

Report Regarding Immediate Proximity Associated with Body Contact in Ice Hockey

Prepared for USA Hockey

By

Stephen J. McGregor, Ph.D.

Sport Performance Technology Laboratory

School of Health Promotion and Human Performance

Eastern Michigan University

Ypsilanti MI, 48197

May 19, 2020

Introduction

As part of the *Leveraging Technology to Address Player Safety and Enhance Player Development in US Ice Hockey* project, wearable sensors have been used to collect data for on-ice activities from players between the ages of 12 to 18 years old. To this end, over 15,000 sessions have been collected for on-ice activities across all of these age groups. The scope of the project has included multiple objectives, but specific to this report, a primary objective has been to quantify impacts incurred by players in practices and games to inform decisions regarding body contact and player safety. Of the more than 15,000 on-ice sessions collected, 10,793 were included in impact analysis based on rigorous data quality standards. From this impact data, some information may be inferred with regard to the amount of time youth hockey players are in “immediate proximity” that would be associated with physical contact.

Impact Characterization

As a first step to determining not only the quantity of impacts experienced by youth hockey players, but also the nature/characteristics of these impacts, a video corroboration study was performed (Pilotti-Riley, A., Stojanov, D., Sohaib Arif, M. and McGregor, S.J. *PLoS One*, 2019). Although impacts were being measured for this project, players could experience impacts due to numerous circumstances, not all of which would include other individuals (i.e. checking). Therefore, this study was performed with the use of video observation to confirm and characterize impacts identified by sensors.

In each of the studies referenced in this report, subjects consented to procedures approved by the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Committee. Also, in each of these associated studies, Bioharness-3 (Zephyr, MD) were used as wearable sensors and triaxial accelerometry signal was recorded at 100 Hz to identify impacts. Specifically for this video corroboration study, National Team Development Program (NTDP) U18 players wore Bioharness-3 (Zephyr, MD) wearable sensors (WS) to record occurrences of player incurred impacts (PII) during games. Impact waveforms were generated using Impact Processor (Zephyr, MD) from raw triaxial accelerometer signal sampled at 100 Hz. Players were observed using video and synchronized with game video collected by NTDP staff. Impacts identified by WS of 6–7.9 g (Z3), 8–9.9 g (Z4) and 10+ g (Z5) from the Impact Processor were used to corroborate PII. Preliminary studies indicated that impacts that fell below these thresholds were not associated with PII. Magnitude and duration of each identified impact were compared by category using MANOVA with Tukey post hoc ($\alpha= 0.05$; SPSS 22.0, IBM, NY).

Event	Definition	Sub-category	Frequency (N)	% of total
Player incurred impacts	Board contact/no check	1	17	4.1%
	Board contact/check	2	74	17.7%
	Open ice check	3	202	48.2%
	Player fall	4	65	15.5%
Non-player incurred impacts	Other form of player to player event	5	19	4.5%
	Hard Stop	6	16	3.8%
	Slapshot	7	19	4.5%
	Other identifiable player event	8	6	1.4%
	False positive		1	0.2%
Total			419	100%

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0218235.t003>

Figure 1. Frequency of events observed by wearable sensors by sub-category. Pilotti-Riley, A. et al. (2019) .

Duration of Immediate Proximity Associated with Body Contact in Ice Hockey

On average, U18 players experienced 17.5 impacts per game. Of these impacts, 28% did not involve other players (e.g. falling on the ice, board contact, slap shot, hard stop; Figure 1). The remaining 72% of impacts did involve other individuals (teammates or opponents). The duration of these player to player interactions lasted 0.098 seconds on average (Figure 2).




Figure 2 Mean durations of events observed by wearable sensors. Sub-category (1) Board contact/no check, (2) Board contact/check, (3) Open ice check, (4) Player fall, (5) other form of player to player event, (6) Hard Stop, (7) Slapshots and (8) other identifiable player events. Pilotti-Riley, A. et al. (2019).

Therefore, if we assume 72% of the 17.46 impacts per player with an average duration of 0.098 seconds, the duration of immediate proximity with other individuals totals 1.23 seconds per player per game. If we extend these observations to the entire data set collected as part of the larger project, this is what can be inferred with regard to impacts incurred at each level of play and the result time of immediate exposure as a result (Figure 3). As can be seen from the complete dataset, which is more robust (e.g. n= 1210 games for U18), that the inferred duration of immediate proximity is greater than determined from the video corroboration dataset, but is still less than 3 seconds for each and level.

