



HAL
open science

An alternative ranking system for biathlon pursuit races

Rémi Servien

► **To cite this version:**

Rémi Servien. An alternative ranking system for biathlon pursuit races. *Journal of Sports Analytics*, 2022, 8, pp.141-148. 10.3233/JSA-200598 . hal-03120424v3

HAL Id: hal-03120424

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03120424v3>

Submitted on 22 Jun 2022

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

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

An alternative ranking system for biathlon pursuit races

Rémi Servien 

INRAE, Univ. Montpellier, LBE, 102 Avenue des étangs, F-11000 Narbonne, France

email: remi.servien@inrae.fr

Abstract:

Biathlon is an Olympic sport combining cross-country skiing with rifle shooting, giving a penalty for each target miss. The biathletes ran different race formats, including the pursuit race. During this race, the biathletes chase the leader with a start time identical to the result of the sprint race previously achieved. So, pursuit involves different skills (such as tactics or management of emotional pressure) that are not present during races with an interval-start procedure like sprint. Nevertheless, final pursuit rankings are strongly correlated to sprint ones, which prevents a spectacular comeback after a disappointing sprint race. We present here an alternative pursuit ranking system that is nearly decorrelated to sprint rankings. This simple ranking system is based on comparisons with previous pursuit results. The current and the alternative rankings were then compared on different pursuit rankings, using a database of 148 results from men pursuit world cups. The alternative ranking was shown to strongly modify a single pursuit ranking but these modifications were smoothed on a whole world cup season. Advantages and limitations of the alternative ranking system are discussed, paving the way to a fairer modification of the current pursuit ranking to increase surprise and suspense in biathlon pursuit races.

Keywords (between 3 and 6): Biathlon, Pursuit race, Ranking system.

23 **Introduction**

24 Biathlon is an Olympic sport combining 3 to 5 laps of cross-country skiing with rifle shooting.
25 Between each skiing lap, biathletes complete a shooting session in which they attempt to hit
26 five targets placed at a distance of 50 m, alternating between the prone and standing shooting
27 positions between laps. A penalty (time or skiing distance) is given for each target miss. The
28 biathlete with the shortest overall time wins the race (International Biathlon Union, 2020).
29 Several different biathlon events exist, in which the individual distance was included as an
30 official Olympic event in 1960, followed by sprint (1980), pursuit (2002), and mass start (2006)
31 (International Biathlon Union, 2020). More precisely, in pursuit races, the 60 best biathletes
32 from the sprint race chase the leader with a start time identical to the result of the sprint race
33 achieved a few days before (*i.e.* if the second biathlete arrives 12s after the winner of the sprint
34 race, he will start 12s after the first for the pursuit race and so on). So, two of the four current
35 individual Olympic biathlon races involve direct confrontation (mass-start and pursuit), where
36 biathletes are fighting against each other, not versus time. In these events, tactics play a major
37 role and the final ranking is often decided during the last shooting and/or the final skiing sprint.
38 Furthermore, tight duels during the shootings and the subsequently increased emotional
39 pressure (Vickers et al., 2007) influence shooting times and accuracies differently than for races
40 with an interval-start procedure. During pursuit or mass-start races, drafting behind other skiers,
41 locating oneself optimally in the crowd also helps maximize the utilization of individual skills
42 (Laaksonen et al., 2018b). Finally, in pursuit races, the skiing speed exerts less impact on the
43 overall performance than in sprint, since the pursuit event involves four bouts of shooting with
44 shorter skiing loops between (Laaksonen et al., 2018b). The pursuit race is therefore expected
45 to reward different skills than sprint or individual races.

