these metrics are regarded as insufficient on their own, leading to their selective use alongside qualitative analysis and expert opinions. Ultimately, the perception of player performance is often influenced by the team’s success, reflecting the challenging nature of separating individual excellence from the dynamics of a team-based esports like League of Legends.

¹LCK Spring All-Pro awards: <https://www.oneesports.gg/league-of-legends/t1-players-all-lck-first-team/>. LCK Summer All-Pro awards: <https://www.oneesports.gg/league-of-legends/all-lck-first-team-summer-2023/>.

Individual statistics, while prominent and readily available, only represent one dimension of a player’s multifaceted skill expression. In the highly dynamic and strategic environment of team invasion games, players frequently find themselves at crossroads where choices that enhance the team’s chances of victory may not align with optimizing their individual metrics. These crucial decisions often go beyond the realm of industry-standard statistics.

Consider a scenario where a player willingly sacrifices their lane advantage to roam and support a struggling teammate in a different lane. While this selfless act may not bolster their individual gold or damage statistics, it significantly contributes to their team’s overall success. Similarly, a player who strategically engages an enemy, disrupting their actions and abilities in a team skirmish, may not emerge with impressive damage numbers, yet their impact on the game, by inhibiting the enemy’s effectiveness, is immeasurable.

The focus on individual performance has given birth to many tools, particularly in solo queue, a game mode where individual players compete in matches without pre-arranged teams. A core part of solo queue is the ranked ladder, which consists of various tiers and divisions reflecting a player’s competitive standing relative to all other players on the server. Websites like OP.GG provide tools to assess player performance in solo queue. These platforms calculate a performance score, typically on a scale from 0 to 10, by analyzing a player’s various metrics such as vision score, KDA ratio, damage dealt, and more and comparing them to their teammates. More dedicated players seeking to use these tools to improve may then focus on their individual performance over contributing to the team.

In order to comprehensively capture a player’s performance, we have to value decisions they make in the game that they believe to be in service of winning the game, notably how effectively the player helps his teammates or inhibits the enemy players. For example, if we’re considering gold as a primary resource, a player’s performance should consider not only how efficient they are at collecting gold, but how their actions help their teammates gather gold or prevent the enemy in comparison to others in the same position.

4 Related work

In solo queue, current research on player skill has, for the most part, defined player skill using Elo (Elo 1967) or Elo-based models. These models define more skilled players as players who win more games. Sapienza, Goyal, and Ferrara (2019) used the TrueSkill ranking system (Herbrich, Minka, and Graepel 2007) to measure how teammates influence a player’s skill improvement in Defense of the Ancients 2 (DotA). Aung et al. (2018) studied the relationship between early learning rate and long term performance by predicting end-of-season rank based on the rate of change in MMR at the beginning of the season. Dehpanah et al. (2021) compared different methods of aggregating win-based skill metrics to derive a team skill metric for matchmaking. Other papers focus on evaluation and improvement of motor skills (Toth et al. 2021; Velichkovsky et al. 2019; Jeong et al. 2022).

Many times, the success of a performance metric is measured by whether the metric can predict wins. Xia, Wang, and Zhou (2019) use kills as a performance metric in DotA, which they found to be more related to strategic/tactical awareness than mechanics. Bahrololloomi et al. (2022) use xp per minute.

This focus on wins is partially rooted in the ethos of competition—what matters most, after all, is whether the team wins. A rather more prolific body of literature in recent years exists around predicting wins (Birant and Birant 2022; Liang 2021; Do et al. 2021; D.-H. Kim, Lee, and Chung 2020; X. Zhang et al. 2017). However, this line of thinking fails to separate the result of the game from performance. A player can perform well but still lose; likewise, another player can perform badly but still win (Kahn and Williams 2016).

Applying this thinking to competitive gaming quickly leads to logical inconsistencies when evaluating individual player performance. In traditional sports, player-level performance is separated from team-level performance through methods such as win probability added (WPA) and plus/minus models (Hvattum 2019; Pettigrew 2015; Kaplan, Mongeon, and Ryan 2014). Within esports, consideration of how to separate player-level performance from team performance is still in its nascent stages. Clark, Macdonald, and Kloo (2020) demonstrated the Plus-Minus model’s utility in DotA. Suznjevic, Matijasevic, and Konfic (2015) argued for publishers to include consideration of in-game performance metrics when designing matchmaking systems, rather than only team result.

MOBA games, and competitive gaming in general, includes many players who take more defensive or supportive roles. In these cases, their performance is best measured in terms of impact on their team or on the enemy team. Few works consider player skill within a team context. Dehpanah et al. (2021) treat team skill as an aggregate measure of individual skill. Team skill on its own remains difficult to quantify, though attempts have been made. Y. J. Kim et al. (2017) use collective intelligence, a group measure of intelligence, to predict performance among ranked teams in League of Legends. Birant and Birant (2022) used post-game statistics and multi-instance learning to predict team wins. Kahn and Williams (2016) showed that transactive memory systems strongly predict the likelihood of a team winning a game in League of Legends. Drachen et al. (2014) used intra-team spatial distance to measure skill level in DotA, ranging from novice to pro.

In traditional sports, performance metrics such as the Plus-Minus statistic seek to measure a player’s skill level in terms of their impact on their team. The method we present has the same conceptual base as the Plus-Minus statistic, where a player’s skill level is measured within the context of the impact on their team. Our method is also able to take into account other external variables such as player role and champion, both key factors which drastically impact how a player is evaluated, and we demonstrate the advantages of our method through quantitative comparison with the Plus-Minus model of Clark, Macdonald, and Kloo (2020).

5 Data

Solo queue data were collected from the Riot API² on a daily basis from accounts ranked Diamond and above.

Solo queue data represent a valuable resource outside of competitive game data for two reasons: one, larger sample size, as the number of games a pro player plays in solo queue is typically much greater than the number of competitive matches they play; two, semi-random game matching allows for more easily attributing player actions to player skill. For example, in a competitive game, the bot player may have the highest gold in the game at 15 minutes because their jungler or mid laner are consistently visiting their lane to help them kill enemies and gain gold. How much of the bot player’s gold can be attributed to their own play, versus attributed to the mid laner or jungler’s actions? Competitive teams often form typical patterns of play such as this, which makes attribution difficult.

In solo queue, players are randomly matched to other players with roughly the same Elo. Most games have a unique set of players and champions in the game. The semi-random shuffling of ally and enemy players means the confounding issue that exists in competitive play is less of an issue in solo queue.

5.1 Criteria for game inclusion

We considered ranked solo queue games played by high-ranking accounts in the North America (NA), Korea (KR), and EU-West (EUW) servers for games played on patches 13.14 - 13.18. These patches roughly correspond to games played from July 18, 2023 to September 27, 2023, and mark the beginning of a major patch release by Riot.

Accounts on each server are separated into tiers based on their rank, updated daily. High-ranking accounts were identified as the top 1000 accounts on each server based on *LP* at the end of each day, which includes the vast majority of professional players’ accounts. This corresponds to the *grandmaster* (players ranked top 1000-301) and *challenger* (players ranked in the top 300) tiers. Any given player may have multiple high-ranking accounts within a server.

Faulty internet or a lack of desire to play the game may cause a player to ‘disconnect’, taking them out of the game. As these games were found to skew model results, we removed them by excluding games where any single player took less than 500 damage by the 7-minute mark.

Each of the five roles in the game (top, jungle, mid, bot, and support) requires a different set of skills and so it is common for players to “main” one or two roles and only occasionally play roles outside of their main roles. Within each role, we identified a set of accounts who “main” the role as those who played at least 50 games in the time period studied, which is roughly an average of two games every three days.

²Riot API: <https://developer.riotgames.com/docs/lol>

Similarly, a different set of champions is typically strong in each role and therefore more likely to be played. For each role, we consider only games with champions played by at least 30 separate accounts.

The number of games required to include an account in the data and the number of players required to include a champion in the data were chosen based on simulations. The simulations used the data availability pattern of high-ranking accounts in NA on patches 13.6 - 13.9, which were then filtered based on different requirements. An intercept, an account random effect, a champion random effect, and random noise were simulated to generate fake data. A simple random effects model was then fit to the fake data and the estimated random effects were compared to the true random effect sizes. One hundred iterations of each filtering pattern were simulated and then fit in this manner. As we are interested in whether the estimated player random effect is ordered in the same way as the actual player effect, the final set of requirements was chosen based on the method which had the highest correlation between the estimated and true effect sizes while maintaining a reasonable data set size.

5.2 Summary of data

Table 1 provides summary statistics of our data, after filtering based on the requirements described above. The data are stratified by server (NA, EUW, and KR) and by role (top, jungle, mid, bot, and support).

As of patch 13.18, there were 165 total possible champions in the game.

Table 1: Summary statistics of final data set. Models are fit separately to each region and role subset.

	Top	Jungle	Mid	Bot	Support
N					
EUW	54,047	59,406	56,888	61,029	57,674
KR	63,704	67,746	64,780	72,434	64,810
NA	43,719	51,211	41,578	48,253	45,339
# games					
EUW	40,529	43,329	41,806	44,528	42,257
KR	48,004	49,951	49,029	52,361	48,163
NA	34,664	39,549	33,344	37,797	35,525
# champions					
EUW	46	44	51	28	37
KR	41	36	43	24	36
NA	43	42	47	26	35

	# accounts				
EUW	396	432	426	449	424
KR	434	480	465	506	474
NA	386	434	390	437	405

5.3 Game data

The Riot API provides snapshots of the game state at one-minute intervals. This includes statistics like the player’s location on the map, the amount of gold they have earned, their champion’s level, and so on. We focus on statistics at 7 minutes, 15 minutes, and 25 minutes. 7 minutes and 15 minutes roughly correspond to the end of the early and mid-game phases. Roughly 50% of games last past 25 minutes, so examining the statistics at 25 minutes gives sufficient time to capture the post-laning phase while maintaining a reasonable dataset size (20,612, 16,896, and 17,769 in our data for NA, EUW, and KR, respectively).

We use the “damage done to champions”, “damage taken”, and “total gold” statistics provided by Riot’s snapshots API. Damage done to champions is the total damage a player has dealt to any other player in the game, after accounting for the effects of armor and magic resist. Damage taken is the total damage a player has taken, after accounting for *armor* and *magic resist*. Total gold is the total gold accrued by that time point.

Note that these statistics are cumulative—for example, total gold at 15 minutes includes gold accrued from 0-7 minutes. We partition the statistics by considering only the change in value within each phase. So, when considering gold at 25 minutes, we subtract total gold at 15 minutes from total gold at 25 minutes to get the gold accrued during the 15 - 25 minute time period.

All statistics are centered and scaled. All statistics are non-negative and exhibit slight skew, but as log and square root transforms of the statistics showed no improvement, no further transformations were applied.

5.4 Linking Riot accounts to professional players

To help validate our methods, we compare model results for known professional players to all other accounts included in our data. We define a professional player as someone who plays for a team in the top-level professional league in North America, Europe, Korea, or China. The respective top-level leagues for each region are the League Championship Series (LCS), League of Legends European Championship (LEC), League of Legends Champions Korea (LCK), and the League of Legends Pro League (LPL). We include players from the LPL because many LPL players have accounts on the Korean server.

Professional player accounts were identified by gathering summoner names from three websites: <https://www.trackingthepros.com/>, <https://gol.gg/>, <https://www.deeplol.gg>, and <https://lolpros.gg/>.

Table 2 gives the number of known player accounts found within our data.

Table 2: Summary of the number of player accounts within our data which were linked to a pro player within the LCS, LEC, LCK, or LPL.

Role	EUW		KR		NA	
	# accounts	# players	# accounts	# players	# accounts	# players
Top	18	15	13	13	10	10
Jungle	22	21	19	19	4	4
Mid	16	15	18	18	5	5
Bot	25	22	17	17	9	8
Support	12	10	16	15	12	9

Note that this is not an exhaustive list and many professional players have alternate accounts that they keep secret.

6 Methods

League of Legends is an invasion game where the goal is to destroy the enemy base. As such, progress is often measured by how much of the map a team can control. If the team can continuously advance towards the enemy base, then they are ahead. Teams establish this control by taking objectives, mainly through destroying enemy towers which provide both vision and defense to the enemy.

