

NFL Ghosts: A framework for evaluating defender positioning with conditional density estimation

Ronald Yurko¹ Quang Nguyen¹ Konstantinos Pelechrinis²

¹Department of Statistics & Data Science, Carnegie Mellon University

²Department of Informatics and Networked Systems, University of Pittsburgh

Abstract

Player attribution in American football remains an open problem due to the complex nature of twenty-two players interacting on the field, but the granularity of player tracking data provides ample opportunity for novel approaches. In this work, we introduce the first public framework to evaluate spatial and trajectory tracking data of players relative to a baseline distribution of “ghost” defenders. We demonstrate our framework in the context of modeling the nearest defender positioning at the moment of catch. In particular, we provide estimates of how much better or worse their observed positioning and trajectory compared to the expected play value of ghost defenders. Our framework leverages high-dimensional tracking data features through flexible random forests for conditional density estimation in two ways: (1) to model the distribution of receiver yards gained enabling the estimation of within-play expected value, and (2) to model the 2D spatial distribution of baseline ghost defenders. We present novel metrics for measuring player and team performance based on tracking data, and discuss challenges that remain in extending our framework to other aspects of American football.

Keywords: Random forests, high-dimensional data, player tracking data, American football

1 Introduction

Player tracking data have become a powerful resource in sports analytics in recent years. Many professional sports leagues around the world collect data on spatial coordinates of players and ball, enabling continuous-time modeling and analysis of sports at a fine-grained level. This is a massive leap forward from traditional data sources like box-score statistics and event-by-event data. For recent surveys on player tracking data in sports, we refer the reader to Baumer et al. (2023) and Kovalchik (2023).

Player tracking data provide a great opportunity for novel advancements in statistical modeling and analysis of sports. In this paper, we focus on one specific task in sports analytics: player evaluation. Specifically, we propose a framework for evaluating players based on the rich tracking data features on player positioning and trajectory. We illustrate our framework with American football, as we aim to provide an assessment of defensive pass coverage performance in the context of limiting yards after catch. Below, we briefly highlight notable contributions on play evaluation, tracking data models, and player evaluation in sports.

1.1 Previous work: expected value of a game state

The task of estimating the expected value of a game state given its contextual information is fundamental in sports analytics. Prior to tracking data became available, this task is performed at the discrete level, where a sport can be divided into categorically distinct events or actions. In baseball, the runs expectancy matrix (Lindsey, 1963) contains the expected number of runs in the remainder of an inning for each situation of number of outs and runners on base. In soccer, expected goals (xG) (Barnett and Hilditch, 1993) is commonly used to value a shot attempt. xG measures the conversion probability of a shot by accounting for various factors, including distance and angle to goal, part of the body used for shooting the ball, and type of previous event.

In American football, expected points (EP) is a common concept for estimating the expected value of a game state. The game state features in an EP model typically include the current down, yards to go for a first down, current yardline, time remaining, to name a few. Importantly, EP has the advantage of interpretability. Since its unit of measurement is on a point scale, EP provides are useful measure for in-game strategic decision making (Romer, 2006). For example, one can take the difference between pre-play EP and post-play EP to measure the value for an individual play. This is commonly known as expected points added (EPA) (Burke, 2009; Yurko et al., 2019).

Early attempts on modeling EP in football provide estimates at the discrete-time between-play level. Yurko et al. (2019) summarize the key points and limitations of previous work (Carter and Machol, 1971; Carroll et al., 1988), before proposing a multinomial logistic regression model to

estimate EP. This approach first estimates the probability of the next scoring outcome, and then computes EP as a function of these probabilities. The considered scoring outcomes and their respective point values are touchdown (7), field goal (3), safety (2), no score (0), opposing team safety (-2), opposing team field goal (-3), and opposing team touchdown (-7).

At the continuous level, the granularity of player tracking data allows for the estimation of within-play expected values. Cervone et al. (2016) propose a continuous-time framework for estimating the expected possession value (EPV) for the offensive team during a possession in basketball. This framework consists of two sub-models, one for player movement and one for player decision-making outcome (pass, shot, or turnover). Sicilia et al. (2019) introduce a different in-play expected value approach for basketball. This work first estimates the probability for within-play actions, namely, shot attempt, foul (shooting and non-shooting), and turnover, before converting to a point scale. In American football, Yurko et al. (2020) provide continuous-time within-play valuation estimates by using a long short-term memory model to predict the expected yards gained for a ball-carrier throughout a play. Fernandez et al. (2021) use deep learning to develop EPV for soccer, based on the values of three main actions: shot, pass, and drive. For more discussions on within-play expected value in sports, see Macdonald (2020).

1.2 Previous work: player tracking data in American football

In American football, the National Football League (NFL) collects tracking data via their tracking system known as Next Gen Stats by having radio frequency identification (RFID) tags installed into players' shoulder pads and the football. These high-resolution data, measured at a rate of 10 frames per second, provide positional information for all players on the field (and also the ball). Along with their player tracking system, the NFL also launched the Big Data Bowl—an annual data science competition focusing on player tracking data—in 2018 (NFL Football Operations, 2024). Each year, the NFL Big Data Bowl releases a sample of tracking data to accompany a competition theme on a specific aspect of American football such as pass coverage, special teams, and linemen on pass plays. The competition has paved the path for many innovations in football analytics and subsequently established the foundation for the peer-reviewed literature on statistical analysis of football tracking data (Lopez, 2020).

Chu et al. (2020) implement model-based clustering to characterize receiver routes on passing plays. Yurko et al. (2020) introduce a framework for obtaining continuous-time estimates of play value in American football. Deshpande and Evans (2020) propose an expected hypothetical completion probability framework for assessing offensive plays and quarterback decision making. Dutta et al. (2020) use unsupervised learning methods to identify pass coverage types for NFL defensive backs. Nguyen et al. (2024a,b) devise novel metrics for evaluating pass rush and tackling

in American football at the frame level. Note that these articles provide novel means for assessing both offensive and defensive players in American football. These are remarkable accomplishments, since there were no comprehensive measures for evaluating positions such as defensive linemen prior to player tracking data became publicly available (Wolfson et al., 2017).

