## O-62:SCOPING REVIEW OF PLAYER DECISION-MAKING MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS IN SOCCER

Mr Afsar Ali<sup>1</sup>, Dr André Roca<sup>1</sup>, Dr Paul R. Ford<sup>1</sup>
<sup>1</sup>St Mary's University, Twickenham, London, United Kingdom

**BACKGROUND**: Researchers have used notational analysis techniques to assess individual player decision-making in soccer games, with several soccer-specific instruments validated (e.g., 1). There is a need to review these instruments to assess their similarity, usability, and validity.

**AIM:** The current scoping review aims to evaluate the range of instruments employed in measuring player decision-making in soccer games.

**METHODS:** Following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) guidelines (2), a systematic literature search was conducted. Articles were screened for relevance, and full-text articles meeting the inclusion criteria were charted for data extraction.

**Results:** From 3,824 articles identified, 11 studies met the inclusion criteria, with the majority published within the last decade (n = 7). Some instruments measured both action selection (AS) and execution (AE) in decision-making (n = 5), whereas others measured only AE (n = 6). Instruments varied in focus, with some assessing decision-making across all phases of possession (n = 5), while others focused solely on offensive phase (n = 4), or a combination of offensive and defensive phases (n = 2). All instruments recorded frequency counts of AS and/or AE in technical or tactical decision-making categories, such as short passing or creating space. These categories were further collated into phases of play, such as team in possession or player in possession. Most instruments evaluated decision-making performance based on AS and/or AE success (n = 9), whereas some used ranked points assigned to different levels of success (n = 3). These data sets were either converted into percentage success scores (n = 4), indices (n = 6), or total frequency (n = 1).

**CONCLUSION:** The variation in phases, categories, and methods used in the instruments highlight differences in measuring player decision-making, suggesting the potential for convergence towards a single tool that is applicable to both soccer research and practice.

## **REFERENCES**

- 1. García López, L. M., González Víllora, S., Gutiérrez, D., & Serra, J. (2013). Development and validation of the Game Performance Evaluation Tool (GPET) in soccer. *Revista Euroamericana de Ciencias del Deporte*, *2*(1), 89-98.
- 2. Tricco, A.C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K.K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M.D., Horsley, T., Weeks, L. & Hempel, S. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *169*, 467-473.