Advancing into enemy territory typically requires a balance of two umbrella categories of skill: ability to gain resources and skill in using those resources. These categories can be further broken down into sub-categories such as strategy, tactics, mechanics, and technical skill, but the end-goal is always to either gain resources or to use them effectively. We thus focus on gold (resource gain) and damage dealt (resource use) as our two main statistics. Further explanation on why we focus on gold and damage dealt specifically is included in Section 6.1.

League of Legends is a cooperative game and a player’s gold and damage dealt statistics are rarely independent from their allies’ or their enemies’ statistics. For example, some junglers may frequently roam to top lane to ambush the enemy top laner, giving their top laner the kills and the resultant gold. Without the jungler’s assistance, the gold from the kills would not have gone to the top laner. These are strategic decisions which reflect skill on the jungler’s part that would go unnoticed if looking at the jungler’s statistics alone. Therefore, we consider not just a player’s own gold and damage dealt statistics, but also evaluate how much of their

allies' and enemies' numbers can be attributed to the player. We partition a player's gold or damage dealt into three components: the portion that the player attained for themselves, the portion they enabled in their allies, and the portion they prevented from their enemies.

This is difficult to do in a competitive setting, but simpler to do with solo queue data. In a competitive setting, a player's effect on their own statistics and their teammate's are highly confounded—and if the team keeps the same roster the entire season, then they are perfectly confounded. However, the semi-random matchmaking environment of solo queue means that teammates are rarely constant from game to game, which makes it possible to separate the player's effects from their allies' effects.

Let P be the set of all players, G_p be the set of games that include player p for $p \in P$, and C be the set of champions. For $c \in C$, $g \in G_p$, we can summarize player p 's effect on their games by:

1. Estimating player p 's effect on their own statistics, gold_{pg} and dmg_{pg} (Sections 6.2 and 6.3).
2. Estimating player p 's effect on their allies' statistics (Section 6.4). To do this, we first remove the portion of the allies' statistics that are not due to player p , and then estimate player p 's effect using the remainder.
 - a. Let A_g be the set of player p 's allies in game g . For each ally a in A_g , first estimate the effect of the ally on their own statistics, $E[\text{gold}_{ag}]$ and $E[\text{dmg}_{ag}]$.
 - b. Estimate the effect of player p on their allies using the residuals $\text{gold}_{ag} - E[\text{gold}_{ag}]$ and $\text{dmg}_{ag} - E[\text{dmg}_{ag}]$, summed over all allies a , as the model response.
3. Estimating player p 's effect on their enemies' statistics (Section 6.4). To do this, we first remove the portion of the enemies' statistics that are not due to player p , and then estimate player p 's effect using the remainder.
 - a. Let E_g be the set of player p 's enemies in game g . For each enemy e in E_g , estimate the effect of the enemy on their own statistics, $E[\text{gold}_{eg}]$ and $E[\text{dmg}_{eg}]$.
 - b. Estimate the effect of player p on the enemy team using the residuals $\text{gold}_{eg} - E[\text{gold}_{eg}]$ and $\text{dmg}_{eg} - E[\text{dmg}_{eg}]$, summed over all enemies e , as the model response.

This approach is motivated by being able to capture, at least in part, subcategories of skill that typically are not quantified. Mechanics and technical skills involve things like aim, reaction time, last-hitting, and teamfighting which are often reflected in a player's individual statistics. Strategic skills like map movements, teamfight formations, and tactical skills like adapting to the enemy team's strategy typically have broader impacts and so are noticed less unless a player's effect on their allies or enemies can be quantified. This is not to say that a player's individual statistics solely reflect mechanics and technical skill, simply that there are more facets to player skill that have not been quantified and so are under-discussed.

The following sections detail the player, ally, and enemy models. Examples of the four sub-categories of skill are in the Appendix, Section 11.2.

6.1 Gold and damage dealt as measures of player skill

Progress in the game of League of Legends requires a balance of between skill in gainng resources and skill in using those resources. Gaining resources allows players to buy power. A gold differential, where one team is ahead of another, often also means a power differential. This makes it easier to force an enemy player off the map by dealing enough damage to them so that they either die or are forced to retreat. With a numbers advantage, objectives like enemy towers become much easier to secure.

As a metric, gold is both meaningful and interpretable. It is commonly accepted within the community as a measure of how ahead a player or team is. Player and team gold levels are central statistics displayed and discussed during Riot broadcasts of professional games. This is both because gold is a rough measure of power in a game and also because most measurable and meaningful actions within the game result in a gold gain. Figure 1 is a relationship of statistics provided by the Riot API. Two statistics are connected if gain in one statistic typically causes a gain in the other. Note that the majority of statistics are directly connected to gold. Those that aren't, are indirectly correlated via other statistics.




Figure 1: Directed graph plot of relationships between statistics in the Riot API.

Gold is also predictive of who will win. Figure 2 provides density plots of the difference in gold accrued by the winning team vs the losing team within each time span. The gold differential is typically positive. The later in the game, the higher gold leads by the winning team tend to be. Note, however, that the winning team is not always ahead in gold. This reflects one characteristic of the game, which is that a good performance does not necessarily lead to a win, and a win does not necessarily justify any single player's individual performance.

In League of Legends, gold is often seen as a metric for measuring a player's efficiency in resource collection. However, the true effectiveness of a player isn't just in the accumulation of resources, but also in how effectively these resources are utilized in the game. Fundamentally, League of




Figure 2: Density plots of gold differential between the winning and losing team in our data set. Percent of games with gold differential above 0 is 69% at 0-7 minutes, 79% at 7-15 minutes, and 83% at 15-25 minutes.

Legends is a strategic contest between two teams, each aiming to capture the opponent’s base. Conflict is an intrinsic part of this contest, and the gold and experience players accumulate translate primarily into combat strength. This strength is crucial for overpowering the enemy, advancing into their base, and securing key resources on the map. Similar to gold, damage is associated with wins, as seen in Figure 3, with winning teams dealing more damage in ~70% of cases during later periods of the game.

More than measuring just combat performance, damage dealt can also serve as an indication of technical and mechanical skill. For instance, a player with superior aiming skills is more likely to land skillshots, resulting in higher damage output over a period. Similarly, a player with quick reflexes can evade enemy abilities more effectively, stay engaged in teamfights longer, and consequently deal more damage while sustaining the same amount of health.

Furthermore, it’s important to recognize the roles of players, champions, and team positions that aren’t primarily focused on dealing damage. Their actions in teamfights, whether it’s enabling teammates to deal damage or hindering the enemy’s ability to inflict harm, are equally pivotal. They contribute to the team’s overall combat strategy and effectiveness. Damage as a metric is particularly insightful because it demonstrates that a player or team can overcome disadvantages through superior strategy, better coordination, or simply outclassing the opposing team in skill. Even when at a numerical or positional disadvantage, a team can triumph in a fight with the right approach and execution. Therefore, while damage is not the sole indicator of skill, it is a significant and measurable aspect of a player’s contribution to the team’s success in League of Legends.

6.2 Player model: Gold

Regression models allow for separating the effects of a player’s skill on the gold they’ve accrued from the effects of confounders. Here, the main confounder we are concerned with is the player’s choice of champion. Different champions are expected to perform better at different stages




Figure 3: Density plots of damage differential between the winning and losing team in our data set. Percent of games with gold differential above 0 is 63% for 0-7 minutes, 73% for 7-15 minutes, and 72% for 15-25 minutes.

of the game, known within the game as “scaling”, and so we do not expect average gold or damage dealt to be the same across champions. Other confounders, such as time effects, were also considered but no meaningful effects were found.

Let P be the set of all players, G_p be the set of games that include player p for $p \in P$, and C be the set of champions. For $c \in C$, we control for the player’s choice of champion with a champion random effect, b_c . We estimate the average impact a player has on their own statistics with a player-specific random effect, b_p . For $g \in G_p$, the regression model used for the gold statistic is as in Equation 1:

$$\text{gold}_{pg} = \beta_0 + b_c + b_p + \epsilon_{pg}, \quad (1)$$

where β_0 is an intercept term, ϵ_{pg} is random noise, and σ^2 is the variance for ϵ_{pg} .

The model is fit in a Bayesian paradigm, which has been shown to perform well in applications with scarce and/or imbalanced data, a property which is often attributed to hierarchical shrinking and information pooling (Gelman 2006; Morris 1983). For this reason, many recent models in sports analytics take a Bayesian approach (Herbrich, Minka, and Graepel 2007; Clark, Macdonald, and Kloo 2020; Santos-Fernandez, Wu, and Mengersen 2019; Mengersen et al. 2016). In a Bayesian paradigm, all parameters Θ have an associated prior probability density $f(\Theta)$ which represents reasonable beliefs on the scale of the parameters. These beliefs are updated by sampling from the conditional distribution $f(\Theta|Y)$, which is called the posterior distribution. Given the posterior distribution, we can then calculate summary statistics such as $E[\Theta|Y]$ or even sample from the posterior predictive distribution $f(Y_{\text{new}}|Y)$ to make predictions on new data.

Let t_3 denote a Student’s-t distribution with three degrees of freedom and let $\text{HalfC}(x)$ denote a half-Cauchy distribution with scale parameter x . The priors in this model are $\beta_0 \sim N(0, 1)$, $b_c \sim t_3(0, \phi)$, $b_p \sim t_3(0, \tau)$, and $\phi, \tau \sim \text{HalfC}(0.5)$, $\sigma \sim \text{HalfC}(0.3)$.

Note here that the random effects have scale hyperparameters τ and ϕ ; this makes the model a Bayesian hierarchical regression model. A Student's-t distribution is used instead of a normal density because it has heavier tails, which allows for outliers in the champion or player random effects. All scale hyperparameter values (ϕ , τ , σ) have half-Cauchy priors as the half-Cauchy has been shown to produce better estimates for scale parameters (Gelman 2006; Polson and Scott 2012). A HalfC(0.5) prior has a median value of 0.5, while a HalfC(0.3) prior has a median value of 0.3. Prior parameter values are chosen to be weakly informative based on reasonable beliefs in the size of effects (Gelman, Simpson, and Betancourt 2017); since all data are centered and scaled, we chose prior parameters that reflect the belief that variance parameters are between 0 and 1. We also compared the prior predictive distribution to the density of the data as a sanity check that the priors were not over-shrunk towards zero.

We use the posterior estimates for the player random effect, b_p , as our metric for player skill. Similar to a Plus-Minus statistic, this presents a naturally ordered list where players with large positive scores are taken as more skilled in gaining gold than average, while players with negative scores are less skilled. Because the statistics are centered and scaled, we can interpret b_p in terms of standard deviations. A value of 1, for example, means that a player's gold generation is, on average, one standard deviation above the mean, relative to all games. If divided by τ , b_p/τ can be interpreted as a score relative to all other players. We use b_p directly so that we have a meaningful measure of effect size; a small τ means the player score will also be appropriately small.

6.3 Player model: Damage dealt

Damage dealt can be high because a player is particularly effective at dealing damage or simply because they are more aggressive. To assess skill in dealing damage, then, we must be able to standardize the amount of damage dealt by the frequency of skirmishes a player is involved in. Since it is rare for damage to be dealt without also taking damage (and vice versa), we include a damage taken covariate as a rough estimate of how aggressive a player is. Otherwise, the model is the same structure as the gold model.

Let P be the set of all players, G_p be the set of games that include player p for $p \in P$, and C be the set of champions. For $c \in C$ and $g \in G_p$, the model for damage dealt is shown in Equation 2 below.

$$\text{dmg}_{pg} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{dmgt}}x_{pg} + b_c + b_p + \epsilon_{pg} \quad (2)$$

where x_{pg} is the amount of damage taken by player p in game g during the given time period in the given role. The prior placed on β_{dmgt} is $N(0, 1)$. All other priors are the same as in the gold model.

6.4 Ally models

When estimating a player’s impact on their allies’ statistics, we first account for each ally’s champion, role, and average gold or damage accrued and remove that from their gold or damage numbers. In a Frequentist context and under the semi-random matchmaking environment of solo queue, these steps may not be necessary so long as a player is not consistently matched with the same ally playing the same role or the same champion. In other words, we would not expect any confounding and therefore would not expect any multicollinearity. However, given the high degree of data imbalance in the data, the prevalence of one-tricks (players who play the same champion and role in the vast majority of their games), and the relatively small pool of high-ranking players who are all playing at different times, meaning the same players can be matched together again and again, we do not assume independence.