Duration of Immediate Proximity Associated with Body Contact in Ice Hockey

Team/Level	Session Type	Impacts per Player per Session	Inferred Duration of Immediate Proximity (Seconds)
12 U	Game (n = 529)	13.41	0.95
	Practice (n = 376)	14.13	1.00
13 U	Game (n = 452)	15.41	1.09
	Practice (n = 322)	11.20	0.79
15 U	Game (n = 272)	10.32	0.73
	Practice (n = 176)	7.68	0.54
U17	Game (n = 1538)	34.16	2.41
	Practice (n = 3297)	20.98	1.48
U18	Game (n = 1210)	30.76	2.17
	Practice (n = 2621)	24.77	1.74

Figure 3. Impacts per player per session and inferred duration of immediate proximity. Impacts determined from triaxial accelerometry Bioharness-3 (Zephyr, MD). Duration of immediate proximity inferred from previous work (Pilotti-Riley, A. et al. (2019)). Data in preparation.

Player proximity inferred from ice rink dimensions

These data indicate the duration of time that players are in immediate proximity, but it does not provide direct evidence as to how long players are in close, but not immediate proximity. Although it is likely players are in immediate proximity for shorter periods of time than are commonly believed it cannot be determined from this data if that is the case for other distances. That being said, given the surface area of a North American ice rink, (approximately 200 ft x 85 ft = 17,000 ft²), each player could be evenly distributed with 1,416.67 ft² to themselves. Of course, as a dynamic game, it is highly unlikely that players would be evenly distributed over the ice surface. A typical scenario that is more likely to be encountered in most game situations would be when one team is trying to maintain possession within the attacking zone and all players (save one goalie) are in one offensive zone. The dimensions of one team's zone (e.g. blue line to boards) are typically 75 ft x 85 ft = 6,375 ft². Therefore, if the zone was populated with 11 players (10 skaters and 1 goalie), the average area occupied by each player would be 579.55 ft² or 24 ft x 24 ft. Although players may not be evenly distributed in the zone, strategy generally dictates players maintain a structure that keeps them spread over the entire zone in relatively even proportions. This is likely the most concentrated on the playing surface players would generally be, on average, at any given time during a game. So, although hockey is a dynamic game, where players do come within immediate proximity numerous times per game, the

Duration of Immediate Proximity Associated with Body Contact in Ice Hockey

players are not limited to small distances and therefore may not be in close proximity for substantial amounts of time.

In conclusion, using a relatively large, robust dataset collected in ecologically valid settings (i.e. on-ice practices and games), it can be determined that youth hockey players are in immediate proximity for less than a few seconds for practices and games, regardless of age or level of play. Additional datasets will be necessary to determine duration of exposure of players at other distances, but it is plausible that the durations of exposure of ice hockey players to others in close proximity during on-ice activities is less than is commonly believed.

References

Pilotti-Riley, A., D. Stojanov, M. Sohaib Arif, and S.J. McGregor, Video Corroboration Of Player Incurred Impacts Using Trunk Worn Sensors Among National Ice-hockey Team Members. *PLoS One*, Jun 24;14(6):e0218235, 2019.

Sohaib Arif, M., A. Pilotti-Riley, Bolt. EM, Stojanov, D. and McGregor. SJ, Automated Impact Corroboration from Game Video in Ice-Hockey Using Computer Vision Approaches. *Medicine & Exercise in Sports & Exercise*, 2019. 51(5s).

Pilotti-Riley, A., S. D, S.A. M, E. Bolt, and McGregor, SJ, Impact Identification with Machine Learning from Low Frequency Wearable Sensor Data Among National Ice-Hockey Players. *Medicine & Exercise in Sports & Exercise*, 2019. 51(5s).

Stojanov, D., K. Martel, A. Workman, and S.J. McGregor, Use Of Player Worn Sensors To Identify Fatigue During A USA Select National Hockey Development Camp. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 2018. 50(5): p. 672-672.

Martel, K., A. Workman, D. Stojanov, and S.J. McGregor, Wearable Sensors to Quantify Performance and Fatigue during Tournament Competition among Elite Developmental Ice Hockey Players. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 2018. 50(5): p. 169-169.

WISEHOCKEY[®]

■ A game changer

Player Close Range Exposure

Analysis

2020-05-27



This analysis aims to produce information on player to player close range exposure time (CRET). Close range between two players is defined as a distance of less than two meters. The analysis focuses on time players spend within close range. The distances were calculated for all the players on ice, regardless of whether the game was active or not. A total of 15 games were analyzed and the data for the analysis was produced by the Wisehockey system.

1. Player Pairs

The first phase of the analysis involved pairing all players of each individual game. The pairs were formed the way described in table 1.