46

47 Nevertheless, and despite its increasing public audience (EBU, 2019), the biathlon has been
48 sparsely studied, as highlighted by the fact that a search in PubMed with “biathlon” as a
49 keyword currently results in 107 hits, whereas a similar search with “cross-country skiing”
50 (resp. “sport shooting”) yields almost 8 (resp. 7) times as many hits. Among these references,
51 the impact of different parameters on shooting accuracy (Gallicchio et al., 2019; Josefsson et
52 al., 2020) or the influence of the different biathlon phases on sprint or individual results
53 (Laaksonen et al., 2018a; Luchsinger et al., 2019) were extensively examined. Despite their
54 specific aspects, the pursuit and the mass-start races are almost unexplored. Recently,
55 Luchsinger et al. (2020) investigated the contribution from cross-country skiing, sprint race
56 performance, and shooting components to the pursuit race performance. Sprint race
57 performance was found to be the most influential factor, explaining more than 50% of the final
58 pursuit performance. This result and the fact that the sprint races are the most numerous events
59 (approximately 40% of the events, 30% being pursuits, 20% mass-starts, and 10% individual
60 races) during a world cup season involve that more than 55% of the final overall world cup
61 results are due to sprint races, which seems very high. Also, the specific skills needed for the
62 pursuit races (tactics, management of emotional pressure ...) are not rewarded by the current
63 pursuit ranking, mostly hidden by the importance of the sprint performances. By consequence,
64 decreasing the correlation between sprint and pursuit results is desirable to decrease the
65 influence of the sprint results in the world cup ones, to reward the pursuit specific skills, and to
66 increase suspense and surprise by allowing biathletes that poorly performed during the sprint
67 race to obtain a good pursuit result. An alternative pursuit ranking which minors the influence
68 of the sprint results would therefore be of high interest for biathletes and organizers of
69 international biathlon events. Different rankings than official ones have been recently
70 developed in numerous sports, for example for football teams (Gásquez and Rovuela, 2016),
71 for football players (Wolf et al., 2020), for tennis (Kovalchik, 2020), for basketball (Barrow et

72 al., 2013) ... We refer the interested reader to the review of Wunderlich and Memmert (2020)
73 for more details. But, to our knowledge, none of the previous works could be easily adapted to
74 our specific biathlon pursuit problem. Therefore, the current paper aimed to propose an
75 alternative, simple, and fairer ranking for the biathlon pursuit and to investigate its impact on
76 pursuit races and world cup pursuit rankings.

77 **Materials and methods**

78 *Data collection*

79 The final results of all sprint and pursuit races are publicly available on the datacenter webpage
80 of the IBU: <https://biathlonresults.com/>. The results were collected on the 15th December 2020
81 starting from the 2001/2002 season. All the results taken into account for the men's pursuit
82 world cup were gathered, including world championships and Olympic games before 2014. It
83 provides us 148 different pursuit results. All these results provide us an important database of
84 pursuit results in different conditions that are considered to give an appropriate representation
85 of the different possible pursuit scenarios.

86 *Alternative pursuit ranking*

87 As explained previously, during pursuit races, biathletes are racing each other in real-time for
88 a better rank and not racing against time. Therefore, we chose to work using final ranks, not
89 final times. All the pursuit results were gathered to compute final pursuit ranks according to the
90 starting pursuit rank. This global information is given in Figure 1 for all sprint ranking positions
91 and the distributions of the final pursuit ranks are provided in Figure 2 for some starting ranks.

92 [***Figure 1 near here***]

93 [***Figure 2 near here***]

94

95 These figures emphasize the results of Luchsinger et al. (2020), highlighting the importance of
96 the starting pursuit rank in the final pursuit result.

97

98 We propose an alternative approach to define a fairer pursuit final ranking that will decrease
99 this correlation. For each starting biathlete at a pursuit race k , a quantity q_{ki} is calculated
100 according to the position of his final results f_{ki} in the final result distribution of all previous
101 starters with the same rank i . Some of these distributions are plotted in Figure 2. This quantity
102 is given by the following formula

103

104

$$q_{ki} = \frac{1}{148} \sum_{j=1}^{148} \mathbb{1}_{(f_{ji} < f_{ki})}$$

105

106 where f_{ji} denotes the final pursuit rank of the biathlete with the starting pursuit rank i at the
107 race j and $\mathbb{1}_{(f_{ji} < f_{ki})}$ is the usual indicator function that is equal to one when $f_{ji} < f_{ki}$, and zero
108 otherwise. Each quantity q_{ki} can be viewed as a quantile of the distribution of the $(f_{ji})_{j=1, \dots, 148}$.
109 Then, the quantities $(q_{ki})_{i=1, \dots, 60}$ are ordered, which provides the final ranking of the pursuit
110 race k . To break the ties, the best current pursuit rank is selected. This rule ensures that the first
111 finisher of the pursuit race will be ranked first at our alternative final pursuit ranking, the best
112 pursuit biathlete will still win.