We determine an ally’s expected gold or damage dealt values and then use the total amount all allies over- or under-perform relative to their expected quantity as the model response. Specifically:

1. Let G_p be the set of all games involving player p and let $g \in G_p$. Let A_g be the set of player p ’s allies in game g . For each ally a in A_g , estimate the expected gold accrued or damage dealt by ally a , $E[\text{gold}_{ag}]$ and $E[\text{dmg}_{ag}]$. This is done using the models in Equation 1 and Equation 2, respectively, but expanded for all allies of players in our data. Note that this requires re-fitting the models to the expanded set of data.
2. Take the sum total of the residuals within each game,

$$\Delta(\text{gold}_{A_g}) := \sum_{a \in A_g} (\text{gold}_{ag} - E[\text{gold}_{ag}])$$

and

$$\Delta(\text{dmg}_{A_g}) := \sum_{a \in A_g} (\text{dmg}_{ag} - E[\text{dmg}_{ag}])$$

3. Fit a mixed-effects regression model to the sum of residuals, Δ ,

$$\Delta = \beta_0 + b_c + b_p + \epsilon_g. \tag{3}$$

We use the posterior estimate for b_p to assess the average impact player p has on their four allies.

By first estimating and then removing a single ally a ’s impact on their own statistics, we account for the champion and role ally a is playing, as well as the amount of gold and damage ally a typically accrues within our data. If any multicollinearity is present, this amounts to saying that any overlap in information should be attributed to ally a , rather than player p . The remainder of ally a ’s statistics is then due to the other players in the game and the particular

circumstances of that single game. By fitting the mixed-effects model in Equation 3, we can determine the total impact player p has on their allies as a collective.

We model a player’s impact on their allies as a team because we typically found that, outside of their direct lane opponent, the majority of players had little impact on their allies in our data, leading to estimates with small effect sizes and wide posteriors.

Re-fitting the models in step 1 to the larger set of data can be expensive in terms of computing time. Since including all allies or enemies increases the sample size of the data, it also increases the fitting time of the model. To speed up computation time, we approximate the re-fitted model estimates using AXE (A. X. Zhang et al. 2023). AXE produces reliable estimates of the fitted values for a re-fitted Bayesian hierarchical regression model as long as the posterior means of the variance hyperparameters (in this case, τ , ϕ , and σ) are similar between the original model and the re-fitted. Note that this usage is an extension of the AXE method, as we first fit to the smaller subset and then use AXE to approximate posterior means for the model fitted to the larger data, rather than the reverse.

6.5 Enemy models

The procedure for the enemy models is the same as the ally model, using gold/damage values for the set of all enemies e in E_g . Rather than the posterior estimate for b_p , we use $-b_p$ as the player’s performance metric, because reducing the enemies’ gold income or damage dealt is a positive indication of skill for player p .

6.6 Champion proficiency heuristic

The SIDO models give a score relative to all players, regardless of the champions they played. An additional heuristic that may be useful is one that measures a player’s skill with a specific champion, relative to all other players who play the same champion.

Using the SIDO models, the posterior expectation of an average player’s performance on champion c is $\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{b}_c$, where $\hat{\beta}_0 := E[\beta_0|Y]$ and $\hat{b}_c := E[b_c|Y]$, where Y is the model response (own gold or damage dealt, in this case). Let G_{pc} be the set of all games player p plays on champion c and n_{pc} be the cardinality of the set G_{pc} . To get the player’s average performance on a champion, we subtract this expectation from their actual gold (or damage) values and take the average of the differences, as in Equation 4 below:

$$\delta_{pc} := \frac{1}{n_{pc}} \sum_{g \in G_{pc}} (Y_{pg} - \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{b}_c), \quad (4)$$

We then center and scale the set of δ_{pc} across all players p to get the champion proficiency heuristic.

7 Results

We compare the SIDO models to two other models: a basic average model (BA), representing the industry standard, and the Plus-Minus model as described by Clark, Macdonald, and Kloo (2020). For the BA model, we simply calculate the average gold (or damage dealt) for each player within the games in our data set.

7.1 Separation of pro players

A difficulty of performance models in general is that there is no objective truth standard. One way to indirectly validate our results is by comparing the average player effect size for accounts known to belong to a professional player to all other accounts. In general, we expect accounts belonging to professional players to score higher in our model than the average grandmaster solo queue player.

We compare scores for accounts belonging to pro players to unknown accounts, i.e. accounts not linked to a current pro, a retired pro, or anyone playing in a professional circuit (such as academy and amateur leagues). We label these unknown accounts as “non-pro”, though it is likely they also contain accounts for pros.

For each of the 0-7 minute, 7-15 minute, and 15-25 minute time periods, we summarize pro scores into two numbers: the “ally + player” score, the sum total of the ally and player models, and the “enemy” score. The BA model does not include ally/enemy scores, so we present only one score. The Plus-Minus model includes defensive and offensive scores—we label the defensive scores as “enemy” scores and offensive scores as “ally” scores.

Overall, we found that there was insufficient evidence that the Plus-Minus model was able to meaningfully differentiate between pro and non-pro accounts. The Plus-Minus model often scored pro accounts lower than the average non-pro account. Most differences were also small in magnitude. Both the BA and SIDO models found large positive differences between the average pro and average non-pro scores in top, mid, and bot, but the BA model showed fewer differences in the jungle and support roles, which are often less carry-focused and more utility-focused. The SIDO model found large positive differences across all roles.

Plots describing our results follow in the next sections.

7.1.1 Gold models

Figure 4 provides bar charts of the differences between pro and non-pro accounts for the SIDO, BA, and Plus-Minus gold models, respectively.

We see a considerable positive difference between pro and non-pro scores in almost all regions, game-segments and roles under the SIDO models, with the exception of “Enemy @ 15-25 min”

for top, mid and bot, and “Ally + Player @ 15-25” for support. These may be a result of the changing priorities or opportunities during that phase of the game. For example, during that time period the laners (top, mid, adc) often work together to synchronize their movement to set up for and capture important objectives instead of prioritizing the denial of resources from their opponents. Similarly, the 0-7 min time period for junglers involves very few opportunities for differentiation as they spend most of their time collecting resources and looking for ways to capitalize on their counterpart’s inefficiencies or enemy weaknesses rather than help allies.

Although the BA model also shows some differences between pro and non-pro scores, it is less consistent than the SIDO model, and the magnitude of such differences are smaller. For most regions, the BA model does not distinguish between pro and non-pros in the jungle and support roles. For the mid and bot roles, it’s interesting to see an increase of differences over the course of the game, with the opposite true for top role—this is consistent with late-game differences we’ve seen for the SIDO model.

The Plus-Minus model overall shows much smaller differences between pro and non-pro accounts for both “ally” and “enemy” models. The density plot of average scores also reveal some scores for NA which might account for the larger differences for “Ally @ 7-15 min” and “Enemy @ 7-15 min”, but in terms of magnitude expressed per standard deviation, these still fall considerably short of the SIDO or BA models.

7.1.2 Damage models

Figure 5 provides bar charts of the differences between pro and non-pro accounts for the SIDO, BA, and Plus-Minus damage models, respectively.

The SIDO models show consistent differences between pro and non-pro players. Notably the support role, whose value is traditionally hard to quantify, shows a significant differentiation through the enemy damage prevented throughout the game. This would highlight that for support players, professionals are significantly better at understanding the enemy players and preventing their damage. The lack of difference in some of the stats may result in specific role priorities. For example, the first seven minutes for junglers involves very few opportunities for differentiation due to the nature of their role. A similar reasoning regarding their approach to the role in teamfights and skirmishes for mid and top laners after 15 min could explain the lack of difference in the enemy damage prevented.

The BA damage models look considerably similar to the BA gold models, which showcases the relationship between gold (resource) and damage (power) that we highlighted earlier. We note that the regional differences in the BA damage models are larger than for gold, especially for mid, bot and support roles.

Similar to the gold scores, the Plus-Minus model shows considerably smaller differences and less consistency, making it unable to distinguish between pro and non-pro players. We will examine the model in more detail in section 7.2.




Figure 4: For all damage models, bar charts of the average difference between pro and non-pro scores and density plots of average non-pro scores. Differences are divided by the standard deviation of non-pro scores, so that different methods may be compared.

7.1.3 SIDO model t-tests

Subfigures 4A and 5A show many large positive differences between pro and non-pro scores under the SIDO model. We conducted one-sided t-tests of these differences to determine which were statistically significant under the alternative hypothesis that the average pro score is




Figure 5: For all gold models, bar charts of the average difference between pro and non-pro scores and density plots of average non-pro scores. Differences are divided by the standard deviation of non-pro scores, so that different methods may be compared.

greater than the average non-pro score. Correction for multiple testing was applied using Benjamini-Hochberg’s false discovery rate adjustment (FDR, Benjamini and Hochberg 1995), which was shown to have more power than the Bonferroni correction. Figure 6 presents density plots of the FDR-adjusted p-values. The majority of the differences in the 0-7 minute and 7-15 minute time period are large enough to be statistically significant. All of the negative

differences have p-values larger than 0.5, indicating that the difference is too small to reject the null. For the 15-25 minute period, the density of the adjusted p-values is much broader and in some cases resembles a uniform distribution. Less difference, then, is detected by the SIDO models between pros and non-pros in the 15-25 minute time period.




Figure 6: Plots of FDR-adjusted p-values for all SIDO models. Vertical line is present at p-value of 0.05.

7.2 Metric quality

Performance metric quality can be assessed using the meta-metrics defined by Franks et al. (2016), who proposed three separate criteria:

- 1) discrimination: does the metric meaningfully differentiate between players?
- 2) independence: does the metric provide new information that other metrics do not?
- 3) stability: does the metric measure the same thing over time?

We evaluate the BA model, the Plus-Minus model of Clark, Macdonald, and Kloof (2020), and our models under the three criteria above.

7.2.1 Discrimination

The discrimination meta-metric is the fraction (between 0 and 1) of between-player variance in a metric that is not attributed to sampling variance. Thus, metrics which are low in noise tend to score high in discrimination.




Figure 7: Density plots of discrimination values for all models.

First, we note that the SIDO player models have lower discrimination than the BA model. This is to be expected, based on the model structure. The SIDO models separate the response into the portion due to the player (b_p) and the portion due to the champion (b_c), but the BA model does not take into account champion. Players with different champion pools will then be scored on uneven scales, creating larger differentiation. Another reason for lower discrimination is because hierarchical Bayesian models are inherently more conservative—they encode more sources of uncertainty and, for those player accounts with fewer games played, will shrink model estimates for the account towards a global mean. While we use bootstrapped standard error estimates for calculating discrimination in the BA model, in the SIDO models we use the posterior standard deviations. Thus a hierarchical Bayesian version of the BA model (the same as the SIDO models but without adjusting for confounders) would also be expected to have lower discrimination scores.

The question, then, is whether the shrinkage and additional uncertainty encoded in the Bayesian model is appropriate or not. To assess this, we used both the SIDO and BA models to predict player gold and damage scores in patches 13.10 and 13.11. We then calculated root mean square error (RMSE) for each player account. Figure 8 shows that the SIDO model consistently performs better at prediction, with lower RMSEs. This indicates that, while the SIDO model performs lower on discrimination than the BA model, it is more accurate.

Next, we note that discrimination scores for the ally/enemy models are low across the board. Scoring high in discrimination requires not just being able to separate the extremes from the




Figure 8: Density plots comparing SIDO player model predictions on test data to BA model predictions.

remaining accounts, but also the ability to separate any given pair of accounts from each other. The results in Section 7.1 suggest that the SIDO ally/enemy models may be able to separate players at the extremes from the remaining player accounts, but the discrimination results above show that the ally/enemy model scores contain a good deal of uncertainty that makes it difficult to distinguish accounts in the middle of the pack from each other. Rather than providing a continuous score for the ally/enemy models as we do for the player models, we thus recommend categorizing ally/enemy scores as “high positive impact”, “low positive impact”, “neutral”, “low negative impact”, and “high negative impact”.

It is possible that most pro players approach solo queue with a less cooperative mindset than professional play. We note that discrimination of the champion effect in the ally/enemy models is more reasonable with median values of 0.73 and 0.76, respectively. This indicates that effect sizes may simply be smaller for the ally/enemy models than for the player models. To verify this, the models need to be extended to pro play, which we leave for future work.