Table 1: Pair formation in a game.

	Player ₁	Player ₂	Player ₃	...	Player _N
Player ₁	-	Pair _{1,2}	Pair _{1,3}	...	Pair _{1,N}
Player ₂	Pair _{2,1}	-	Pair _{2,3}	...	Pair _{2,N}
Player ₃	Pair _{3,1}	Pair _{3,2}	-	...	Pair _{3,N}
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
Player _N	Pair _{N,1}	Pair _{N,2}	Pair _{N,3}		-

After pairing the players the total CRET for all pairs was calculated. Table 2 shows the results. Please notice that not all players were on ice at the same time – this lowers the median, mean, Q1, and Q3 considerably. This data represents the overall exposure.


Table 2: Total CRET statistics for all pairs in all games (s).

Game	Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
1	17.4	113.1	18.6	3.8	11.0	23.8
2	17.5	96.8	17.6	4.4	12.5	23.9
3	21.5	111.7	19.6	7.7	16.0	28.5
4	22.3	110.8	21.0	6.4	16.8	29.7
5	21.2	111.0	20.8	5.8	14.1	30.6
6	23.0	113.5	23.6	6.2	14.8	31.6
7	22.2	108.4	24.3	5.1	13.5	29.7
8	22.4	111.1	21.1	6.7	16.6	32.2
9	20.6	108.4	20.1	5.6	14.6	29.0
10	25.9	111.6	24.4	7.1	17.8	37.4
11	18.9	111.7	19.7	5.0	12.1	25.3
12	24.4	113.4	23.3	7.4	15.7	34.7
13	19.2	113.3	19.3	4.2	13.3	27.2
14	23.3	112.5	21.9	7.5	16.2	32.3
15	21.6	112.0	22.3	5.8	14.0	29.3

An aggregate statistics table 3 summarizes the table 2. The first column on the left describes the statistic and the rest of the columns show the aggregate results corresponding to the definition on the first row.

Table 3: Aggregate statistics of table 2.

	Mean	Min	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
Mean	21.4	17.4	25.9	2.4	19.9	21.6	22.7
Max	110.6	96.8	113.5	4.1	110.9	111.7	112.8
Std	21.2	17.6	24.4	2.1	19.7	21.0	22.8
Q1	5.9	3.8	7.7	1.3	5.0	5.8	6.9
Median	14.6	11.0	17.8	1.9	13.4	14.6	16.1
Q3	29.7	23.8	37.4	3.7	27.8	29.7	31.9



2. Continuous Exposure

Statistics in table 4 are similar to the ones in table 2 but with one key difference: the CRET is calculated for all continuous exposures separately. In other words, the statistics are not calculated for pairs but rather for continuous exposures. Continuous exposure is defined as the time it takes a pair to exit close range after entering it.

Table 4: Continuous CRET statistics for all pairs in all games (s).

Game	Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
1	1.9	43.4	2.9	0.6	1.1	2.0
2	2.0	41.9	2.9	0.6	1.1	2.1
3	1.9	41.7	2.6	0.6	1.0	2.1
4	2.3	41.8	3.4	0.6	1.2	2.4
5	2.3	61.4	3.7	0.6	1.2	2.4
6	1.5	52.1	2.1	0.4	0.9	1.8
7	2.6	96.9	5.6	0.6	1.2	2.5
8	2.2	60.5	3.5	0.6	1.2	2.4
9	2.0	55.7	3.0	0.6	1.1	2.1
10	2.3	70.9	3.8	0.6	1.1	2.4
11	2.1	48.5	3.4	0.6	1.1	2.4
12	2.1	55.6	3.1	0.6	1.1	2.3
13	2.2	69.5	3.3	0.6	1.2	2.5
14	2.4	63.7	4.0	0.6	1.2	2.5
15	2.2	83.7	4.0	0.6	1.1	2.2

The table 5 shows the aggregate statistics of the table 4. The statistics are derived the same way they were derived in table 3.

Table 5: Aggregate statistics of table 4.

	Mean	Min	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
Mean	2.1	1.5	2.6	0.3	2.0	2.2	2.3
Max	59.1	41.7	96.9	16.1	46.0	55.7	66.6
Std	3.4	2.1	5.6	0.8	3.0	3.4	3.8
Q1	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6
Median	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
Q3	2.3	1.8	2.5	0.2	2.1	2.4	2.4



3. Player CRET Totals

Table 6 shows the total time other players spent within close range of a player while on ice. The results are derived from all games as a summary. This data describes the overall exposure of a player to all other players. Please note that the time is not the time player was exposed to a close range but a sum of the exposure to all other players separately. While some of the exposures probably occurred simultaneously, the sum exposure counts them as if they happened one at a time – hence the higher values.

