## Calculating League Standings

## PROPOSAL

To change the criteria used to determine league positions where teams are equal on match points.

## CURRENT RULE

Match Points then
Games Won

## PROPOSAL

Match Points then
Sets Percentage then Games Percentage

SETS: Based on the premise that winning a rubber 2-0 should be rated above winning a rubber 2-1 we propose using SETS PERCENTAGE rather than GAMES WON.

GAMES: Based on the premise that winning a set 6-2 should be rated above winning a set 7-5 we propose using GAMES PERCENTAGE rather than GAMES WON.

## BACKGROUND

A few years ago we moved from awarding two match points for a match win to awarding match points for the number of sets won. This was so that every set was important in that every set has points attached to it. We are not proposing to change this, we are simply concerned with how we distinguish between two teams ending up on the same number of points.

Currently if two teams are equal on MATCH POINTS we go to GAMES WON to determine where the teams should sit in the table. Teams ending a season with the same number of points are rare, less than $1 \%$, but it does happen and it is important for the teams affected by it and to the integrity of the league that we have a fair method of determining league positions.

As we use SETS to determine MATCH POINTS we propose continuing to use SETS for the next level comparison and if teams are still tied to then look at GAMES. As regards SETS we propose using SETS PERCENTAGE as it is marginally more accurate than SETS DIFFERENCE, and the league table doesn't show SETS DIFFERENCE. The same applies to GAMES PERCENTAGE.

## JUSTIFICATION

## SETS PERCENTAGE

The table below, using a one match result from Winter, shows that by taking Sets Won AND Sets Lost into account we can use SETS PERCENTAGE to better determine table position.

| LGE <br> POS | MATCH <br> POINTS | MATCH <br> SCORE | SETS <br> WON | SETS <br> LOST | SET <br> DIFF | SETS <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 16 | $8-0$ | 8 | 0 | 8 | 100 |
| 2 | 16 | $8-1$ | 8 | 1 | 7 | 89 |
| 3 | 16 | $8-2$ | 8 | 2 | 6 | 80 |
| 4 | 16 | $8-3$ | 8 | 3 | 5 | 73 |
| 5 | 16 | $8-4$ | 8 | 4 | 4 | 67 |

In the example below Bourne and Elstead have equal MATCH POINTS and equal Sets Won but the GAMES WON rule places Bourne above Elstead.

Elstead though lost fewer sets and this is reflected in the SETS PERCENTAGE so by looking at SETS PERCENTAGE rather than GAMES WON Elstead would be placed above Bourne.


## GAMES PERCENTAGE

If teams are still equal after taking SETS PERCENTAGE into account we can go a level lower and consider games. The table below shows how, currently, winning a set 7-5 and 7-6 would place a team ahead of one winning a set 6-0, 6-1, 6-2 etc etc

| SET <br> SCORE | SET <br> SCORE | GAMES <br> WON | GAMES <br> LOST | GAMES <br> DIFF | GAMESS <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $7-6$ | 7 | 6 | 1 | 54 |
| 1 | $7-5$ | 7 | 5 | 2 | 58 |
| 3 | $6-3$ | 6 | 3 | 3 | 67 |
| 3 | $6-0$ | 6 | 0 | 6 | 100 |

Under this proposal the table would look like this.

| SET <br> SCORE | SET <br> SCORE | GAMES <br> WON | GAMES <br> LOST | GAMES <br> DIFF | GAMES <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $6-0$ | 6 | 0 | 6 | 100 |
| 2 | $6-3$ | 6 | 3 | 3 | 67 |
| 3 | $6-4$ | 6 | 4 | 2 | 60 |
| 4 | $7-5$ | 7 | 5 | 2 | 58 |
| 5 | $7-6$ | 7 | 6 | 1 | 54 |

Looking at the table below, David Lloyd and Farnborough have the same SETS PERCENTAGE and David Lloyd are ranked above Farnborough because they have won more games; 573 to 560.

|  | Points Played | Rubbers |  | Sets |  | Sets \% |  | Games | Games \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

However Farnborough's GAMES PERCENTAGE is superior; their GAMES DIFFERENCE is greater, ie they lean more to the 6-2 than the 7-6, and so they ought to be placed above David Lloyd which they would be under this proposal.

## WHY WE NEED TO USE SETS IN SUMMER CALCULATION

In the winter we can play anywhere between 8 and 12 sets whereas in summer we play 9 sets and so sets won and lost will almost always reflect MATCH POINTS.

In the summer table below Camberley and Aldershot TC both ended on 78 points. If we look at SETS WON we can see that Aldershot TC won 43 sets compared to Camberley's 39 ; due to Aldershot TC having conceded 8 penalty points. Penalty points are deducted from MATCH POINTS not SETS WON and as the SETS PERCENTAGE calculation uses the actual sets won we will include it in both summer and winter to keep the effect of penalty points the same.

|  | Points Played |  | Rubbers |  | Sets |  |  | Sets \% <br> 74.1\% | Games$590-352$ |  | Games \%62.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Ash Men | 160 | 12 | 160 | - 56 | 80 | - | 28 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Avondale Mens C | 142 | 12 | 142 | - 74 | 71 | - | 37 | 65.7\% | 559 | - 399 | 58.4\% |
| 3 Brightwell Mens B | 128 | 12 | 128 | - 88 | 64 | - | 44 | 59.3\% | 525 | - 440 | 54.4\% |
| 4 Farnborough Mens B | 118 | 12 | 118 | - 98 | 59 | - | 49 | 54.6\% | 512 | - 430 | 54.4\% |
| 5 Camberley Men | 78 | 12 | 78 | - 138 | 39 | - | 69 | 36.1\% | 433 | - 537 | 44.6\% |
| 6 Aldershot TC Mens B | 78* | 12 | 86 | - 130 | 43 | - | 65 | 39.8\% | 359 | - 522 | 40.7\% |
| 7 Brightwell Mens C | 44 | 12 | 44 | - 172 | 22 | - | 86 | 20.4\% | 285 | - 583 | 32.8\% |

## OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

## DIFERENCE v PERCENTAGE

PERCENTAGE is more specific for our purpose.

| GAMES <br> WON | GAMES <br> LOST | GAMES <br> DIFF | GAMESS <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 4 | 2 | 60 |
| 7 | 5 | 2 | 58 |

## HEAD TO HEAD

This option doesn't really reflect a whole season's performance.