The SIDO ally/enemy models do out-perform the Plus-Minus models in discrimination. We posit a few reasons for this: 1) The Plus-Minus models do not take into account role, champion, or other confounding variables. For example, a player who mains top lane will have very different numbers in a jungle role than their main role. All of the above would lead to greater

uncertainty in the model and thus a lower discrimination score. 2) The Plus-Minus models require fitting a separate effect for all players in all games. This creates a highly skewed distribution of player effects, where most player effects belong to people that are filtered out of the SIDO models as not having enough high-Elo games. The vast majority of player effects under the Plus-Minus models are very close to zero, which one would expect under a model where the majority of players are included in only a handful of games.

The discrimination results indicate that it is necessary to carefully consider how SIDO model results are presented so that the level of uncertainty does not lead to misleading conclusions. Part of this is mitigated by the structure of Bayesian hierarchical models—players whose numbers carry a large degree of uncertainty will have their numbers shrunk towards zero. Another method is to save all trace results from the model so that when any two player numbers are compared to each other, the posterior probability that one player has a higher score than another can be computed.

A full table of the discrimination scores is provided in the Appendix, Section [11.3.1](#).

7.2.2 Independence

Franks et al. (2016) define the independence metric as the fraction of variance in a metric that is not correlated with any other performance metric. When independence is high (1), then a metric is independent from all other performance metrics. The independence metric is calculated by first estimating correlation using a Gaussian copula model. The properties of a multivariate normal distribution can then be used to calculate independence. Note that, based on this definition, independence tends to decrease as more metrics are compared to each other, and so the value of the independence metric depends on the set of metrics that are being considered.

A full table of the independence scores is provided in the Appendix, Section [11.3.2](#).

The Plus-Minus model scores the highest in independence, while the BA model scores the lowest. The low scores for the BA model are likely due to the high correlation between raw gold and raw damage numbers. Without accounting for champion and other confounders, the raw damage statistic essentially provides very little new information from the raw gold statistic. The SIDO models perform in the middle, with numbers generally between 0.5 and 0.7.

7.2.3 Stability

Measuring stability over time provides assurance that a metric is measuring the same thing from patch to patch. However, we note that part of the usefulness of a good metric is tracking progression of a player’s career over time. Thus, we are interested in determining whether the SIDO models are relatively stable—meaning that a player who scores high one patch does not




Figure 9: Density plots of the independence metric across all regions, roles, and timepoints.

have an extremely low score the next patch—but they should also reflect any change in ability over large periods of time.

To assess stability of each method’s performance metrics over time, we fit the SIDO and BA models to data from patches 13.14 - 13.18 and compared to the metrics from patches 13.6 - 13.9. This corresponds to dates March 21, 2023 to May 18, 2023. The amount of overlap in player accounts between the two data sets is around 20% across all regions, as shown in Table 3. In contrast, the amount of overlap between the two data sets in champions played in each role is much higher at around 80% in most roles and around 90% in the bot and top roles. This is likely due to our data collection method, which selects only games played by the top 1000 players for every day, then further filters down players based on the number of games. For players who hover around the boundary for grandmaster, this two-step process greatly increases the number of games they need to play to be included in our data.

Table 3: Percent of overlap between the two time periods of data.

Role	Accounts	Champions
BOT	0.17	0.90
JGL	0.18	0.79
MID	0.19	0.77
SUP	0.17	0.78
TOP	0.22	0.92

We calculated the concordance index between player scores from patches 13.14 - 18 and 13.6 - 13.9. Given the set of all possible pairs of players within our data, the concordance index counts the number of pairs which are identically ordered between the two data sets, e.g. a concordance index of 0.6 means that 60% of all possible combinations of two players have the same ordering between our two data sets. As the purpose of a performance metric is to compare players to each other, the concordance index provides an intuitive measure of how similar any two sets of player rankings are to each other.

For the ally/enemy models, we use the categorizations described in Section 7.2.1. We assign number rankings of 1-5 to the categorizations, which are then used to calculate concordance. Concordance is scale-free, so the actual numbers assigned to the categorizations do not matter as long as they are in order.

Given the Plus-Minus model's low discrimination and high computing time (22 - 96 hours for a single model), we did not re-fit the Plus-Minus model to the new data set.




Figure 10: Density plots of concordance index for each model and method.

Conceptually, the player SIDO models are similar to the BA model, except they account for the champion played and include additional shrinkage based on the structure of the data. In other words, the BA model, to some degree, conflates the player scores with the champion effect, since most players will stick to the subset of champions they are comfortable with. The additional stability for the BA model comes from the champion effect, which we can see by looking at the concordance index of the champion effect, shown in Figure 11. In the EUW and NA servers, concordance is typically above 0.8 for the champion effect. Since the BA model does not distinguish between the champion effect and the player effect, it will naturally be more stable.

We note that the player and champion effects are all relative estimates—a value of 0 indicates the player (or champion) typically performs at an average level, relative to all other players (or champions). The low degree of intersection between the two data sets then makes it more difficult to measure stability. The SIDO models still have high stability for the player model regardless, but in the ally and enemy models, where there are lower effect sizes and wider uncertainty bounds, the models have relatively low stability. While the categories help to improve stability, the improvement is modest compared to using the model effects directly without the categorizations. However, the ally/enemy models typically have higher stability in the champion effect, as seen in Figure 11.




Figure 11: Density plots of concordance index values for SIDO “player” models, champion effect.

A full table of the independence scores is provided in the Appendix, Section 11.3.3.

7.3 Qualitative analysis and examples

To evaluate the performance of our models, we assessed whether they align with specific expectations pertaining to professional players.

7.3.1 Champion prioritization

Within a given season, certain champions in each role are deemed more optimal for competitive play, leading players to dedicate increased time to practicing and analyzing these champions during team practices and competitive matches.

1. **We examined the proficiency of professional players on the highest-priority champion for their respective roles during a season in comparison to the average non-professional player. We anticipated observing a significant difference in performance.**

To conduct this assessment, we focused on professional bot-lane players in the Korean server, as they are the most likely to practice the same champions in solo queue as they would during team practices.

For instance, during the Summer 2023 season, Kaisa emerged as the most prevalent bot lane pick (known as a “meta” pick) in competitive play in Korea. We assumed that players extensively trained with this champion during team practices. Figure 12 illustrates that the average proficiency of professional bot lane players on Kaisa, in terms of both gold earned and damage dealt, was 1.075 and 1.1975, respectively, as compared to non-professional accounts with an average of 0.




Figure 12: LCK champion proficiencies (gold) on Kaisa in the summer.

2. We examined professional players’ proficiency on champions they actively practiced in comparison to their proficiency on champions they did not prioritize. We anticipated an observable difference in performance.

To investigate this, we conducted an analysis focusing on Ruler, consistently regarded as one of the best bot lane players globally, with notable achievements including two regional championships and an MSI title in 2023. During the Spring season, his preferred champions for stage play encompassed Aphelios, Zeri, Varus, and Jinx, as shown in Figure 13.

Assuming that Ruler’s on-stage champion selections reflect his practice focus, we expected these champions to exhibit his highest proficiency in solo queue. Figure 14 shows that Ruler consistently demonstrated significantly higher gold accumulation throughout all phases of the game on champions he played on stage and presumably practiced extensively, in contrast to those he did not prioritize.

3. We explored the proficiency levels of professional players on specific champions over time, considering the influence of increased or decreased practice.

To investigate this, we examined the proficiency change for Xayah among professional bot lane players between the Spring and Summer seasons. We selected this champion due to its increased presence, rising from 20% pick and ban rate in Spring to 59% pick/ban rate in Summer, and the

CHAMPION	NB GAMES	WIN RATE	KDA
Zeri	13	84.6%	10.4
Aphelios	13	84.6%	8.8
Varus	11	72.7%	6.8
Jinx	11	90.9%	11.5
Xayah	5	60%	7.3
Caitlyn	4	75%	8.3
Sivir	2	50%	6.0
Jhin	2	100%	25.0
Lucian	2	0%	2.3

Figure 13: Bot lane player Ruler’s statistics in Spring 2023. Screenshot from <https://gol.gg>.




Figure 14: Champion proficiency scores for Ruler in spring and summer.

availability of data for player performance on this champion in both seasons. We expected an improvement in proficiency, assuming that players had engaged in more consistent practice.

As depicted in Figure 15, the average proficiency levels for Xayah among each player demonstrated a notable increase from Spring to Summer.




Figure 15: Champion proficiency scores for LCK bot players on Kaisa. Aiming and V1per are not included due to insufficient games on Xayah in spring.

The three qualitative tests conducted in our study, while not exhaustive, provide valuable insights into the model’s capabilities with regard to specific metrics. These tests underscore the model’s ability to:

- **Show player proficiency levels on different champions:** One of the primary strengths of our model is its capacity to reveal a player’s proficiency on various champions and offer a more nuanced assessment of their skill set, transcending a one-size-fits-all evaluation.
- **Compare different players:** The model’s effectiveness in comparing different players is another noteworthy aspect. Through our analysis, we have demonstrated the model’s ability to distinguish between professional players and non-professionals, showcasing its discriminative power. This capability opens avenues for evaluating player performance on a broader scale, allowing us to pinpoint standout individuals, identify trends, and make informed comparisons across the player spectrum.
- **Tracking proficiency over time:** Our study highlights the model’s effectiveness in tracking proficiency over time. This is vital for understanding player growth, adaptation, and development. Observing changes in proficiency offers insights into the impact of practice, evolving strategies, and meta shifts on a player’s performance.

These findings lay the groundwork for our research, providing a robust foundation for future endeavors. We aim to extend our models by incorporating additional metrics that offer deeper insights into player performance, such as adaptability and decision-making. Furthermore, our aspiration is to broaden the scope of our research to encompass various skill levels.

7.3.2 Collaborative teamplay

Another assumption we make is that professional players possess a better strategic and tactical understanding of the game, that they are adept at collaborating with teammates and responding effectively to opponents to secure victory.

1. Analyzing Player Impact on Teammates and Enemies:

To assess this, we selected professional junglers from the Korean server, as the role inherently affords players significant freedom throughout the game in terms of where to go and what actions to undertake. For instance, in the early game, a jungler can opt for the most efficient gold-generating path, divert their efforts to aid a struggling ally, or hinder and weaken an enemy player. Likewise, during teamfights, the player can exercise discretion in choosing when to maximize damage output or secure kills, determine the optimal timing for enabling allies to inflict the most damage, or adopt strategic positioning and attack patterns to thwart the most formidable foes. These decisions, all equally valid, can pave the way for victory, with the finest junglers adept at prioritizing them based on the game’s evolving state.

Our analysis encompassed various LCK junglers alongside Kanavi and Tarzan, prominent figures from the Chinese league, and Blaber and Jankos, esteemed junglers from North America and Europe respectively. We anticipated a broad spectrum of playstyles and a discernible impact on both allies and enemies compared to non-professional counterparts.

As depicted in Figure 16, all professional junglers exhibited proficiency in accumulating more gold. Notably, they also excelled in impeding enemy gold acquisition and damage output in comparison to their non-professional counterparts (with an average of 0). We posit that the impact of professional players on their allies may be neutral or even negative when contrasted with their non-professional counterparts. In the solo queue context, they might prioritize self-resource allocation for victory, rather than diverting resources to their non-professional allies.