Along with the contribution to their respective evaluation aspect of football, the aforementioned work all share one common theme. That is, their models consist of features obtained from tracking data based on player positioning and trajectory. As classified by Kovalchik (2023), there are two main types of features for measuring player performance: directly-derived features and model-based features. Directly-computed variables such as distance, velocity, acceleration, orientation and angle for each player (and between players in the case of distance and angle) are quintessential to developments in player evaluation with tracking data. For instance, Nguyen et al. (2024b) propose a model-free, continuous pass rush metric by simply taking the ratio of the pass rusher’s velocity toward the quarterback and distance to the quarterback. As for model-based features, one common strategy is to define space ownership for each player on the field. For example, Yurko et al. (2020) construct different features with respect to football field region owned by the ball carrier obtained from Voronoi tessellation.

Nevertheless, the task of player evaluation using inputs that are functions of players themselves remains an open problem.

1.3 Previous work: player evaluation with ghosting

Ghosting is a prominent approach for evaluating players in continuous-time based on player positioning and movement information. As its name would suggest, ghosting aims to identify optimal player actions throughout a play by comparing a player to an average player, i.e., “ghost”. This notion is first introduced in basketball, as Lowe (2013) illustrates how the Toronto Raptors at the time were using tracking data to perform player evaluation. In particular, the team develops an algorithm for comparing players in reality to ghost players, in order to analyze the actual player actions on the basketball court versus what they should have done at any particular moment within a possession.

Perhaps the most common data-driven technique for ghosting is *deep imitation learning*, which is first proposed by Le et al. (2017a). This seminal work examines defensive strategies in soccer, studying where a defender at any given moment within a play should have been based on a league average model. Here, the optimal locations are those that minimize the offense’s chance of scoring given positional information of every player on the pitch. Le et al. (2017b) then follow-up by proposing a coordinated multi-agent imitation learning framework in soccer. This strategy uses a long short-term memory network to model player trajectories and a three-phase training process that

alternates between evaluating individual player policies and a team’s joint policy. Le et al. (2017b)’s coordinated multi-agent model is then adopted in basketball and American football. In basketball, Seidl et al. (2018) propose an interactive player sketching system, which outputs ghost players that imitate basketball defensive behaviors after receiving information about offensive trajectories. In American football, Schmid et al. (2021) offer a ghosting framework which generates defensive trajectories and allows for the comparison of player movement within a play with a simulated league-average behavior. The article also introduces a pass completion probability model to evaluate the proposed ghosting model for understanding defensive behavior in the NFL.

Note that the aforementioned work provide ghosting models for only the defensive players and team. Felsen et al. (2018) use conditional variational autoencoders to simulate the offense in basketball and predict the personalized adversarial motion of players on the court. Indeed, recent developments of ghosting have seen the rise of *generative models* in their methodology. Zhan et al. (2019) propose a method for simulating how a basketball team would execute a play given a defined “macro intent” (e.g., setting up a formation). This allows for the understanding of player trajectories and how they interact with one another to reach a specific end state and achieve a goal. Gu and De Silva (2023) introduce a deep generative ghosting model using conditional variational recurrent neural network to imitate player movement and interactions in soccer. This approach first creates sequences of pitch control grids to represent player interactions, before training the generative model to generate benchmark player and team performances. More recently, Srinivasan et al. (2023) combine imitation learning with generative and language models to imitate the playing style and shot selection of tennis players.

1.4 Our contributions

In this paper, we propose a framework for evaluating player positioning and trajectory relative to baseline ghost players. In doing so, we use a high-dimensional conditional density estimation approach to account for a rich set of features derived from tracking data to compute the expected within-play value. Our flexible framework provides evaluation on the scale of expected points, thus having the benefit of interpretability. Further, the expected within-play value for ghosts can be computed using a full probability distribution of player positioning and movement information. This overcomes a major limitation of previous ghosting approaches, which only return a point estimate for the optimal player location and trajectory.

To illustrate our framework, we focus specifically on evaluating defensive pass coverage performance in the NFL. In every passing play, there are two separate yardage components that contribute to the final spot where the ball is placed: (1) air yards, which represents the yards gained at the moment the ball is caught by the receiver, and (2) yards after catch (YAC), which represents the




Figure 1: Comparison of distributions for yards gained during the 2018 NFL season through the air (in gray) versus yards after catch (in blue), along with the distribution for expected points added through the air versus after the catch obtained from the `nflfastR` R package (Carl and Baldwin, 2024; R Core Team, 2024). Vertical dashed lines indicate the means for the respective distributions. Yards after catch represent a significant part of the value obtained through passing.

extra yards gained by the receiver after the catch is made. Figure 1 displays a comparison of the distributions of value added through the air versus YAC in terms of both yards gained and expected points added for receptions in the 2018 season. It is evident that YAC represents a significant portion of the value of passing plays and warrants investigation into the role defenders play in limiting YAC.

Using player tracking data provided by the NFL Big Data Bowl, we introduce a ghosting framework for analyzing the ability of defenders to limit YAC. In particular, we compare the observed expected value of defensive player positioning and trajectory with a distribution of ghost defenders on passing plays. Our approach leverages random forests for conditional density estimation (RFCDE) as the primary method and consists of two main components: (1) an estimate for the yards after catch distribution of the receiver, and (2) an estimate for the 2D location distribution of ghost defenders. For each model, we account for the high-dimensional features derived from player tracking data and play-level context. The benefits of our RFCDE approach are plentiful. RFCDE allows for estimating the full distribution of our quantities of interest, rather than just a point prediction which differs from previous ghosting approaches. Thus, we can quantify the




Figure 2: Example play heatmap of expected play values (EPV) over a grid of hypothetical ghost defender locations, with the observed nearest defender to the receiver at the moment of catch highlighted in red. The team on offense (in blue) is moving from right to left against the opposing defense (in orange). The first down line is highlighted in yellow, and the arrows indicates players' velocity vectors of movement. The size of the ghost grid points are proportional to the 2D RFCDE ghost defender location estimates, indicating which locations are more likely for the defender to be positioned at. The point color represents the associated location EPV with lower values (dark blue) corresponding to a better expected outcome for the defense, versus regions with higher positive EPV (yellow) that are better for the offense.

uncertainty in the response for both univariate (yards after catch) and multivariate (2D defender location) cases, which is crucial for our framework.