113 This formula is somewhat natural and explainable: indeed, if q_{ki} is equal to zero, it means that,
114 during the previous 148 pursuit races, no biathlete with starting rank i achieved a final better
115 (*i.e.* smaller) rank f_{ki} and so, for all j , $f_{ji} \geq f_{ki}$. So, this biathlete deserves a good alternative
116 final pursuit rank, whatever his starting rank. On the contrary, if q_{ki} is equal to one (*i.e.* for all
117 j , $f_{ji} < f_{ki}$), then f_{ki} is the worst final pursuit rank achieved by any of the 148 biathletes with
118 this starting rank i and it must lead to a poor alternative final pursuit rank.

119 Estimating a quantity (here a performance during a pursuit race) using comparisons to existing
120 distributions (such as the previous pursuit results) is a common approach in non-parametric
121 statistics (Wasserman, 2006). It prevents making false assumptions on the underlying
122 distributions but requires an important number of datasets. In this application, with 148 datasets
123 of previous biathlon pursuit results, this framework seems adapted. All the different pursuit
124 scenarios (including extreme ones) will by consequence be taken into account according to their
125 previous occurrences. Note that, if we consider each of the 148 pursuit races as a ballot, a
126 connection can be made with the well-known Borda count ranking (Borda, 1781) for the use of
127 all the pursuit races with strong differences for the other part of the alternative ranking
128 computations. We can also notice that there exists a continuum of possible ranking functions
129 between the non-parametric alternative one defined above and the current one. So, if needed,
130 the alternative method could be modified to bring fewer modifications to the pursuit rankings.
131 But this will complicate the formula provided above and, thus, is beyond the scope of this paper.

132 *Data analyses*

133 All the data analyses were performed using the R freeware, version 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2019).
134 The correlations were calculated using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. For the world
135 cup rankings, we remind that only the first forty biathletes of each race score points, according
136 to the current rules of IBU (International Biathlon Union, 2020). Note that all the races are

137 taken into account to compute all the alternative rankings, even those that took place in the
138 future. This will ensure a good estimation of the different distributions of the final rankings
139 according to the starting ranks.

140 **Results**

141 *Study of a specific pursuit race*

142 We first choose to study a specific pursuit race to illustrate the modifications induced by our
143 alternative ranking. We choose the pursuit race that took place at Annecy – Le Grand Bornand
144 (21 December 2019). The results are given in Table 1.

145 [***Table 1 near here***]

146 The correlation between the starting rank and the current pursuit rank (resp. the alternative
147 pursuit rank) is equal to 0.82 (resp. 0.20) which highlights the decreased influence of the sprint
148 results on the alternative ranking. If we look at the main modifications we could see that T.
149 Boe, B. Doll, E. Bjoentegaard, or J. Dale are losing more than 15 ranks with the alternative
150 pursuit ranking. This is due to the fact that they had lost ranks during the pursuit and, therefore,
151 their current good pursuit ranks are mainly due to their good performances in the sprint race.
152 So, it seems logical that they lose ranks with the alternative ranking. On the contrary, E.
153 Jacquelin, S. Schempp, and T. Bormolini performed very well during the pursuit race (resp. 14,
154 22, 28 ranks won during the pursuit race) and deserve their better pursuit rank using the
155 alternative ranking. For example, T. Bormolini will be ranked 6th with the alternative pursuit
156 ranking whereas it never happened on all the past 148 pursuit races with the current ranking
157 system for a biathlete with the 60th starting rank, as it could be seen on the last plot of Figure 2.

158 The computer code used to obtain the results of Table 1 is provided as Supplementary Material
159 with the corresponding dataset. This code could be reused with any pursuit result to compute
160 the alternative rankings in less than a second on an ordinary laptop.

161 *Study of the 2019/2020 pursuit world cup ranking*

162 As explained above, the alternative pursuit ranking can lead to major modifications on a specific
163 pursuit race. Then, we chose to study the 2019/2020 pursuit world cup to analyze the
164 modifications at the scale of a whole season. The first ten biathletes using the two pursuit
165 rankings on all the 2019/2020 races are given in Table 2.