	Gold			Damage			Gold enabled (allies)			Damage enabled (allies)			Gold prevented (enemies)			Damage prevented (enemies)		
	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m
tarzan	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.1	0.24	0.25	-0.04	-0.02	0	-0.07	-0.06	-0.01	0.12	0.22	0.03	0.06	0.12	-0.02
sylvie	0.12	0.1	0.13	0	0.12	0.13	0	0.02	0	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.09	0.22	0.08	0.03	0.12	0.02
sponge	0.16	0.1	0.03	0.06	0.21	0.13	-0.08	-0.02	0.08	0	-0.07	0.03	0.12	0.15	0.06	0.05	0.08	-0.01
oner	0.27	0.21	0.12	0.31	0.24	0.3	-0.05	-0.02	-0.01	-0.07	-0.04	-0.08	0.18	0.19	0.04	0.06	0.11	0.34
lucid	0.12	0.17	0.06	-0.02	0.21	0.15	0.01	0.04	-0.04	0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.07	0.07	-0.02	0.01	0.08	-0.01
kanavi	0.2	0.1	0.02	0.28	0.27	0.17	0	-0.01	0	-0.03	-0.07	-0.03	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.07	-0.01	-0.02
jankos	0.02	0.05	0.18	-0.12	0.04	0.13	-0.13	0.04	0.01	0.2	0.07	-0.01	0.02	0.16	0.06	0	0.14	0.03
grizzly	0.13	0.18	0.21	0.01	0.1	0.06	-0.05	-0.02	0.06	-0.05	-0.03	0	0.05	0.14	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.05
cuzz	0.05	0.11	0.04	0.15	0.09	0.12	0.03	0.05	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.06	0.24	0	0.07	0.1	-0.01
canyon	0.09	0.1	0	-0.19	-0.11	0.13	-0.22	-0.01	-0.03	-0.1	-0.03	-0.05	0.07	0.32	0.02	0.09	0.24	0.05
blaber	0.25	0.13	0.17	0.08	0.09	0.19	0.01	0.06	0.28	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.13	0.03	0.02	0.07	-0.03

Figure 16: SIDO scores for LCK junglers identified in our dataset, + Kanavi, Tarzan, Blaber, and Jankos. Scores for players with multiple identified accounts are combined into one mean score.

2. Professional players distinguish themselves in terms of both technical skill and strategic/tactical depth.

To examine this distinction, we sought to quantify the extent of difference in average proficiency levels between professional and non-professional players across all measured categories. For the jungle role, we anticipated that the most significant disparity between professional and non-professional players would lie in their impact on enemies rather than individual statistics. Conversely, for the bot lane role, we expected the reverse trend due to the role’s emphasis on technical skill, damage capability, and limited strategic choices.

Initially, we conducted an analysis encompassing a broader spectrum of professional and semi-professional junglers across the EU West and Korean servers. Table 4 illustrates that, on average, the most substantial differentiation between professionals and non-professionals lies in their impact on the enemy team’s ability to accumulate gold during the 7-15 minute phase.

Table 4: Average SIDO model score for jungler accounts belonging to pros in the LCK and LEC. Our database contains known accounts for 9 players in the LCK and 7 players in the LEC.

Metric	LCK			LEC		
	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m	0-7m	7-15m	15-25m
Gold	0.13	0.12	0.09	0.05	0.20	0.13
Damage	0.06	0.14	0.16	0.05	0.17	0.10
Gold enabled (allies)	-0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.08	-0.03	-0.02
Damage enabled (allies)	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.08	-0.08	-0.06
Gold prevented (enemies)	0.08	0.17	0.03	0.02	0.12	0.05
Damage prevented (enemies)	0.05	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.12	0.08

This variance can be attributed to the phase’s complexity during the laning phase, marked by numerous objectives to contest and dynamic player movement across the map. Experienced professional junglers demonstrate a keen ability to recognize diverse game states and make well-informed decisions. However, this impact may diminish later in the game when teams typically converge for major objectives, leaving fewer choices for most roles overall. The jungle also has fewer resources than the lanes and fewer opportunities to gain gold. This means the role often has more limited capabilities in the 0-7 minute time frame and may contribute to having less impact on allies and enemies in that period.

Furthermore, we extended our analysis to encompass all roles and all players identified as belonging to a professional or semi-professional team (including academy and amateur), then evaluated their average proficiency levels across various categories. Building on our prior analysis, we specifically focused on own gold earned and gold prevented from enemies during the 0-7 minute and 7-15 minute intervals, as these categories exhibited the most significant disparities between professionals and non-professionals in the jungle role. Own gold earned reflects more technical and mechanical skill, while gold prevented from enemies reflects strategic and tactical decision-making. See Section 11.2 for examples.

Figure 17 highlights that, considering solely these two categories, the discrepancy between technical skill and teamplay for bot lane players leaned almost 2:1 in favor of technical skill. Conversely, for junglers, it exhibited a 1:2 ratio, emphasizing the significance of preventing enemies from accumulating gold. In contrast, for other roles, the ratio was nearly 1:1.

8 Discussion

In this paper, we presented results comparing SIDO performance metrics to a basic average model, representing the industry standard, and a Plus-Minus model. We presented evidence that suggests the SIDO models are better able to capture all the ways a player can contribute




Figure 17: Average pro and semi-pro player proficiency, compared to non-pro proficiency, aggregated and presented as percentages.

positively to the game and not just to their own individual statistics, something which the BA model cannot do. We showed as well that the Plus-Minus model did not perform well in solo queue data, and posit that the reason is because of the structure of solo queue data. In solo queue, the same players may play multiple roles, which drastically changes their statistics from game to game. Since the Plus-Minus model does not differentiate between roles, this introduces additional noise. The large number of players outside our data set that are required to be included in the Plus-Minus model which may have skewed results.

We provided a number of qualitative examples showing how the SIDO models can be used. We measured pro player proficiency on specific champions, and we showed how this translated to competitive play. We demonstrated how the SIDO models quantify strategic and tactical skill by comparing professional junglers to an average grandmaster player, and showed the majority of junglers performed well at shutting down their enemies, in addition to performing well in terms of their own statistics. Lastly, we showed that the jungle and support roles demonstrate more strategic and tactical skill as compared to the other roles. Notably, the bot role has the heaviest emphasis on mechanics and technical skill.

Although the SIDO ally and enemy models in many ways appear to perform as desired—they are able to capture differences between professional players at the highest level of competitive play relative to average high-MMR soloqueue players and provide context to player statistics that conforms with expectations—low discrimination scores suggest taking any numerical result with a note of caution. In general, player effect sizes for the ally/enemy models are lower than for the player models, which naturally leads to lower discrimination. This may be a result of soloqueue play, which does not have the same level of communication as teams in competitive

play and so cooperation within a team is more difficult. Future work is needed to investigate this further.

The SIDO models represent first steps towards framing player performance as the combination of their total impact on the game (themselves, their allies, and their enemies). In this way, we hope to shift the discourse towards a more holistic understanding of the game and enable:

1. Better experience for players

In the world of professional gaming, solo queue is where most players sharpen their skills. But solo queue isn't a perfect reflection of teamwork, as players can't plan or talk to their teammates as effectively as in team practices or real competitions. So, players often think that to win in solo queue, they have to do everything themselves. When they fall behind and can't carry the game, they take big risks to try and get back in control. When many players share this mindset, it can lead to conflicts within the team. This focus on individual performance is also encouraged by the data shown to players and analysts. They often look at individual stats to compare players, and the post-game screen in League of Legends emphasizes individual achievements.

But our research shows that professional players stand out not just for their individual stats but also for how they influence their teammates—a kind of teamwork that's possible even in solo queue.

To bridge this gap, we need to introduce new measures that highlight how a player affects their teammates and opponents. This change could encourage players to value teamwork more and make more strategic and cooperative decisions in the game. This shift towards teamwork aligns with what we see in professional play and could make the gaming experience more enjoyable and strategic for everyone.

2. Scouting at the professional level

The issue of superteams in professional gaming is a recurring phenomenon during each offseason. Teams invest significant resources in creating these superteams by assembling players with exceptional technical skills from various professional teams. However, there is a fundamental problem with this approach. When these individual star players were part of their previous teams, they often enjoyed certain privileges and the freedom to play the game in a way that best suited their strengths. Their former teammates understood how to enable them, and this synergy allowed them to shine.

The real challenge arises when these star players are brought together into a single team. Despite their remarkable individual skills, they may have distinct playing styles that do not necessarily align. Moreover, they lack the experience of enabling their new teammates in the same way they were supported in their previous teams. This can lead to a disconnect within the superteam, resulting in underperformance compared to what would be expected based on the individual talents of its members.

A more effective approach for organizations could involve considering players as a combination of their technical skill and teamplay. By evaluating a player's ability to work cohesively with their teammates and contribute to the overall team strategy, organizations can build more harmonious and efficient teams without the need for exorbitant budgets. This approach not only ensures better team dynamics but also maximizes the potential of each player within the collective unit, ultimately leading to more successful and balanced teams in the competitive gaming landscape. In this way, team synergy and teamwork become critical factors in creating a winning formula, rather than just relying on individual star power.

3. More efficient coaching at all levels of the ecosystem

A significant challenge within the League of Legends ecosystem lies in the relatively primitive state of coaching, particularly with a heavy focus on performance rather than player development. One of the primary reasons behind this limitation is the lack of objective tools to track player performances and proficiencies in a quantifiable manner. In the absence of such metrics, coaches often rely on subjective evaluations and anecdotal evidence to assess players' strengths and weaknesses.

This issue is particularly pronounced in a game like League of Legends, which is still relatively young in the realm of competitive esports. Unlike more established sports with well-established coaching methodologies and data-driven approaches, League of Legends coaching has lagged behind in terms of sophistication. The current emphasis on performance rather than player development can hinder the long-term growth and potential of players. The solution to this challenge lies in creating a quantifiable way to evaluate players in different roles at all skill levels. By developing comprehensive metrics and data-driven assessments that go beyond individual statistics, coaches can gain a deeper understanding of a player's proficiency, decision-making, and overall impact on the game. These metrics can encompass not only technical skills but also teamplay, adaptability, and strategic thinking.

With such tools at their disposal, coaches can design more efficient and tailored training regimens to help their players learn, improve, and perform consistently. By identifying areas for improvement and tracking progress over time, coaches can provide targeted guidance and support, fostering player development and elevating the overall competitive landscape. This shift towards a more data-driven and objective approach to coaching holds the potential to revolutionize player development in League of Legends and contribute to the game's continued growth and evolution as a competitive esports.

4. A metric that allows for research projects to be conducted at scale

Conducting research in competitive gaming has long been hindered by the absence of a standardized metric to evaluate player performance. This challenge has raised questions about how various factors, such as sleep patterns or practice routines, impact player performance. Traditional research methods often involve subjective assessments, resulting in potential biases and limited generalizability.

A model that benchmarks player’s proficiency and performance in solo queue that can be tracked over a period of time can allow for:

- **Objective analysis:** Researchers can now employ a more objective framework for assessing player performance.
- **Precise variable measurement:** The model enables more precise measurements of different performance factors, ensuring the accuracy of research findings.
- **Comparative research:** Researchers can conduct direct comparisons across players, teams, or regions, uncovering valuable insights into performance disparities and trends.
- **Longitudinal studies:** The model facilitates longitudinal studies, allowing researchers to explore the developmental trajectories of player skills and strategies over time.
- **Causal inference:** Researchers can investigate causal relationships, providing a more robust basis for drawing conclusions.
- **Sample size and generalizability:** The model’s scalability accommodates large datasets, increasing the statistical power and generalizability of research.
- **Hypothesis testing:** Researchers can rigorously test hypotheses regarding the impact of various factors on player performance.

9 Future work

Our exploratory journey into the realm of performance modeling in competitive gaming has illuminated numerous exciting avenues for future research and development. While our current work serves as a foundational stepping stone, there exists a vast landscape of possibilities waiting to be explored. Here, we outline three primary directions in which we intend to expand, validate, and apply our performance models in the coming year.

- **Expansion:** The first path forward involves a substantial expansion of our models. To create a more comprehensive and inclusive framework, we aim to encompass a broader spectrum of the playerbase. This entails incorporating a wider array of metrics that capture additional dimensions of player performance. Notably, we recognize the significance of vision as an independent and vital aspect of the game, and its incorporation will enhance our model’s representation of the support role. By broadening our horizons, we aspire to provide a more holistic understanding of player proficiency.
- **Validation:** A critical aspect of our future work centers around refining the validation process. We acknowledge the limitations of our current assumptions regarding player practice regimens, priorities, and perceptions of solo queue. To bridge the gap between solo queue and competitive play more effectively, we plan to establish partnerships with professional and semi-professional teams. This collaboration will enable us to gather

invaluable data from team practices, offering a richer and more authentic perspective. In particular, practice games will provide a larger sample size and more granular data, enabling us to refine our assumptions. Insights gained from examining the interplay between professional players' solo queue, team practices, and on-stage performances will inform the development of programs at the amateur, collegiate, and community levels.