Figure 2 displays the culmination of our approach for an example play at the moment of catch, before the receiver was tackled by the nearest defender short of the first down line. The combination of estimates obtained from RFCDE allow us to observe expected play values across a grid of hypothetical ghost defender locations. Thus, our framework enables us to evaluate the positioning and trajectory of the defender in this play, relative to moving the player around the grid of ghost locations. We note that even though our focus is on assessing defenders on passing plays, our framework can be extended to the within-play evaluation of players in other aspects of American football and other sports.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we provide an overview of the NFL tracking data. We describe our modeling approach and player evaluation framework in Section 3,

and then demonstrate our framework with an example play along with a presentation of novel player and team metrics in Section 4. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of our findings in Section 5.

2 Data

For our analysis, we use the player tracking data supplied by the NFL Big Data Bowl 2021 (Howard et al., 2020). The data are recorded at a frequency of 10 Hz (i.e. 10 times a second) and contain information for every passing play across all 17 weeks of the 2018 NFL regular season. Of primary interest, the data provide x and y coordinates of players on the field at every frame within each play. It is worth noting that offensive and defensive linemen information are omitted from the provided tracking data. The data also record player attributes at each time step including speed, acceleration, distance traveled from previous frame, orientation, and angle of motion. In addition, a vital feature in our data is the event label (e.g., ball snap, pass release, tackle, etc.) that corresponds to each moment of time within a play.

As an example, Table 1 presents the tracking data for an example play (from Figure 2) during the 2018 season week 10 game between the Miami Dolphins and the Green Bay Packers. For context, this play is a third down with six yards to go for the offense as Dolphins receiver DeVante Parker caught the forward pass thrown by his quarterback teammate, before being tackled by Packers cornerback Jaire Alexander. In Section 4, we use this play as a case study to illustrate our proposed framework.

In total, there are 19,239 passing plays where the play outcome includes complete pass, incomplete pass, intercepted pass, or quarterback sack. Since the primary focus of this paper is the assessment of defender ability to limit yards after catch, we only consider plays that result in a complete pass outside of the end zone (i.e., the receiver catches the forward pass by the quarterback with yards remaining to their target end zone). We take a similar approach to Yurko et al. (2020) to construct tracking data features that capture information about the players involved at relevant events within a play. We split the players into four groups: quarterback (qb_), receiver (rec_), offense excluding quarterback (offX_), and defense (defX_), where we order the offensive and defensive players based their Euclidean distance to the receiver at the moment of catch (e.g., def1_x_adj denotes how many yards away the *closest* defender is from the receiver’s target endzone). All of the features are computed at the moment of catch, except for information about the quarterback which is measured at the moment the ball is thrown. After pre-processing our data to only consider plays without missing values for the features in Table 2, our analysis is limited to 10,363 completed passes.

Table 1: Example of tracking data for a play during the Miami Dolphins versus Green Bay Packers NFL game on November 11, 2018. The selected variables include frame identifier for each play (frameId); player location on the field (x and y coordinates); speed (s, in yards/second); acceleration (a, in yards/second²); distance traveled from previous frame (dis, in yards); orientation (o, between 0 and 360 degrees); angle of motion (dir, between 0 and 360 degrees); and event label for each frame (event). The data shown here are for Packers cornerback Jaire Alexander, and the frames included are between the ball snap and when the tackle is made (the end-of-play event).

frameId	x	y	s	a	dis	o	dir	event
11	84.63	43.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.26	238.61	ball_snap
12	84.63	43.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	92.26	250.10	None
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
38	81.45	33.11	8.05	1.94	0.81	167.45	180.08	pass_forward
39	81.46	32.28	8.29	1.90	0.84	162.66	178.47	None
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
43	81.70	28.79	9.01	0.90	0.90	167.24	174.88	pass_arrived
44	81.78	27.88	9.13	0.49	0.91	167.24	174.72	None
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
51	81.87	21.40	8.93	3.03	0.90	198.63	184.53	pass_outcome_caught
52	81.78	20.52	8.75	3.34	0.89	205.36	186.89	None
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
55	81.30	18.03	8.05	3.66	0.82	205.80	193.49	tackle

3 Methods

Our framework for evaluating the positioning of defenders at the moment of catch relies on distribution estimates for (1) the yards after catch gained by a receiver and (2) the 2D location of ghost defenders. Instead of relying on parametric assumptions for these distributions, we use random forests for conditional density estimation (RFCDE) (Pospisil and Lee, 2018, 2019). RFCDE is a flexible nonparametric tree-based approach that can handle the high-dimensional tracking data features described in Table 2. Here, the features are accounted for via weighted kernel density estimation, where the weights are determined by the terminal nodes of the trees in a random forest (Breiman, 2001).

Following the notation in Pospisil and Lee (2019), let θ_t represent the tree structure for tree t and $R(X^*, \theta_t)$ denote the feature space region covered by its terminal leaf node for observation X^* . For observation X^* , the weight for each observation $i = 1, \dots, n$ in the training data across T trees

Table 2: List of features constructed from player tracking data.