166 [***Table 2 near here***]

167 First, we could see that there is only a small modification on the podium, J. Boe who was 4th
168 with the current ranking is now 3rd whereas Q. Fillon-Maillet who was 3rd is now 5th. There is
169 no modification for the first two ranks and eight biathletes are in the two top 10. The strong
170 modifications of the rankings of each pursuit race (as seen in the previous subsection) lead to
171 non-negligible but with less impact world cup ranking modifications. Nevertheless, we can note
172 some important individual modifications for example for E. Garanichev (26th with the current
173 ranking and 6th with the alternative) or M. Krcmar (resp. 21st and 10th) who benefit from the
174 alternative ranking unlike T. Boe (resp. 6th and 11th) or S. Desthieux (resp. 7th and 18th).

175 The number of points with the alternative ranking seems lower than the current one. Indeed,
176 that is an important property of the alternative ranking: the points are awarded to most biathletes
177 as they are less linked to the sprint results (71 biathletes with the current ranking and 81 with
178 the alternative one). But there is a strong correlation of 0.83 between the number of points of
179 each biathlete with the current or the alternative ranking which could explain the relatively
180 small modifications between the two rankings, as mentioned above.

181 Note that these small modifications could have a major impact on the overall world cup ranking.
182 Indeed, J. Boe won the overall world cup with 2 points ahead of M. Fourcade. With the
183 alternative ranking, M. Fourcade would have won the overall world cup with the same margin.
184 Obviously, this is science fiction as the application of the alternative ranking would probably
185 modify the pursuit races. Nevertheless, it could highlight the importance of the sprint results in
186 the overall world cup ranking (J. Boe won 4 of them this season) and the potential impact of
187 the alternative ranking on the overall world cup rankings, mainly when there are few points of
188 difference.

189 *Study of the last ten pursuit world cup seasons*

190 We then studied the pursuit world cup seasons of the ten last years to analyze if the previous
191 remarks could be extended. First, on the pursuit races, the correlations between the starting
192 ranks and the pursuit ranks decreased as seen in the first results subsection: the correlation mean
193 is equal to 0.74 with the current ranking and to 0.06 with the alternative one. Then, we analyzed
194 the last ten pursuit world cup rankings. For all the rankings, there are more biathletes with points
195 with the alternative ranking than with the current one with a mean increase of 11 biathletes. The
196 mean of the difference of points between the first rank and the ranks from 2 to 10 are also all
197 smaller for the alternative pursuit ranking. This would have led to, in most of the cases, closer
198 rankings and more suspense in the last races of the season.

199 As seen in the previous subsection, the modifications on the podiums of the pursuit world cup
200 rankings are small but not negligible. For 7 seasons we have the same winner, two times the
201 first and the second invert their rankings and for the last one, the 4th becomes 1st with the
202 alternative ranking. There are only two identical podiums but, if we compare the name of the
203 first three biathletes, 23 above 30 are shared by the two different rankings. It highlights some
204 important common traits between the two rankings even if some individual rankings could be

205 strongly modified, for example, a biathlete who was 3rd with the current ranking is 16th with the
206 alternative one highlighting the importance of his sprint results in his good current pursuit
207 ranking.

208 **Discussion**

209 *Advantages of the alternative ranking*

210 First, the main advantage of this alternative ranking is obviously that the correlation with the
211 starting rank is very low. Therefore, even the 60th ranked at the end of the sprint had a chance
212 to be on the podium which is not the case with the current ranking. In other words, a biathlete
213 with high pursuit skills who had a bad sprint result has an increased chance of obtaining a good
214 pursuit result with the alternative ranking. But we have to keep in mind that the best pursuit
215 biathlete is still the one that cut the finish line first. It will result in more surprising and contested
216 pursuit races, at each stage of the races, which is desirable for gaining audience (Bizzozero et
217 al., 2016). More generally, it will also decrease the importance of the sprint races on the overall
218 world cup rankings.