- **Application:** The ultimate goal of our research is to translate our models into actionable insights and practical applications. We envision conducting experiments that investigate the impact of crucial factors, such as sleep and communication, on the learning, training, and competitive performances of players. Sleep, a fundamental health factor, profoundly affects cognitive load capacity. Surprisingly, even professional teams have yet to incorporate sleep tracking into their programs. Similarly, efficient in-game communication, a crucial aspect of competitive gaming, lacks a standardized approach. Our aim is to establish a direct relationship between these variables and players' learning speed and performance. Leveraging our performance metrics, we intend to compare a larger player cohort to identify key patterns and correlations.

In summary, our future work is poised to expand the horizons of performance modeling in competitive gaming. By embracing inclusivity, refining validation methods, and unlocking practical applications, we endeavor to propel the field forward. Our journey is not only one of discovery but also of innovation, with the ultimate aspiration of elevating the standard of research, enhancing player development, and fostering a more informed and efficient competitive gaming ecosystem.

10 References

- Aung, M., V. Bonometti, A. Drachen, P. Cowling, A. V. Kokkinakis, C. Yoder, and A. Wade. 2018. "Predicting Skill Learning in a Large, Longitudinal MOBA Dataset." In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computational Intelligence and Games (CIG)*, 1–7. Maastricht: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CIG.2018.8490431>.
- Bahrololloomi, Farnod, Sebastian Sauer, Fabio Klonowski, Robin Horst, and Ralf Dörner. 2022. "A Machine Learning Based Analysis of e-Sports Player Performances in League of Legends for Winning Prediction Based on Player Roles and Performances." In *6th International Conference on Human Computer Interaction Theory and Applications*, 68–76. SCITEPRESS - Science; Technology Publications. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0010895900003124>.
- Baker, Thomas. 2018. "Standard League of Legends Statistics Oversimplify the Game." *Game Haus*, March. <https://thegamehaus.com/columns/standard-league-of-legends-statistics-oversimplify-the-game/2018/03/15/>.
- Benjamini, Yoav, and Yosef Hochberg. 1995. "Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 57 (1): 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>.

- Birant, Kokten Ulas, and Derya Birant. 2022. “Multi-Objective Multi-Instance Learning: A New Approach to Machine Learning for eSports.” *Entropy* 25 (1): 28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e25010028>.
- Clark, Nicholas, Brian Macdonald, and Ian Kloo. 2020. “A Bayesian Adjusted Plus-Minus Analysis for the Esport Dota 2.” *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports* 16 (4): 325–41. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jqas-2019-0103>.
- Dehpanah, Arman, Muheeb Faizan Ghori, Jonathan Gemmell, and Bamshad Mobasher. 2021. “Evaluating Team Skill Aggregation in Online Competitive Games.” In *2021 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, 01–08. Copenhagen, Denmark: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CoG52621.2021.9618994>.
- Do, Tiffany D., Seong Ioi Wang, Dylan S. Yu, Matthew G. McMillian, and Ryan P. McMahan. 2021. “Using Machine Learning to Predict Game Outcomes Based on Player-Champion Experience in League of Legends.” In *FDG’21: The 16th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games 2021*, 1–5. Montreal QC Canada: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3472538.3472579>.
- Drachen, Anders, Matthew Yancey, John Maguire, Derrek Chu, Iris Yuhui Wang, Tobias Mahlmann, Matthias Schubert, and Diego Klabajan. 2014. “Skill-Based Differences in Spatio-Temporal Team Behaviour in Defence of the Ancients 2 (DotA 2).” In *2014 IEEE Games, Media, Entertainment (GEM) Conference*, 1–8. Toronto, ON: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/GEM.2014.7048109>.
- Elo, Arpad E. 1967. “The Proposed USCF Rating System: Its Development, Theory and Applications.” *Chess Life* 22 (August): 242–47. https://uscf1-nyc1.aodhosting.com/CL-AND-CR-ALL/CL-ALL/1967/1967_08.pdf#page=26.
- Franks, Alexander M., Alexander D’Amour, Daniel Cervone, and Luke Bornn. 2016. “Meta-Analytics: Tools for Understanding the Statistical Properties of Sports Metrics.” *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports* 12 (4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/jqas-2016-0098>.
- Gelman, Andrew. 2006. “Prior Distributions for Variance Parameters in Hierarchical Models (Comment on Article by Browne and Draper).” *Bayesian Analysis* 1 (3). <https://doi.org/10.1214/06-BA117A>.
- Gelman, Andrew, Daniel Simpson, and Michael Betancourt. 2017. “The Prior Can Often Only Be Understood in the Context of the Likelihood.” *Entropy* 19 (10): 555. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e19100555>.
- Gerrard, Bill. 2007. “Is the Moneyball Approach Transferable to Complex Invasion Team Sports?” *International Journal of Sport Finance* 2 (4): 214–30. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/229399553?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true>.
- Hajir, Alexander. 2021. “Significant Statistics: A Basic Guide to Informing Your Opinions with Oracle’s Elixir.” <https://oracleselixir.com/blog/post/13483/significant-statistics-a-basic-guide-to-informing-your-opinions-with-oracles-elixir>.
- Herbrich, Ralf, Tom Minka, and Thore Graepel. 2007. “TrueSkill™: A Bayesian Skill Rating System.” In, edited by Bernhard Schölkopf, John Platt, and Thomas Hofmann, 569–76. The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/7503.003.0076>.
- Hvattum, Lars Magnus. 2019. “A Comprehensive Review of Plus-Minus Ratings for Evaluating Individual Players in Team Sports.” *International Journal of Computer Science in Sport*

- 18: 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ijcss-2019-0001>.
- Jeong, Inhyeok, Kento Nakagawa, Rieko Osu, and Kazuyuki Kanosue. 2022. “Difference in Gaze Control Ability Between Low and High Skill Players of a Real-Time Strategy Game in Esports.” Edited by Greg Wood. *PLOS ONE* 17 (3): e0265526. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0265526>.
- Kahn, Adam S., and Dmitri Williams. 2016. “We’re All in This (Game) Together: Transactive Memory Systems, Social Presence, and Team Structure in Multiplayer Online Battle Arenas.” *Communication Research* 43 (4): 487–517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215617504>.
- Kaplan, Edward H., Kevin Mongeon, and John T. Ryan. 2014. “A Markov Model for Hockey: Manpower Differential and Win Probability Added.” *INFOR: Information Systems and Operational Research* 52 (2): 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.3138/infor.52.2.39>.
- Kim, Dong-Hee, Changwoo Lee, and Ki-Seok Chung. 2020. “A Confidence-Calibrated MOBA Game Winner Predictor.” In, 622625. Osaka, Japan: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CoG47356.2020.9231878>.
- Kim, Young Ji, David Engel, Anita Williams Woolley, Jeffrey Yu-Ting Lin, Naomi McArthur, and Thomas W. Malone. 2017. “What Makes a Strong Team?: Using Collective Intelligence to Predict Team Performance in League of Legends.” In *CSCW ’17: Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, 2316–29. Portland Oregon USA: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2998181.2998185>.
- Lewis, Michael. 2004. *Moneyball: The Art of Winning an Unfair Game*. WW Norton & Company.
- Liang, Muchen. 2021. “Research on Prediction of the Game Winner Based on Artificial Intelligence Methods.” In *ICAIP 2021: 2021 5th International Conference on Advances in Image Processing*, 97–102. Chengdu China: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3502827.3502843>.
- LoL Esports. 2017. “Stats Science 101: EU LCS Top Laner Performance.” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kkp_LMYBEFY.
- Mengersen, Kerrie L., Christopher C. Drovandi, Christian P. Robert, David B. Pyne, and Christopher J. Gore. 2016. “Bayesian Estimation of Small Effects in Exercise and Sports Science.” Edited by Cathy W. S. Chen. *PLOS ONE* 11 (4): e0147311. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147311>.
- MissFortuneDaBes. 2022. “League of Legends Stat Websites Are LYING to You. Here’s How.” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6pzzrI3WqQTY>.
- Morris, Carl N. 1983. “Parametric Empirical Bayes Inference: Theory and Applications.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 78 (381): 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.1983.10477920>.
- Pettigrew, Stephen. 2015. “Assessing the Offensive Productivity of NHL Players Using in-Game Win Probabilities.” In, 2:8.
- Polson, Nicholas G., and James G. Scott. 2012. “On the Half-Cauchy Prior for a Global Scale Parameter.” *Bayesian Analysis* 7 (4). <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-BA730>.
- Santos-Fernandez, Edgar, Paul Wu, and Kerrie L. Mengersen. 2019. “Bayesian Statistics Meets Sports: A Comprehensive Review.” *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports* 15 (4): 289–312. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jqas-2018-0106>.

- Sapienza, Anna, Palash Goyal, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. “Deep Neural Networks for Optimal Team Composition.” *Frontiers in Big Data* 2 (June): 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2019.00014>.
- Suznjevic, Mirko, Maja Matijasevic, and Jelena Konfic. 2015. “Application Context Based Algorithm for Player Skill Evaluation in MOBA Games.” In *2015 International Workshop on Network and Systems Support for Games (NetGames)*, 1–6. Zagreb, Croatia: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/NetGames.2015.7382993>.
- Toth, Adam J., Niall Ramsbottom, Christophe Constantin, Alain Milliet, and Mark J. Campbell. 2021. “The Effect of Expertise, Training and Neurostimulation on Sensory-Motor Skill in Esports.” *Computers in Human Behavior* 121: 106782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106782>.
- Velichkovsky, Boris B., Nikita Khromov, Alexander Korotin, Evgeny Burnaev, and Andrey Somov. 2019. “Visual Fixations Duration as an Indicator of Skill Level in eSports.” In, edited by David Lamas, Fernando Loizides, Lennart Nacke, Helen Petrie, Marco Winckler, and Panayiotis Zaphiris, 11746:397–405. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-29381-9_25.
- Xia, Bang, Huiwen Wang, and Ronggang Zhou. 2019. “What Contributes to Success in MOBA Games? An Empirical Study of Defense of the Ancients 2.” *Games and Culture* 14 (5): 498–522. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1555412017710599>.
- Zhang, Amy X., Le Bao, Changcheng Li, and Michael Daniels. 2023. “Approximate Cross-Validated Mean Estimates for Bayesian Hierarchical Regression Models.” *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14238>.
- Zhang, Xiaoling, Yufeng Yue, Xiaofei Gu, Ben Niu, and Y. Y. Feng. 2017. “Investigating the Impact of Champion Features and Player Information on Champion Usage in League of Legends.” In *ICIT 2017: 2017 International Conference on Information Technology*, 91–95. Singapore Singapore: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3176653.3176730>.

11 Appendix

11.1 League of Legends Glossary

Armor: An in-game statistic for the player’s character that contributes to reduction of incoming physical-type damage. See also Magic Resist.

Assist: Contributing to the killing blow of an enemy champion. Assists occur if one player helps deal damage and/or applies crowd control to the enemy champion, or heals/buffs their ally in a short window before the killing blow.

Baron Nashor (Baron): A neutral monster in the top-side jungle of the map. Defeating Baron grants a temporary buff and is often a pivotal objective in the late game.

Bot Lane: See Roles: Bot.

Buffs: Temporary enhancements gained from various sources, boosting specific stats or granting special abilities.

Carries: Champions whose primary role is to inflict high damage on enemy champions and objectives.

Challenger (rank): The name for the top-ranked players on each server, based on LP. See also LP.

CS (Creep Score): The number of last hits landed on enemy minions (small-scale monsters which travel through the lanes and help defend towers), which provides gold and experience.

DotA: Defense of the Ancients 2, another popular MOBA often compared to League of Legends.

Drake (Dragon): A neutral monster in the bottom-side jungle of the map, which grants temporary buffs. Typically contested throughout the course of the game.

Early Game: The first phase of the game, where the top, middle, bot, and support players face off against their lane opponents at the boundaries of their territory, between two sets of opposing towers. The only significant variation at this stage comes from the jungle role, the only role which does not go to a tower at the beginning of the game and instead roams in the jungle area between lanes.

Elo: A rating system for calculating the relative skill level of players in competitive games, typically zero-sum games like chess, go, and many competitive video games.

Grandmaster (rank): The second-highest tier for players on each server, after challenger. In NA, KR, and EUW, a player must be in the top 1000 players, based on LP, to make it to grandmaster tier. See also challenger, LP.