Features (relevant positions)	Description
x_adj (rec, off, def)	Horizontal yards from the receiver’s target endzone.
y_adj (rec, off, def)	Vertical yards from the center of field with respect to the target endzone, where positive values indicate left side while negative values indicate right side.
dir_endzone (rec, off, def)	Absolute value of the direction a player is moving with respect to the target endzone, where 0 indicates that the player is moving towards the endzone, while positive degrees between 0 and 180 indicate that the player is moving to the left or right.
o_endzone (rec, off, def)	Absolute value of the orientation a player’s shoulder pads are facing with respect to the target endzone, where 0 indicates that the player is facing the endzone while positive degrees between 0 and 180 indicate that the player is facing left or right.
x_adj_from_first_down (rec)	Distance (in yards) the receiver is from the first down line (or endzone in goal to go downs) where positive values denote the yards to go while negative values indicate yards past the first down line.
s (qb, rec, off, def)	The speed (in yards/second) a player is moving at.
x_adj_change (qb, off, def)	Horizontal displacement between a player and the receiver according to x_adj values.
y_adj_change (qb, off, def)	Absolute value of vertical displacement between a player and the receiver according to y_adj values.
dist_to_rec (qb, off, def)	Euclidean distance between a player and the receiver.
dir_wrt_rec_diff (off, def)	Minimal absolute difference between a player’s direction of movement and the angle between the player and the receiver.
o_wrt_rec_diff (off, def)	Minimal absolute difference between a player’s orientation and the angle between the player and the receiver.

is calculated as

$$w_i(X^*) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\mathbb{1}(X_i \in R(X^*, \theta_t))}{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}(X_i \in R(X^*, \theta_t))}. \quad (1)$$

Unlike traditional random forests for regression or classification, the tree splits in RFCDE are determined to minimize a loss specific to conditional density estimation (Izbicki and Lee, 2017). For computational efficiency, this relies on an orthogonal basis expansion (which we set to fifteen cosine basis functions in our work). Ultimately, these random forest weights are used to perform

weighted kernel density estimation,

$$\hat{f}(Y | X^*) = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i(X^*)} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(X^*) K_h(Y_i - Y), \quad (2)$$

where K_h is a kernel function (e.g., Gaussian), with bandwidth h chosen using plug-in methods. The RFCDE estimate $\hat{f}(Y | X^*)$ determines how “close” each of the training data observations are to the point of interest based on whether they belong to the same leaf node in the collection of T trees. This provides a flexible way to capture high-dimensional features and interactions for the purpose of conditional density estimation. RFCDE has been successfully demonstrated before in the context of modeling yards gained by NFL running backs using tracking data (Yurko et al., 2020). For the remainder of this section, we rely on the RFCDE software described in detail by Dalmaso et al. (2020) and use $T = 500$ trees to estimate our distributions of interest.

3.1 Expected play value at the moment of catch

Our quantity of interest is the expected play value (EPV) for the offensive team at the moment of catch. Let V be some measure of play-value, such as the output of the previously mentioned expected points (EP) or win probability (WP) model described in Yurko et al. (2019). Then our quantity of interest is

$$EPV_{catch} = \mathbb{E}[V | X_{catch}], \quad (3)$$

where X_{catch} contains covariate information observed at (or up to) the moment of time the receiver makes the catch, such as the features described in Table 2.

In practice, the play value V is the result of a complex utility function $g(\cdot)$ of the receiver’s ending yard line Y . A receiver’s ending yard line is simply a combination of their field position at the moment of catch and their yards gained after the catch (YAC). In other words, modeling the receiver’s ending yard line is equivalent to modeling the receiver’s YAC conditioned on their known starting position at the moment of catch. In order to compute EPV_{catch} , we need to integrate over the conditional density f for the receiver’s ending yard line Y given covariate information X_{catch} ,

$$EPV_{catch} = \int g(Y) f(Y | X_{catch}) dY. \quad (4)$$

As for measuring the utility $g(\cdot)$, we use the expected points approach of Yurko et al. (2019), which relies on a multinomial logistic regression model to predict that next scoring event given a play’s context (e.g., down, yards to go, yardline, etc.). This is just one example of an EP model, with a variety of approaches in the literature each possessing their own problems and limitations (see Brill and Wyner (2023) for a description). However, the choice of the EP approach does not

matter in the context of our framework. As long as the choice of the utility function $g(\cdot)$ is a function of the ending yard line, then our considered EP model can be replaced but our approach will remain valid.

To compute EPV_{catch} in Equation 4, we need an estimate for the conditional density of the receiver’s ending yard line, $\hat{f}(Y | X_{catch})$. To this end, we use RFCDE to estimate this density as a function of high-dimensional tracking data features X_{catch} . Although the trees within RFCDE implicitly perform variable selection, we use leave-one-week-out cross validation (LOWO CV) to assess the out-of-sample performance of the RFCDE estimate $\hat{f}(Y | X_{catch})$ for a varying set of features based on the included number of defensive and offensive players. We consider three evaluation metrics for the YAC model: (1) CDE loss considered in Dalmasso et al. (2020), (2) root mean squared error (RMSE) between the observed YAC with RFCDE mean, and (3) RMSE with RFCDE mode. We consider both the mean and mode relevant since the YAC distributions will likely be skewed and exhibit non-symmetrical behavior. We observe that the YAC density estimate’s LOWO CV performance do not improve after accounting for information about the nearest defender (def1), in addition to accounting for the receiver and quarterback information in Table 2 (see Supplementary Figure S1). This simplicity in the considered number of defenders is likely driven by the fact we are only modeling information at the moment of catch (as well as quarterback information at the moment when the pass is released), with challenges for extending this approach discussed later in Section 5.

For each of our considered 10,363 passing plays, we obtain \widehat{EPV}_{catch} using RFCDE for yards after catch trained on all plays with the quarterback (qb), receiver (rec), and closest defender (def1) features listed in Table 2. Specifically, for each play, we generate conditional density estimates for the receiver’s YAC (or ending yard line) $\hat{f}(Y | X_{catch})$ over a grid of possible values in increments of one yard that range from -10 yards gained (determined based on the yardage distribution displayed in Figure 1) to the maximum possible yards gained given the location of the catch (i.e., distance to the target end zone). Similar to the RFCDE approach in Yurko et al. (2020), we include a “padding” of additional two yards to the maximum possible value for a better estimate of the receiver reaching the target end zone. Since we are estimating the conditional density in a discrete-like manner, for a given play, we normalize the conditional density estimates $\hat{f}(Y | X_{catch})$ over the considered grid of values so that they add up to one. Our estimate for \widehat{EPV}_{catch} is then based on the summation of these discrete probability estimates multiplied by their respective utility function $g(Y)$ values.