219 Second, even if the alternative ranking deeply modifies each pursuit ranking, each season
220 pursuit world cup ranking is less modified than each single pursuit race. It sounds natural as,
221 even if tactics and head-to-head are of major importance in pursuit races, it remains biathlon
222 with cross-country skiing and shootings. So, the best biathletes are globally the same, the
223 alternative pursuit ranking allows to define the pursuit as a whole discipline with real
224 specialists, not just as a relatively small perturbation of the sprint ranking (as proven in
225 Luchsinger et al., 2020).

226 *Limitations of the alternative ranking*

227 The first criticism that could be made to the alternative ranking is that it is more complicated
228 than the current one. Nowadays, when you cross the finish line of the pursuit race in 3rd place,
229 you are ranked 3rd, whereas with the alternative ranking you need to wait for all the biathletes
230 to finish the race. Even if the alternative ranking is calculated in less than one second at the end
231 of the race, it could be seen as a limiting factor. Nevertheless, this argument needs to be
232 mitigated. First, the winner of the pursuit race is necessarily the winner of the alternative pursuit
233 ranking and is therefore known immediately as he crosses the finish line. Then, for the sprint
234 or individual biathlon races or for other sports such as the decathlon (where you need to refer
235 to a complex points system to see how many points you score, see Cox et al. (2002) for further
236 details) the final ranks are unknown until the last athlete crosses the finish line. This could
237 induce important cliffhangers when biathletes are waiting in the finish area to wait and see if
238 they are or not on the podium. Finally, at each split time, a ranking based on the alternative
239 pursuit ranking could be quickly calculated to inform the biathletes of their rankings.

240 Another limitation is that, when you have several biathletes that did not start or did not finish
241 the pursuit race despite their presence on the first 60 biathletes of the sprint, it artificially
242 increases the alternative rankings of biathletes that are at the end of the ranking. That could
243 induce unmerited good alternative pursuit rankings for biathletes that have not performed well
244 during the pursuit race but who improved their final rankings thanks to those who gave up. It
245 could be solved by integrating the number of finishers of each pursuit race in the formula to
246 calculate the quantity q_{ki} for example by dividing f_{ji} and f_{ki} by the number of finishers of each pursuit
247 race. But, to keep a very simple formula and as it is uncommon and does not impact the more
248 important highest ranks, it was not taken into account in this paper.

249 **Conclusion**

250 The alternative pursuit ranking presented in this paper is less correlated to the starting ranking
251 than the current one. Some minor limitations remain but, if considered as important, could be
252 easily corrected. This paper paves the way to a fairer modification of the current pursuit ranking
253 that will also increase surprise and suspense in the pursuit races.

254 **Acknowledgments**

255 The author thanks Benoît Rey-Robert for fruitful comments and English corrections and the
256 anonymous reviewer for his/her fruitful comments that helped us to improve the paper.

257 **Declaration of interest statement**

258 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

259 **Supplementary Material**

260 The computer code and the dataset of the pursuit of Annecy-Le Grand Bornand 2019 are
261 provided as Supplementary Material.

262 **References**

263 Barrow, D., Drayer, I., Elliott, P., Gaut, G., and Osting, B. (2013). Ranking rankings: an
264 empirical comparison of the predictive power of sports ranking methods. *Journal of*
265 *Quantitative Analysis in Sport*, 9(2), 187–202. [doi: 10.1515/jqas-2013-0013](https://doi.org/10.1515/jqas-2013-0013).

266 Bizzozero, P., Flepp, R., and Franck, E. (2016). The importance of suspense and surprise in
267 entertainment demand: Evidence from Wimbledon. *Journal of Economic Behavior &*
268 *Organization*, 130, 47-63. [doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2016.07.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2016.07.006).

269 Borda, J.C. (1781). Mémoire sur les élections au scrutin, *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des*
270 *Sciences*.

271 Dunn, C., and Ryan, T. F. (2002). An analysis of decathlon data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
272 *Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 51(2), 179-187. [doi: 10.1111/1467-9884.00310](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9884.00310)

273

274 EBU (2019). European Broadcasting Union. [https://www.ebu.ch/news/2019/03/eurovision-](https://www.ebu.ch/news/2019/03/eurovision-sport-brings-biathlon-to-the-world)
275 [sport-brings-biathlon-to-the-world](https://www.ebu.ch/news/2019/03/eurovision-sport-brings-biathlon-to-the-world) (accessed on 8 January 2021).