Herald (Rift Herald): A neutral monster in the top-side jungle of the map. Defeating Herald grants a buff and control of a temporary allied Herald which can aid in taking down enemy turrets in the mid-game.

Items: Equipment a player can purchase within the game using gold earned from various sources. Items provide stat boosts, unique enhancements, and active abilities, allowing you to customize your champion's strengths and adapt to different situations.

Jungle: The neutral area between lanes where a champion roams, clears monsters, and ganks lanes. May also refer to the player role, see Roles: Jungler.

Kill: Dealing the final blow to an enemy champion.

LCS: League of Legends Championship Series, the top-level North American professional league.

LEC: League of Legends European Championship, the top-level European professional league.

LCK: League of Legends Champions Korea, the top-level South Korean professional league.

LPL: League of Legends Pro League, the top-level Chinese professional league.

Lane: One out of three designated paths (top, middle, bot) on the map where champions primarily duel or farm against their opponent. Lanes provide structure and focus for early game competition, offering experience, gold, and objectives like towers to fight over.

Lane Advantage: Having superior pressure, resources, or control over the opponent in your lane.

Laning Phase: The early phase where champions compete for resources and experience in their assigned lanes. See Early Game.

Late Game: The final phase of the game, characterized by more extensive teamfights focused around major objectives. By this time point, the laning phase has concluded and all tower plates have been removed.

LP (League Points): In solo queue, a number ranging from 0 to 100 that represents progress towards a higher ranked tier. In the master, grandmaster, and challenger tiers, the value of LP is unbounded and is used to determine exact rankings. The top 1000 players by LP are split into the grandmaster and challenger tiers. Winning a match causes a gain in LP, while losing a match causes a reduction in LP. LP is related to MMR, but unlike MMR, it is not hidden.

Magic Resist: An in-game statistic for the player's character that contributes to reduction of incoming magical-type damage. See also Armor.

Map: The entire playing field in a MOBA. In this paper, "map" refers specifically to Summoner's Rift, though other game modes have different maps.

Map Control: Controlling key areas on the map to limit enemy movement and access to resources.

Map Impact: A champion's ability to influence the entire map through pressure, mobility, or global abilities.

Mid Game: The transitional phase between the laning phase of the early game and the open map of the late game, where objectives become more crucial and teamfights become more common.

MMR: Matchmaking Rating, the hidden rating used to match players of similar skill level.

MOBA: Multiplayer Online Battle Arena, a genre of video game that pits two teams of players against each other in an online battlefield.

Neutral Objective: Monsters and areas outside lanes that offer strategic advantages, like buffs or vision, and do not belong to any team.

Nexus: Each team's base structure, located on opposite corners of the map. Destroying the enemy team's Nexus wins the game.

Objective: Any point of interest on the map worth contesting, like towers, buffs, dragons, or Rift Herald.

Pathing: The route a jungler takes through the jungle, optimizing monster clears and gank opportunities.

Pick/Ban: A phase at the beginning of the match where teams take turns banning champions they don't want their opponents to play and selecting their own champions. Picking strategically for team synergy and countering enemy picks is crucial for setting the stage for the game.

Ranked Ladder: The leaderboard displaying players' ranks and their relative position within their region.

Rift Herald: A neutral monster granting a powerful buff to a tower upon its destruction.

Roam: Leaving your lane to assist teammates in other lanes or secure objectives.

Roles: Similar to positions within traditional sports, players elect to play one of five roles which correspond both to a high-level playstyle and a zone of the battlefield the player is responsible for in the early game.

- **Top:** Typically plays self-sufficient champions and starts off the game in the top-most lane.
- **Jungler:** Travels in the jungle area between lanes. The jungler's actions are often not visible to the enemy team and the jungler's role is often to coordinate with their teammates in planning ambushes.
- **Mid:** Typically plays a mage-type champion and starts off the game in the middle lane. The mid role may also roam to the side lanes.
- **Bot:** Typically plays fragile damage dealers and starts off the game in the bottom-most lane, aided by the support player.
- **Support:** Typically plays utility-focused champions with the goal of aiding mainly their bot lane partner in the early game and team in general.

Skillshot: An ability that requires aim and skill to hit a target, as opposed to abilities which automatically hit their targets.

Solo Queue: A play mode where players are individually matched based on their skill level, using the hidden internal matchmaking rating (see MMR). Match results contribute to a player's rank on the ranked ladder.

Support: See Roles: Support.

Summoner's Rift: The game's primary map, a mirrored battlefield divided by jungle areas and three lanes.

Tanks: Champions with high health and defenses, designed to absorb damage and disrupt enemy teams.

Team Composition: The mix of champions a team chooses, focusing on synergy and overall strengths.

Teamfights: Large-scale clashes between teams, often determining the momentum of the game.

Top Lane: See Roles: Top.

Towers: Defensive structures guarding each lane, offering vision and gold/experience upon destruction.

Tower Plates: Protective defenses around towers, which reduce throughout the game.

XP: Experience points. These points determine your champion's level and unlock their abilities as they progress throughout the game.

11.2 Player skills

1. Mechanics

Mechanics refer to the game-agnostic skills that players possess, which are fundamental to their performance across various games. These include:

- **Reaction Time:** The ability to quickly and effectively respond to game stimuli.
- **Aim:** Precision in targeting, crucial in shooting and action games.
- **Spatial Awareness:** Understanding and utilizing the in-game environment effectively.

2. Technical Skills

Technical skills are specific to each game and involve individualized abilities that vary depending on the game's mechanics and objectives. Key aspects include:

- **Last-Hitting:** Specific to certain strategy games, where players time their attacks to deal the final blow to enemy units.
- **Teamfighting:** Skills related to engaging in coordinated group battles within the game.
- **Champion Depth:** Expertise in using specific game characters, understanding their strengths, weaknesses, and optimal use cases.

Note: Higher mechanical ability generally enhances the speed and efficiency of acquiring and executing these technical skills, allowing for more advanced gameplay.

3. Strategy

Strategy encompasses the overarching plan and approach a team takes in a game. It involves:

- **Team Compositions:** Deciding the combination of characters or units to form a balanced and effective team.
- **Lane Allocations:** Assigning players or resources to different areas of the game map.
- **Teamfight Formations:** Strategizing the positioning and roles of team members during group battles.
- **Strategic Playbook:** A collection of pre-planned strategies and approaches the team can deploy.
- **Impact of Technical Skills:** Teams with members possessing higher technical skills have access to a broader range of strategic options, allowing for more dynamic and adaptable gameplay.

4. Tactics

Tactics are the real-time decisions and actions taken in response to immediate game situations and opponent strategies. They include:

- **Adaptability:** Changing the team's approach based on the current state of the game.
- **Opponent Analysis:** Understanding and exploiting the weaknesses or tendencies of the opposing team.
- **Tactical Execution:** Effectively implementing tactics in response to in-game developments.
- **Synergy with Technical Skills and Strategy:** Teams with advanced technical skills and a diverse strategic playbook can deploy more varied and effective tactics against their opponents.

11.3 Meta-metric tables

11.3.1 Discrimination

Table 5 provides discrimination scores for all gold models while Table 6 provides scores for all damage models. Note the low discrimination scores for Plus-Minus; this is a by-product of the majority of player effects being near 0 and thus difficult to differentiate.

Table 5: Statistic discrimination values for all gold models.

	Server	Time	Player		Ally		Enemy	
			SIDO	BA	SIDO	Plus-Minus	SIDO	Plus-Minus
Top	EUW	0-7 min	0.77	0.87	0.30	0.00	0.46	0.01
	EUW	7-15 min	0.82	0.89	0.33	0.00	0.55	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.75	0.89	0.42	0.01	0.27	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.79	0.88	0.32	0.01	0.44	0.00
	KR	7-15 min	0.83	0.90	0.23	0.00	0.54	0.00
	KR	15-25 min	0.75	0.88	0.32	0.00	0.23	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.76	0.88	0.23	0.01	0.39	0.00
	NA	7-15 min	0.81	0.90	0.24	0.00	0.48	0.00
	NA	15-25 min	0.75	0.90	0.22	0.02	0.31	0.00
Jungle	EUW	0-7 min	0.64	0.84	0.51	0.00	0.51	0.01
	EUW	7-15 min	0.74	0.89	0.50	0.00	0.59	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.65	0.87	0.36	0.01	0.41	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.70	0.84	0.51	0.01	0.44	0.00
	KR	7-15 min	0.72	0.86	0.37	0.00	0.52	0.00
	KR	15-25 min	0.63	0.83	0.39	0.00	0.31	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.67	0.86	0.45	0.01	0.42	0.00
	NA	7-15 min	0.81	0.91	0.42	0.00	0.45	0.00
	NA	15-25 min	0.67	0.88	0.35	0.02	0.37	0.00
Mid	EUW	0-7 min	0.68	0.82	0.36	0.00	0.44	0.01
	EUW	7-15 min	0.74	0.84	0.43	0.00	0.54	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.70	0.84	0.34	0.01	0.27	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.76	0.84	0.19	0.01	0.46	0.00
	KR	7-15 min	0.80	0.87	0.31	0.00	0.51	0.00
	KR	15-25 min	0.74	0.86	0.37	0.00	0.32	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.75	0.82	0.25	0.01	0.34	0.00
	NA	7-15 min	0.76	0.86	0.26	0.00	0.40	0.00
	NA	15-25 min	0.71	0.85	0.29	0.02	0.33	0.00
Bot	EUW	0-7 min	0.70	0.86	0.37	0.00	0.57	0.01
	EUW	7-15 min	0.76	0.87	0.44	0.00	0.54	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.68	0.83	0.41	0.01	0.39	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.61	0.79	0.39	0.01	0.42	0.00
	KR	7-15 min	0.75	0.86	0.38	0.00	0.41	0.00
	KR	15-25 min	0.62	0.78	0.30	0.00	0.31	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.70	0.86	0.33	0.01	0.42	0.00
	NA	7-15 min	0.81	0.89	0.33	0.00	0.51	0.00
	NA	15-25 min	0.72	0.83	0.30	0.02	0.31	0.00
Support	EUW	0-7 min	0.73	0.89	0.38	0.00	0.53	0.01
	EUW	7-15 min	0.78	0.93	0.31	0.00	0.54	0.00

EUW	15-25 min	0.48	0.86	0.25	0.01	0.32	0.00
KR	0-7 min	0.67	0.89	0.37	0.01	0.46	0.00
KR	7-15 min	0.79	0.92	0.32	0.00	0.43	0.00
KR	15-25 min	0.49	0.82	0.24	0.00	0.35	0.00
NA	0-7 min	0.70	0.87	0.32	0.01	0.49	0.00
NA	7-15 min	0.79	0.92	0.31	0.00	0.47	0.00
NA	15-25 min	0.50	0.82	0.28	0.02	0.38	0.00

Table 6: Statistic discrimination values for all damage models.