3.2 Expected ghost play value

While the quantity in Equation 4 gives us the receiver’s expected value at the moment of catch, our goal is to assess the spatial positioning of defenders in limiting the receiver’s value added after

the catch. This amounts to the difference between EPV_{catch} and the expected value if we replaced the defender of interest with a hypothetical ghost defender, which we denote as EPV_{catch}^{ghost} . With regards to Equation 4, this means replacing the observed covariate information X_{catch} with a ghost version \tilde{X}_{catch} .

However, we recognize that \tilde{X}_{catch} is itself random, i.e., there is a distribution for the positioning of hypothetical defenders with certain locations more likely than others. For ease of notation, we let ℓ represent the location tuple (x, y) across the grid of possible locations \mathcal{L} on the field in one yard increments (6,897 possible values based on 121 unique x and 57 unique y coordinates). Since we are interested in the nearest defender, for a given play, we restrict the set of possible locations \mathcal{L} to be all locations that are less than or equal to the distance between the receiver and second closest defender. Thus, to compute EPV_{catch}^{ghost} , we integrate over the distribution of 2D locations for the nearest defender,

$$EPV_{catch}^{ghost} = \int_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \left(\int_Y g(Y) f(Y | \tilde{X}_\ell) dY \right) h(\ell | X_{catch}^{-def1}) d\ell. \quad (5)$$

In this form, we can rely on our conditional density estimate for the ending yard line described in the previous section for f that takes in the updated features for def1 represented by \tilde{X}_ℓ . However, we now need an estimate for the conditional density h of the ghost defender location ℓ given the covariate information X_{catch}^{-def1} that excludes the features on the nearest defender to the receiver.

To address this problem, we use a 2D RFCDE for the nearest defender locations conditional density h . Similar to the previously discussed RFCDE for yards after catch, this 2D conditional density estimate relies on the high-dimensional tracking data information X_{catch} , but with information about the nearest defender removed (i.e., without the def1 features). We again assess the performance of the 2D RFCDE modeling the nearest defender location with different sets of player tracking data features using LOWO CV. We observe that only relying information about the receiver and quarterback is optimal (based two criteria: cross-entropy and Euclidean distance between observed location with RFCDE mean), relative to including information about other defensive and offensive players (see Supplementary Figure S2). We recognize that there is potentially other information that is relevant in modeling a defender's location, but leave expanding on additional features with larger datasets than our considered sample for future work.

Coupling a 2D RFCDE trained on all available plays with the YAC RFCDE, we are able to estimate $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost}$ in Equation 5 for each play as follows.

1. For each 2D location $\ell \in \mathcal{L}$, update the nearest defender features with the ghost location ℓ to create \tilde{X}_ℓ , then integrate over the YAC RFCDE to compute the expected play value for a particular ghost location, $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^\ell$.

2. Integrate over the 2D location RFCDE to compute $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost}$. Similar to the YAC RFCDE, we normalize the conditional density estimates $\hat{h}(\ell | X_{catch}^{-def1})$ to sum to one and compute the expectation as a summation with the location discrete probability estimates multiplied by their respective $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ values.

Although the above steps provide us with an estimate of ghost defender value, modifying the defender’s observation location does not change all of the relevant features describing that defender listed in Table 2. Beyond the defender’s location, their trajectory (speed (s), direction of movement (dir), orientation (o)) is also relevant and affects several of the considered features describing the context at the moment of catch. Rather than dealing with the complexity of jointly modeling defender trajectory with their location, we use a sampling strategy by resampling the observed trajectories for the nearest defenders at the moment of catch (where their angular measurements are all normalized with respect to the receiver so that the values are not distorted based on the field location).

In detail, for each sample b in B iterations, we update the previous process for estimating the ghost expected value associated with a location ℓ as follows.

1. Sample with replacement a defender’s trajectory from the observed dataset (i.e., sample the speed, direction, and orientation of the nearest defender (def1) together to preserve their correlation structure).
2. Update the nearest defender features with the ghost location ℓ and sampled trajectory to create $\tilde{X}_{\ell,b}$.
3. Integrate over the YAC RFCDE conditioned on $\tilde{X}_{\ell,b}$ to compute the expected play value for a particular ghost location and sampled trajectory, $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell,b}$.

We then average over the B samples to compute $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ for a given location, and then integrate over the 2D location RFCDE as before to compute $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost}$. This naive sampling approach represents a reasonable starting point for handling the defender trajectory, and we leave the exploration of modeling the trajectory information for future work.

3.3 Evaluation of defender positioning

In order to evaluate the defender positioning and trajectory at the moment of catch for a given play, we simply take the difference between the observed and ghost expected play values, denoted by δ . Specifically,

$$\delta = \widehat{EPV}_{catch} - \widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost} \quad (6)$$

Our novel framework results in this single value δ , which provides an estimate for a defender’s contribution based on their positioning and trajectory relative to a distribution of hypothetical defenders. We are able to aggregate these values for players and teams across the observed season of data to create new valuation metrics based on player tracking data. All of the code to implement our framework are available on GitHub at <https://github.com/ryurko/nfl-ghosts>.

4 Results

4.1 Example play valuations

We demonstrate our framework with the example play mentioned in Section 2, where Green Bay Packers cornerback Jaire Alexander tackled the receiver short of the first down line. First, we estimate the expected value at the moment of catch (\widehat{EPV}_{catch}) using the RFCDE for yards after catch described in Section 3.1. Figure 3 displays the locations of players on the field for the example play along with the CDE of the receiver’s YAC based on the observed tracking data at the moment of catch. We observe that the mass of the YAC density estimate is behind the first down line, which is beneficial to the defense. Using this CDE along with the previously described EP model, we get $\widehat{EPV}_{catch} = -0.16$ as the expected play value when the receiver catches the ball. Here, notice that the expected value for the offense when the receiver catches the ball based on the observed player tracking data, with the considered features that include the nearest defender, is negative. In other words, the defense is more likely to score next based on information observed up to the moment of the ball being caught. Ultimately, this play does result in the nearest defender tackling the receiver short of the first down, which leads to the offensive team turning the ball over to the defense with a punt.