276

277 Gallicchio, G., Finkenzeller, T., Sattlecker, G., Lindinger, S., and Hoedlmoser, K. (2019). The
278 influence of physical exercise on the relation between the phase of cardiac cycle and shooting
279 accuracy in biathlon. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 19(5), 567-575. [doi:](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2018.1535626)
280 [10.1080/17461391.2018.1535626](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2018.1535626).

281

282 Gásquez, R., and Royuela, V. (2016). The determinants of international football success: a
283 panel data analysis of the elo rating. *Social Science Quarterly*, 97(2), 125-141. [doi:](https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12262)
284 [10.1111/ssqu.12262](https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12262).

285 International Biathlon Union. (2020). IBU event and competition rules.
286 <http://www.biathlonworld.com/downloads/> (accessed on 8 January 2021).

287

288 Josefsson, T., Gustafsson, H., Iversen Rostad, T., Gardner, F. L., and Ivarsson, A. (2020).
289 Mindfulness and shooting performance in biathlon. A prospective study. *European Journal of*
290 *Sport Science*, Forthcoming. [doi: 10.1080/17461391.2020.1821787](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2020.1821787).

291 Kovalchik, S. (2020). Extension of the Elo rating system to margin of victory. *International*
292 *Journal of Forecasting*, 36(4), 1329-1341. [doi: 10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2020.01.006).

293 Laaksonen, M. S., Finkenzeller, T., Holmberg, H.-C., and Sattlecker, G. (2018a). The influence
294 of physiobiomechanical parameters, technical aspects of shooting, and psychophysiological
295 factors on biathlon performance: A review. *Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 7(4), 394-40.
296 [doi: 10.1016/j.jshs.2018.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2018.09.003).

297

298 Laaksonen, M. S., Jonsson, M., and Holmberg, H.-C. (2018b). The Olympic Biathlon – Recent
299 Advances and Perspectives After Pyeongchang. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9, 796. [doi:](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2018.00796)
300 [10.3389/fphys.2018.00796](https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2018.00796).

301

302 Luchsinger, H., Kocbach, J., Ettema, G., and Sandbakk, Ø. (2019). The Contribution From
303 Cross-Country Skiing and Shooting Variables on Performance-Level and Sex Differences in
304 Biathlon World Cup Individual Races. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and*
305 *Performance*, 14(2), 190-195. [doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2018-0134](https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsp.2018-0134).

306

307 Luchsinger, H., Kocbach, J., Ettema, G., and Sandbakk, Ø. (2020). Contribution from cross-
308 country skiing, start time and shooting components to the overall and isolated biathlon pursuit
309 race performance. *PLoS ONE*, 15(9), e0239057. [doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0239057](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239057).

310

311 R Core Team. (2019). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundati
312 on for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.

313

314 Vickers, J. N., and Williams, A. M. (2007). Performing under pressure: the effects of
315 physiological arousal, cognitive anxiety, and gaze control in biathlon. *Journal of Motor*
316 *Behavior*, 39(5), 381-94. [doi: 10.3200/jmbr.39.5.381-394](https://doi.org/10.3200/jmbr.39.5.381-394).

317

318 Wasserman, L. (2006). All of nonparametric statistics. Springer Science & Business Media.

319

320 Wolf, S., Schmitt, M., and Schuller, B. (2020). A football player rating system, *Journal of*

321 *Sports Analytics*, Forthcoming. [doi: 10.3233/JSA-200411](https://doi.org/10.3233/JSA-200411).

322

323 Wunderlich, F., and Memmert, D. (2020). Forecasting the outcomes of sports events: A review.

324 *European Journal of Sport Science*, Forthcoming. [doi: 10.1080/17461391.2020.1793002](https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2020.1793002).