	Server	Time	Player		Ally		Enemy	
			SIDO	BA	SIDO	Plus-Minus	SIDO	Plus-Minus
Top	EUW	0-7 min	0.83	0.93	0.39	0.00	0.52	0.00
	EUW	7-15 min	0.77	0.93	0.45	0.00	0.54	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.64	0.88	0.46	0.00	0.41	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.82	0.92	0.29	0.47	0.57	0.47
	KR	7-15 min	0.82	0.91	0.31	0.20	0.51	0.19
	KR	15-25 min	0.64	0.84	0.28	0.00	0.30	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.83	0.93	0.31	0.22	0.50	0.22
	NA	7-15 min	0.80	0.91	0.29	0.20	0.53	0.24
	NA	15-25 min	0.72	0.86	0.36	0.05	0.50	0.00
Jungle	EUW	0-7 min	0.85	0.90	0.42	0.00	0.49	0.00
	EUW	7-15 min	0.80	0.92	0.43	0.00	0.60	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.73	0.91	0.48	0.00	0.46	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.82	0.91	0.42	0.47	0.38	0.47
	KR	7-15 min	0.77	0.91	0.34	0.20	0.49	0.19
	KR	15-25 min	0.68	0.89	0.19	0.00	0.32	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.81	0.90	0.34	0.22	0.48	0.22
	NA	7-15 min	0.81	0.92	0.39	0.20	0.54	0.24
	NA	15-25 min	0.73	0.91	0.37	0.05	0.44	0.00
Mid	EUW	0-7 min	0.85	0.93	0.26	0.00	0.51	0.00
	EUW	7-15 min	0.79	0.90	0.35	0.00	0.53	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.65	0.85	0.37	0.00	0.36	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.83	0.92	0.38	0.47	0.53	0.47
	KR	7-15 min	0.80	0.90	0.32	0.20	0.56	0.19
	KR	15-25 min	0.68	0.85	0.39	0.00	0.29	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.81	0.90	0.28	0.22	0.54	0.22
	NA	7-15 min	0.78	0.89	0.31	0.20	0.54	0.24
	NA	15-25 min	0.70	0.85	0.29	0.05	0.48	0.00
Bot	EUW	0-7 min	0.78	0.89	0.39	0.00	0.49	0.00

	EUW	7-15 min	0.78	0.91	0.39	0.00	0.53	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.68	0.85	0.48	0.00	0.40	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.79	0.89	0.34	0.47	0.52	0.47
	KR	7-15 min	0.75	0.88	0.36	0.20	0.48	0.19
	KR	15-25 min	0.64	0.80	0.41	0.00	0.33	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.76	0.90	0.30	0.22	0.41	0.22
	NA	7-15 min	0.77	0.91	0.27	0.20	0.55	0.24
	NA	15-25 min	0.71	0.86	0.33	0.05	0.40	0.00
Support	EUW	0-7 min	0.83	0.96	0.39	0.00	0.51	0.00
	EUW	7-15 min	0.85	0.97	0.36	0.00	0.59	0.00
	EUW	15-25 min	0.80	0.95	0.31	0.00	0.38	0.00
	KR	0-7 min	0.82	0.96	0.35	0.47	0.49	0.47
	KR	7-15 min	0.87	0.97	0.36	0.20	0.54	0.19
	KR	15-25 min	0.80	0.94	0.23	0.00	0.42	0.00
	NA	0-7 min	0.83	0.96	0.42	0.22	0.46	0.22
	NA	7-15 min	0.87	0.97	0.41	0.20	0.55	0.24
	NA	15-25 min	0.84	0.96	0.28	0.05	0.49	0.00

11.3.2 Independence

Table 7 provides independence scores for all models. Table 8 provides independence scores when considering only the SIDO models.

Table 7: Statistic independence scores for all models.

	statistic	Server	Player		Ally		Enemy	
			BA	SIDO	Plus-Minus	SIDO	Plus-Minus	SIDO
Top	Damage	EUW	0.07	0.58	0.99	0.58	0.99	0.62
	Damage	KR	0.06	0.60	0.98	0.51	1.00	0.54
	Damage	NA	0.07	0.63	0.99	0.63	0.99	0.63
	Gold	EUW	0.07	0.56	0.99	0.58	0.98	0.63
	Gold	KR	0.06	0.60	0.99	0.51	0.99	0.54
	Gold	NA	0.07	0.60	0.99	0.63	0.99	0.63
Jungle	Damage	EUW	0.06	0.65	0.99	0.66	0.99	0.56
	Damage	KR	0.06	0.51	0.98	0.67	1.00	0.60
	Damage	NA	0.06	0.65	0.99	0.63	0.99	0.56
	Gold	EUW	0.06	0.64	1.00	0.58	0.99	0.55
	Gold	KR	0.06	0.49	1.00	0.58	0.99	0.58
	Gold	NA	0.06	0.59	0.98	0.58	0.99	0.54
Mid	Damage	EUW	0.06	0.57	0.99	0.68	1.00	0.61

	Damage	KR	0.07	0.59	0.99	0.63	0.99	0.52
	Damage	NA	0.07	0.62	0.99	0.61	0.99	0.58
	Gold	EUW	0.06	0.54	0.98	0.66	0.99	0.61
	Gold	KR	0.07	0.54	0.98	0.62	0.99	0.51
	Gold	NA	0.07	0.58	0.99	0.57	0.99	0.57
Bot	Damage	EUW	0.09	0.56	0.98	0.64	0.99	0.57
	Damage	KR	0.07	0.48	0.99	0.58	0.98	0.53
	Damage	NA	0.07	0.51	0.98	0.58	1.00	0.60
	Gold	EUW	0.08	0.53	0.99	0.65	0.99	0.57
	Gold	KR	0.07	0.48	0.98	0.55	0.99	0.53
	Gold	NA	0.07	0.51	0.99	0.56	0.98	0.60
Support	Damage	EUW	0.21	0.59	1.00	0.64	0.98	0.58
	Damage	KR	0.18	0.52	0.99	0.64	0.98	0.50
	Damage	NA	0.20	0.52	0.98	0.60	0.99	0.60
	Gold	EUW	0.22	0.58	0.99	0.59	0.97	0.58
	Gold	KR	0.20	0.58	0.98	0.56	0.97	0.49
	Gold	NA	0.22	0.51	0.98	0.52	0.99	0.60

Table 8: Statistic independence scores for all models.

	Server	Gold			Damage		
		Player	Ally	Enemy	Player	Ally	Enemy
Top	EUW	0.68	0.59	0.63	0.68	0.59	0.64
	KR	0.70	0.52	0.55	0.71	0.52	0.55
	NA	0.72	0.63	0.63	0.73	0.63	0.65
Jungle	EUW	0.77	0.58	0.55	0.69	0.66	0.57
	KR	0.57	0.58	0.59	0.55	0.67	0.60
	NA	0.71	0.59	0.55	0.69	0.63	0.57
Mid	EUW	0.69	0.67	0.61	0.70	0.68	0.62
	KR	0.70	0.63	0.51	0.70	0.64	0.53
	NA	0.73	0.58	0.57	0.71	0.62	0.59
Bot	EUW	0.63	0.66	0.58	0.60	0.64	0.58
	KR	0.52	0.56	0.54	0.53	0.58	0.53
	NA	0.60	0.57	0.61	0.59	0.58	0.61
Support	EUW	0.61	0.60	0.58	0.68	0.64	0.59
	KR	0.64	0.57	0.49	0.73	0.64	0.50
	NA	0.55	0.53	0.61	0.63	0.61	0.61

11.3.3 Stability

Table 9 provides concordance index values for all gold models while Table 10 provides concordance index values for all damage models.

Table 9: Statistic stability scores for SIDO and BA gold models.

	Server	Time	Player		Ally	Enemy
			SIDO	BA	SIDO	SIDO
Top	EUW	0-7 min	0.73	0.76	0.54	0.58
	EUW	7-15 min	0.72	0.77	0.55	0.60
	EUW	15-25 min	0.68	0.80	0.55	0.55
	KR	0-7 min	0.75	0.77	0.50	0.59
	KR	7-15 min	0.72	0.76	0.48	0.65
	KR	15-25 min	0.72	0.78	0.50	0.53
	NA	0-7 min	0.65	0.77	0.54	0.59
	NA	7-15 min	0.73	0.82	0.56	0.64
	NA	15-25 min	0.68	0.80	0.56	0.62
Jungle	EUW	0-7 min	0.66	0.73	0.55	0.60
	EUW	7-15 min	0.70	0.77	0.65	0.59
	EUW	15-25 min	0.68	0.73	0.56	0.57
	KR	0-7 min	0.62	0.62	0.59	0.59
	KR	7-15 min	0.66	0.69	0.53	0.62
	KR	15-25 min	0.63	0.67	0.51	0.50
	NA	0-7 min	0.59	0.68	0.58	0.59
	NA	7-15 min	0.70	0.76	0.55	0.57
	NA	15-25 min	0.67	0.75	0.54	0.61
Mid	EUW	0-7 min	0.64	0.70	0.55	0.57
	EUW	7-15 min	0.68	0.71	0.47	0.61
	EUW	15-25 min	0.66	0.70	0.55	0.53
	KR	0-7 min	0.71	0.71	0.57	0.62
	KR	7-15 min	0.66	0.73	0.55	0.60
	KR	15-25 min	0.68	0.75	0.56	0.53
	NA	0-7 min	0.70	0.76	0.55	0.63
	NA	7-15 min	0.68	0.74	0.54	0.60
	NA	15-25 min	0.67	0.74	0.50	0.55
Bot	EUW	0-7 min	0.67	0.75	0.53	0.61
	EUW	7-15 min	0.73	0.75	0.60	0.62
	EUW	15-25 min	0.72	0.73	0.59	0.50
	KR	0-7 min	0.64	0.65	0.62	0.61
	KR	7-15 min	0.69	0.71	0.60	0.56

	KR	15-25 min	0.73	0.71	0.56	0.53
	NA	0-7 min	0.66	0.71	0.53	0.57
	NA	7-15 min	0.70	0.76	0.59	0.54
	NA	15-25 min	0.71	0.74	0.57	0.58
Support	EUW	0-7 min	0.66	0.74	0.55	0.63
	EUW	7-15 min	0.70	0.78	0.54	0.57
	EUW	15-25 min	0.60	0.71	0.56	0.54
	KR	0-7 min	0.62	0.68	0.50	0.58
	KR	7-15 min	0.71	0.74	0.57	0.56
	KR	15-25 min	0.53	0.64	0.52	0.53
	NA	0-7 min	0.67	0.72	0.54	0.62
	NA	7-15 min	0.70	0.72	0.60	0.59
	NA	15-25 min	0.56	0.65	0.49	0.53

Table 10: Statistic stability scores for SIDO and BA damage models.

	Server	Time	Player		Ally	Enemy
			SIDO	BA	SIDO	SIDO
Top	EUW	0-7 min	0.75	0.81	0.58	0.57
	EUW	7-15 min	0.69	0.79	0.56	0.60
	EUW	15-25 min	0.63	0.73	0.60	0.57
	KR	0-7 min	0.75	0.78	0.54	0.63
	KR	7-15 min	0.71	0.79	0.55	0.63
	KR	15-25 min	0.66	0.75	0.53	0.60
	NA	0-7 min	0.68	0.78	0.55	0.64
	NA	7-15 min	0.67	0.74	0.57	0.56
	NA	15-25 min	0.64	0.78	0.55	0.59
	Jungle	EUW	0-7 min	0.72	0.76	0.58
EUW		7-15 min	0.70	0.77	0.60	0.58
EUW		15-25 min	0.68	0.74	0.58	0.58
KR		0-7 min	0.67	0.69	0.55	0.56
KR		7-15 min	0.67	0.70	0.55	0.62
KR		15-25 min	0.66	0.71	0.50	0.53
NA		0-7 min	0.70	0.73	0.55	0.59
NA		7-15 min	0.70	0.73	0.51	0.61
NA		15-25 min	0.64	0.71	0.58	0.50
Mid		EUW	0-7 min	0.76	0.78	0.60
	EUW	7-15 min	0.71	0.74	0.50	0.60
	EUW	15-25 min	0.65	0.71	0.54	0.57
	KR	0-7 min	0.74	0.78	0.60	0.55

	KR	7-15 min	0.71	0.75	0.55	0.63
	KR	15-25 min	0.65	0.71	0.53	0.50
	NA	0-7 min	0.71	0.77	0.58	0.59
	NA	7-15 min	0.62	0.74	0.55	0.63
	NA	15-25 min	0.64	0.69	0.54	0.57
Bot	EUW	0-7 min	0.69	0.73	0.59	0.62
	EUW	7-15 min	0.69	0.78	0.58	0.63
	EUW	15-25 min	0.63	0.72	0.60	0.54
	KR	0-7 min	0.72	0.75	0.55	0.65
	KR	7-15 min	0.69	0.75	0.57	0.61
	KR	15-25 min	0.64	0.71	0.55	0.54
	NA	0-7 min	0.63	0.72	0.51	0.61
	NA	7-15 min	0.64	0.75	0.61	0.57
	NA	15-25 min	0.64	0.72	0.57	0.59
Support	EUW	0-7 min	0.71	0.78	0.54	0.60
	EUW	7-15 min	0.68	0.76	0.55	0.59
	EUW	15-25 min	0.67	0.78	0.50	0.60
	KR	0-7 min	0.70	0.74	0.54	0.63
	KR	7-15 min	0.71	0.77	0.57	0.65
	KR	15-25 min	0.66	0.74	0.55	0.61
	NA	0-7 min	0.71	0.72	0.50	0.62
	NA	7-15 min	0.72	0.70	0.56	0.64
	NA	15-25 min	0.60	0.70	0.50	0.54