Next, we use our proposed framework in Section 3.2 to evaluate the positioning and trajectory of the nearest defender to the receiver relative to the ghost distribution baseline. Figure 4 displays the 2D RFCDE output for the example play, showing which locations on the field are more likely for the closest defender to be positioned at. We observe the most likely location (in yellow) with notably an asymmetric distribution for the ghost defender locations, supporting the need for a flexible technique to model player locations.

We then estimate the expected value associated for each ghost defender location $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ using the combination of the YAC RFCDE and sampling of defender trajectories outlined in Section 3.2. Figure 2 displays the $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ values across the field with the observed nearest defender displayed on top. Here, the locations with the lowest $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ values, which are more beneficial to the defense, are located right on top of the receiver, which is where the nearest defender is actually observed. We also observe that the locations further away from the actual location of the




Figure 3: Visualization of the example play featuring nearest defender Jaire Alexander (in red), offensive players (in blue), and other defensive players (in orange) at the moment of catch, along with the corresponding RFCDE for yards after catch. The first down line (in gold) is displayed for reference, indicating that the mass of the conditional density estimate for YAC is before the first down line (as the play direction is from right to left).




Figure 4: Heatmap display of 2D RFCDE for nearest defender positioning in the example play (with the actual nearest defender removed). The most and least likely locations correspond to high (in yellow) and low (in dark blue) CDE values. The heatmap also reveals an asymmetrical distribution for the ghost defender location.

defender are more beneficial for the offense. From this view, we can already see that the defender is positioned in an optimal location for the defensive point of view at the moment of catch.

Next, we integrate the $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{\ell}$ values over the 2D RFCDE values to arrive the baseline ghost expected value $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost} = 0.77$. This means that the baseline expected value to assess the observed nearest defender location, based on player tracking data for the receiver at the moment of catch and quarterback at release, is a small positive quantity. Hence, we expect a positive situation for the offense given the observed information and quantified uncertainty about the distribution of player locations and YAC outcome.

Finally, we apply our calculated \widehat{EPV}_{catch} and $\widehat{EPV}_{catch}^{ghost}$ for this example play to Equation 6 and get $\delta = -0.16 - 0.77 = -0.93$. This indicates that the observed nearest defender's spatial positioning and trajectory is worth about one point in benefit of the defense, relative to the expected value of the baseline ghost defender distribution. Ultimately, this approach provides us with the first known point-based evaluation system of a player's spatial positioning and trajectory from tracking data.

4.2 Player and team performance

For each of the 10,363 considered plays in the data, we apply the same procedure as outlined in Section 4.1 to compute the δ values defined in Equation 6. This allows us to assess the positioning and trajectory of the closest defender to the receiver at the moment of catch relative to a baseline

Table 3: Top ten defensive players based on total accumulated δ across the 2018 NFL season. The total and average δ values are displayed (where lower values indicate better defensive positioning than ghost baseline), along with the total and average YAC allowed for the number of plays where they are the nearest defender to the receiver at the moment of catch.

Player	Position	Plays	Total δ	Total YAC	Average δ	Average YAC
Adoree' Jackson	CB	56	-7.23	158.32	-0.13	2.83
A.J. Bouye	CB	41	-6.98	76.19	-0.17	1.86
Jaire Alexander	CB	53	-6.65	128.46	-0.13	2.42
Johnathan Joseph	CB	50	-6.40	152.47	-0.13	3.05
Janoris Jenkins	CB	53	-6.01	152.06	-0.11	2.87
Desmond Trufant	CB	52	-5.68	104.28	-0.11	2.01
Ronald Darby	CB	39	-5.62	56.82	-0.14	1.46
Derwin James	SS	40	-5.50	232.20	-0.14	5.80
Malcolm Butler	CB	48	-5.48	161.48	-0.11	3.36
Kyle Fuller	CB	54	-5.42	207.86	-0.10	3.85

ghost defender over the entire 2018 NFL regular season.

Table 3 displays the top ten NFL defenders based on their accumulated δ values across all plays where they are the closest to the receiver at the moment of catch. This leaderboard is dominated by cornerbacks (CB), with only one strong safety (Derwin James). The top CB Adoree' Jackson accumulates a total δ of -7.23 across the 56 plays where he is the nearest defender to the receiver, which means that Jackson's positioning and trajectory at the moment of catch is effectively seven points better than the ghost baseline across the entire 2018 NFL season. Since this aggregate is based on the change in expected points, it is measured in an interpretable scale which relates to actual game outcomes. In particular, Adoree' Jackson's spatial positioning when the receiver catches the ball is worth approximately a single touchdown across the entire regular season. We also present in Table 3 the observed YAC allowed for these defenders for the plays in which they are the nearest defender at the moment of catch, since our EPV-based δ values do not actually account for the play outcome. We observe noticeable differences in δ and YAC values. For example, Derwin James records the highest total and average YAC allowed among the top ten players rated by total δ . This signals that James may be in great positioning at the moment of catch, but consistently fails to tackle the receiver shortly after they catch the ball.

We also explore the relationship between our framework's δ values and the actual play outcome in terms of YAC in Figure 5. We observe a moderately strong positive relationship between the average δ (change in EPV values) and the average YAC allowed for defenders that faced at least ten receptions as the nearest defender at the moment of catch. This indicates that players who tend to be more optimally positioned relative to the ghost baseline, thus more negative average δ values, also




Figure 5: Relationship between the average YAC allowed (y-axis) and average δ (change in EPV values, x-axis) across the 2018 NFL season for defenders with at least ten plays where they are the nearest defender to the receiver at the moment of catch. The overall correlation is moderately strong ($r = 0.65$) and there are similar levels of correlation within the two position groups: defensive backs (in blue, $r = 0.51$) and linebackers (in yellow, $r = 0.65$).

allow fewer YAC on average. Figure 5 also stresses a positional separation between defensive backs (cornerbacks and safeties) and linebackers. Linebackers are traditionally expected to be weaker in pass coverage relative to defensive backs, and we can see that linebackers display more positive average δ values. From a player evaluation perspective, this motivates conditioning on the player position in the 2D ghost RFCDE model. For now, a post-hoc position adjustment can be used for our results by simply taking the difference in the total or average δ values for players relative to their respective position groups. We leave the consideration of position and other categorical variables for future work.