325

326

327 **Tables**328 *Table 1. Sprint ranks, current and alternative final pursuit rank for the pursuit race in*329 *Annecy-Le Grand Bornand in 2019. The gain is the difference between the alternative and the*330 *current pursuit rank.*

Current pursuit rank	Name	Sprint rank	Alternative pursuit rank	Gain
1	BOE Johannes Thingnes	4	1	0
2	FILLON MAILLET Quentin	3	5	-3
3	CHRISTIANSEN Vetle	13	2	1
4	BOE Tarjei	2	25	-21
5	DOLL Benedikt	1	42	-37
6	JACQUELIN Emilien	20	4	2
7	FOURCADE Martin	12	12	-5
8	BJOENTEGAARD Erlend	5	24	-16
9	PEIFFER Arnd	21	10	-1
10	SCHEMPP Simon	32	3	7
11	HORN Philipp	25	7	4
12	DALE Johannes	6	38	-26
13	LOGINOV Alexander	11	23	-10
14	KRCMAR Michal	17	15	-1
15	DESTHIEUX Simon	8	35	-20
16	EBERHARD Julian	10	29	-13
17	WINDISCH Dominik	7	48	-31
18	ILIEV Vladimir	22	14	4
19	PONSILUOMA Martin	15	30	-11
20	PIDRUCHNYI Dmytro	18	27	-7
21	LAPSHIN Timofei	19	26	-5
22	CLAUDE Florent	23	20	2
23	KUEHN Johannes	14	41	-18
24	HOFER Lukas	9	49	-25
25	TRSAN Rok	47	9	16
26	EDER Simon	26	21	5
27	PRYMA Artem	34	17	10
28	LABASTAU Mikita	46	11	17
29	DUDCHENKO Anton	31	19	10
30	ELISEEV Matvey	28	33	-3
31	PORSHNEV Nikita	24	37	-6
32	BORMOLINI Thomas	60	6	26
33	RASTORGUJEVS Andrejs	36	22	11
34	CLAUDE Fabien	35	31	3
35	FEMLING Peppe	56	8	27
36	GARANICHEV Evgeniy	30	40	-4
37	SEPPALA Tero	33	34	3

38	BOCHARNIKOV Sergey	29	43	-5
39	SAMUELSSON Sebastian	27	44	-5
40	NELIN Jesper	42	32	8
41	VACLAVIK Adam	37	39	2
42	STVRTECKY Jakub	16	52	-10
43	GUIGONNAT Antonin	59	13	30
44	WEGER Benjamin	58	16	28
45	LEITNER Felix	49	36	9
46	LATYPOV Eduard	55	18	28
47	TKALENKO Ruslan	39	45	2
48	NORDGREN Leif	38	46	2
49	WIESTNER Serafin	57	28	21
50	BAUER Klemen	44	47	3
51	MALYSHKO Dmitry	41	53	-2
52	STENERSEN Torstein	43	51	1
53	CHENG Fangming	45	50	3
54	DOHERTY Sean	40	57	-3
55	LANDERTINGER Dominik	52	54	1
56	DOVZAN Miha	50	56	0
57	GUZIK Grzegorz	54	55	2
58	DOLDER Mario	48	58	0
59	HARJULA Tuomas	51	59	0
60	BURKHALTER Joscha	53	60	0

331


332

333 *Table 2. The current and the alternative rankings for the 2019/2020 pursuit world cup. The*
 334 *winner of a pursuit race scores 60 points, the second 54 points, the third 48 points, etc. ...*
 335 *until the fortieth who scores one point (IBU, 2020).*

Rank	Name	Alternative points	Name	Official points
1	JACQUELIN Emilien	219	JACQUELIN Emilien	232
2	FOURCADE Martin	188	FOURCADE Martin	230
3	BOE Johannes Thingnes	171	FILLON MAILLET Quentin	230
4	PEIFFER Arnd	160	BOE Johannes Thingnes	217
5	FILLON MAILLET Quentin	154	LOGINOV Alexander	197
6	GARANICHEV Evgeniy	153	BOE Tarjei	178
7	CHRISTIANSEN Vetle	141	DESTHIEUX Simon	171
8	BJOENTEGAARD Erlend	138	CHRISTIANSEN Vetle	169
9	LOGINOV Alexander	128	PEIFFER Arnd	167
10	KRCMAR Michal	114	BJOENTEGAARD Erlend	147

336


337



339

340 *Figure 1.*

341



342

343 *Figure 2.*

344 **Figure captions**

345 *Figure 1. Final pursuit ranks according to starting pursuit ranks.*

346 *Figure 2. Barplots of the final pursuit ranks according to six different starting pursuit ranks.*

347