Table 6: Other players to one player CRET (s).

Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
880.6	1628.2	247.2	695.4	894.9	1040.8

Table 7 shows the time a player spent in close range of any other player. Here the value is the time player was in close range exposure regardless of how many simultaneous exposures the player was in.

Table 7: Player CRET (s).

Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
595.4	996.9	187.8	459.8	598.4	713.5



4. CRET Relation to Player Game Time

Table 8 shows the relative player CRET. The CRET is similar to one shown in table 7 but it is measured only when the game is active and it is divided by the active game time of the player.

Table 8: Active Player CRET / Player Game Time

Game	Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
1	0.20	0.31	0.07	0.17	0.21	0.26
2	0.20	0.33	0.08	0.16	0.21	0.25
3	0.20	0.34	0.07	0.16	0.22	0.25
4	0.23	0.40	0.09	0.18	0.24	0.27
5	0.21	0.35	0.08	0.16	0.23	0.26
6	0.22	0.32	0.07	0.18	0.22	0.26
7	0.23	0.38	0.09	0.18	0.23	0.30
8	0.24	0.39	0.09	0.19	0.26	0.30
9	0.21	0.33	0.08	0.17	0.23	0.27
10	0.23	0.43	0.09	0.17	0.25	0.28
11	0.20	0.32	0.08	0.14	0.21	0.24
12	0.20	0.30	0.07	0.15	0.21	0.26
13	0.22	0.37	0.09	0.17	0.24	0.28
14	0.22	0.32	0.07	0.18	0.23	0.27
15	0.19	0.30	0.08	0.15	0.19	0.26

Table 9 shows the aggregate results of table 8.

Table 9: Aggregate statistics of table 8.

	Mean	Min	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
Mean	0.21	0.19	0.24	0.01	0.20	0.21	0.22
Max	0.35	0.30	0.43	0.04	0.32	0.33	0.37
Std	0.08	0.07	0.09	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.09
Q1	0.17	0.14	0.19	0.01	0.16	0.17	0.18
Median	0.23	0.19	0.26	0.02	0.21	0.23	0.24
Q3	0.27	0.24	0.30	0.02	0.26	0.26	0.27

Figure 1 represents the time player is in close range exposure during active game as the function of active game time of the player. The figure is derived using the information in table 9.






Figure 1: Active player CRET as function of player game time.

In table 10 the data is similar to the data in table 8 but the CRET is calculated when the player is on ice, regardless of whether the game is active or not – CRET similar table 7. The player game time is still calculated from the time when the game is active.

Table 10: Player CRET / Player Game Time

Game	Mean	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
1	0.55	1.14	0.22	0.40	0.58	0.67
2	0.53	0.82	0.17	0.39	0.56	0.62
3	0.66	1.21	0.22	0.53	0.66	0.76
4	0.64	1.06	0.23	0.53	0.68	0.80
5	0.51	0.95	0.20	0.40	0.57	0.62
6	0.70	1.33	0.28	0.50	0.69	0.82
7	0.64	1.26	0.27	0.47	0.67	0.80
8	0.65	0.95	0.22	0.57	0.68	0.82
9	0.59	1.35	0.28	0.39	0.60	0.73
10	0.76	1.01	0.20	0.67	0.81	0.90
11	0.53	0.81	0.16	0.40	0.53	0.65
12	0.70	1.21	0.27	0.54	0.72	0.84
13	0.54	0.89	0.22	0.41	0.56	0.68
14	0.60	0.89	0.19	0.49	0.62	0.73
15	0.60	0.93	0.23	0.50	0.65	0.76

Table 11 shows the derived results of table 10.




Table 11: Aggregate statistics of table 10.

	Mean	Min	Max	Std	Q1	Median	Q3
Mean	0.61	0.51	0.76	0.08	0.54	0.60	0.66
Max	1.05	0.81	1.35	0.18	0.91	1.01	1.21
Std	0.22	0.16	0.28	0.04	0.20	0.22	0.25
Q1	0.48	0.39	0.67	0.08	0.40	0.49	0.53
Median	0.64	0.53	0.81	0.08	0.57	0.65	0.68
Q3	0.75	0.62	0.90	0.08	0.68	0.76	0.81

Figure 2 represents the time player is in close range exposure while on ice as the function of active game time of the player. The figure is derived using the information in table 11. Please note that the players spend more time on ice than in the actual active game – hence, the maximum exposure time can be higher than the actual time on ice.




Figure 2: On-ice player CRET as function of player game time.