Although we demonstrate our framework for evaluating the spatial positioning of defenders at only the moment of catch, we observe in Figure 6 that our novel δ metrics (in terms of change in EPV) are associated with aggregate measures of team passing defense performance using expected points added (EPA) available from the `nflfastR` package in R (Carl and Baldwin, 2024). These pass defense EPA metrics are outcome-based, and include all pass attempts unlike our δ metrics which are only for passes that are complete. In Figure 6 (left), we observe a moderate positive relationship ($r = 0.41$) between each team’s total pass defensive EPA and our novel accumulated δ values across all receptions allowed by the team. We observe a similar positive relationship ($r = 0.46$) on the average scale in Figure 6 (right). These results indicate that more optimal spatial




Figure 6: Scatterplots displaying relationship between team-level passing defensive EPA (y-axis) and δ (change in EPV, x-axis) across the 2021 NFL season for both the total (left) and average (right) calculations. Teams are displayed by their respective logos using the `nflplotR` package in R (Carl, 2024). Negative passing defensive EPA values indicate better team-level defensive performance.

positioning and defender trajectories at the moment of catch is related to better aggregate pass defense performance. For example, the Chicago Bears were considered one of the best defensive teams during the 2018 NFL season, with the best aggregate pass defense EPA relative to other teams. Our change in EPV metrics is in agreement as the Bears defenders on completed passing plays have the best total change in EPV relative to the ghost baseline. While this may sound unsurprising, our novel framework is the first approach to properly quantify and evaluate player positioning and trajectory information in American football.

5 Discussion

In this work, we introduce a framework for evaluating the spatial positioning and trajectory of NFL defenders at the moment of catch relative to baseline ghost defenders. Our framework is the first public approach to evaluate the observed tracking data of players with proper consideration that hypothetical ghost players come from a distribution. We illustrate our framework in the context of modeling the nearest defender positioning at the moment of catch and estimate how much better or worse their positional information compares to ghosts with regards to the receivers value added through yards after catch. Using high-dimensional, flexible random forests for conditional density estimation, our proposed framework provides estimates for (1) the distribution of a receiver’s YAC which enables the estimation of the expected value of an interpretable utility function, and (2) the

2D distribution of hypothetical defender locations, providing full uncertainty quantification for baseline comparisons of defender positioning. This approach allows us to develop new metrics for player valuation using tracking data, and we demonstrate how such metrics are related to aggregate measures of performance.

We recognize that our framework and results are subject to various limitations. With regards to evaluating the spatial positioning of players, we cannot attribute the entire change in EPV to a single player without recognizing that the scheme of the team’s coaching staff may have played a large role. Additionally, we only use the nearest defender to the receiver at the moment of catch in our framework. This definition of nearest defender may be viewed as undesirable, since by chance a defender that is covering a different receiver may be physically closer than the defender that is actually responsible for covering the receiver. There is opportunity to address this concern via a Hidden Markov Model approach, such as a basketball example demonstrated by Franks et al. (2015). Furthermore, our framework imposes a simplified representation of American football, as we imagine that we can effectively move the nearest defender around without altering the positions of their teammates. Modeling a team’s defense together, instead of just a single defender, is a challenging problem that could address this concern. However, we leave these problems and considerations for accounting for additional information (e.g., coverage type, receiver route type) for future work that can expand on our framework with more publicly-released data by the NFL over time.

Throughout this work, we emphasize that our main contribution is the framework in which we are evaluating the observed tracking data of players with an appropriate baseline. Our consideration for only considering a defender’s positioning at the moment of catch with regards to receiver’s YAC is relatively simple compared to the rest of play. Indeed, in order for the catch to be made, this means the defender has already “failed” in preventing the receiver from catching the football. We could extend our framework and attempt to evaluate defender’s ability prior to completion, however this would require additional models for whether a receiver is targeted by the quarterback and catches the football (Yurko et al., 2020; Deshpande and Evans, 2020). Moving beyond a single moment of time, we look forward to implementing our framework in full continuous-time and dealing with the challenges of modeling temporal ghost distributions to create new ways of measuring player performance in American football.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Mike Lopez and the NFL Big Data Bowl 2021 for releasing publicly-available player tracking data, as well as Sam Ventura, Nic Dalmasso, the attendees and organizers of the 2023 New England Symposium on Statistics in Sports, and participants at the 2024 CMSAC Football Analytics Workshop for their valuable feedback.

References

- Barnett, V. and Hilditch, S. (1993). The effect of an artificial pitch surface on home team performance in football (soccer). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 156(1):39.
- Baumer, B. S., Matthews, G. J., and Nguyen, Q. (2023). Big ideas in sports analytics and statistical tools for their investigation. *WIREs Computational Statistics*, 15(6).
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32.
- Brill, R. S. and Wyner, A. J. (2023). Analytics, have some humility: a statistical view of fourth-down decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03490v1*.
- Burke, B. (2009). Expected point values. <https://www.advancedfootballanalytics.com/2009/12/expected-point-values.html>.
- Carl, S. (2024). *nflplotR: NFL Logo Plots in 'ggplot2' and 'gt'*. R package version 1.3.1, <https://github.com/nflverse/nflplotR>.
- Carl, S. and Baldwin, B. (2024). *nffastR: Functions to Efficiently Access NFL Play by Play Data*. R package version 4.6.1. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=nflfastR>.
- Carroll, B. N., Palmer, P., Thorn, J., and Pietrusza, D. (1988). *The Hidden Game of Football*. New York: Total Sports, Inc.
- Carter, V. and Machol, R. E. (1971). Operations research on football. *Operations Research*, 19(2):541–544.
- Cervone, D., D'Amour, A., Bornn, L., and Goldsberry, K. (2016). A multiresolution stochastic process model for predicting basketball possession outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):585–599.
- Chu, D., Reyers, M., Thomson, J., and Wu, L. Y. (2020). Route identification in the National Football League. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(2):121–132.
- Dalmasso, N., Pospisil, T., Lee, A. B., Izbicki, R., Freeman, P. E., and Malz, A. I. (2020). Conditional density estimation tools in python and R with applications to photometric redshifts and likelihood-free cosmological inference. *Astronomy and Computing*, 30:100362.
- Deshpande, S. K. and Evans, K. (2020). Expected hypothetical completion probability. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(2):85–94.

- Dutta, R., Yurko, R., and Ventura, S. L. (2020). Unsupervised methods for identifying pass coverage among defensive backs with nfl player tracking data. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(2):143–161.
- Felsen, P., Lucey, P., and Ganguly, S. (2018). Where Will They Go? Predicting Fine-Grained Adversarial Multi-Agent Motion using Conditional Variational Autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 732–747.
- Fernandez, J., Bornn, L., and Cervone, D. (2021). A framework for the fine-grained evaluation of the instantaneous expected value of soccer possessions. *Machine Learning*, 110(6):1389–1427.
- Franks, A., Miller, A., Bornn, L., and Goldsberry, K. (2015). Characterizing the spatial structure of defensive skill in professional basketball. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, pages 94–121.
- Gu, C. and De Silva, V. (2023). Deep Generative Multi-Agent Imitation Model as a Computational Benchmark for Evaluating Human Performance in Complex Interactive Tasks: A Case Study in Football. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13323*.
- Howard, A., Reid, J. E., Lopez, M., Bliss, T., and Cukierski, W. (2020). NFL Big Data Bowl 2021. <https://kaggle.com/competitions/nfl-big-data-bowl-2021>.
- Izbicki, R. and Lee, A. B. (2017). Converting high-dimensional regression to high-dimensional conditional density estimation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11(2).
- Kovalchik, S. A. (2023). Player Tracking Data in Sports. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 10(1):677–697.
- Le, H. M., Carr, P., Yue, Y., and Lucey, P. (2017a). Data-driven ghosting using deep imitation learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 MIT Sloan Sports Analytics Conference*.
- Le, H. M., Yue, Y., Carr, P., and Lucey, P. (2017b). Coordinated multi-agent imitation learning. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W., editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1995–2003. PMLR.
- Lindsey, G. R. (1963). An investigation of strategies in baseball. *Operations Research*, 11(4):477–501.
- Lopez, M. J. (2020). Bigger data, better questions, and a return to fourth down behavior: an introduction to a special issue on tracking data in the National Football League. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(2):73–79.

- Lowe, Z. (2013). Lights, cameras, revolution. Grantland. <https://grantland.com/features/the-toronto-raptors-sportvu-cameras-nba-analytical-revolution/>. [Accessed 22-June-2024].
- Macdonald, B. (2020). Recreating the game: using player tracking data to analyze dynamics in basketball and football. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(4).
- NFL Football Operations (2024). Big Data Bowl. NFL.com. <https://operations.nfl.com/gameday/analytics/big-data-bowl>. [Accessed 22-June-2024].
- Nguyen, Q., Jiang, R., Ellingwood, M., and Yurko, R. (2024a). Fractional Tackles: Leveraging Player Tracking Data for Within-Play Tackling Evaluation in American Football. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14769*.
- Nguyen, Q., Yurko, R., and Matthews, G. J. (2024b). Here Comes the STRAIN: Analyzing Defensive Pass Rush in American Football with Player Tracking Data. *The American Statistician*, 78(2):199–208.
- Pospisil, T. and Lee, A. B. (2018). RFCDE: Random forests for conditional density estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.05753*.
- Pospisil, T. and Lee, A. B. (2019). (f) RFCDE: Random Forests for Conditional Density Estimation and Functional Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07177*.
- R Core Team (2024). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Romer, D. (2006). Do Firms Maximize? Evidence from Professional Football. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(2):340–365.
- Schmid, M., Blauburger, P., and Lames, M. (2021). Simulating defensive trajectories in american football for predicting league average defensive movements. *Frontiers in Sports and Active Living*, 3.
- Seidl, T., Cherukumudi, A., Hartnett, A., Carr, P., and Lucey, P. (2018). Bhostgusters: Realtime interactive play sketching with synthesized nba defenses. In *Proceedings of the 2018 MIT Sloan Sports Analytics Conference*.
- Sicilia, A., Pelechrinis, K., and Goldsberry, K. (2019). DeepHoops: Evaluating Micro-Actions in Basketball Using Deep Feature Representations of Spatio-Temporal Data. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*. ACM.

- Srinivasan, P., Subramanian, R., and Knottenbelt, W. (2023). Thinking the GOAT: Imitating Tennis Styles. In *Proceedings of the 2023 MIT Sloan Sports Analytics Conference*.
- Wolfson, J., Addona, V., and Schmicker, R. (2017). Forecasting the Performance of College Prospects Selected in the National Football League Draft. In *Handbook of Statistical Methods and Analyses in Sports*, pages 137–163. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Yurko, R., Matano, F., Richardson, L. F., Granered, N., Pospisil, T., Pelechrinis, K., and Ventura, S. L. (2020). Going deep: models for continuous-time within-play valuation of game outcomes in american football with tracking data. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 16(2):163–182.
- Yurko, R., Ventura, S., and Horowitz, M. (2019). nflWAR: a reproducible method for offensive player evaluation in football. *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, 15(3):163–183.
- Zhan, E., Zheng, S., Yue, Y., Sha, L., and Lucey, P. (2019). Generating multi-agent trajectories using programmatic weak supervision. In *7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019*.

Supplementary Material




Figure S1: Comparison of leave-one-week-out cross validation performance (y-axis) for YAC RFCDE based on set of player features accounted for (x-axis) for three different metrics (in order): CDE loss, RMSE using RFCDE mean, and RMSE using RFCDE mode. Mean values are displayed as points with intervals for plus/minus one standard error.




Figure S2: Comparison of leave-one-week-out cross validation performance (y-axis) for nearest defender 2D RFCDE based on set of player features accounted for (x-axis) for three different metrics (in order): cross entropy, distance from observed location using RFCDE mean, and distance from observed location using RFCDE mode. Mean values are displayed as points with intervals for plus/minus one standard error.