

## Bayesian Prediction of Volleyball Sets Using the Truncated Skellam and the Ordered Multinomial Models

IOANNIS NTZOUFRAS\*, VASILIS PALASKAS and SOTIRIS DRIKOS  
*AUEB Sports Analytics Group, Computational and Bayesian Statistics Lab,  
Department of Statistics, University of Economics and Business,  
76 Patission Street, 10434 Athens, Greece*

\*Corresponding author: ntzoufras@aueb.gr  
[Received on ]

In this work, we focus on building Bayesian models to analyze the outcome of a volleyball game as recorded by the difference of the winning sets for the Greek A1 men's League of the regular season 2016/17. More specifically, the first and foremost challenge is to find appropriate models for the response outcome which cannot be based on the usual Poisson or binomial assumptions. Here we will use two major approaches: a) an ordinal multinomial logistic regression model and b) a model based on a truncated version of the Skellam distribution. For the first model, we consider the set difference as an ordinal response variable within the framework of multinomial logistic regression models. Concerning the second model, we adjust the Skellam distribution in order to take into account for the volleyball rules. We fit and compare both models with the same covariate structure as in Karlis & Ntzoufras (2003). Both models are fitted, illustrated and compared using data from the Greek Volleyball League for 2016/17.

*Keywords:* Volleyball, Set difference, Bayesian modelling, Multinomial logistic, Truncated Skellam.

### 1. Introduction and background information

Analytics and modelling of sports outcomes have gained an increased popularity over the last years due to the information and the data which are now readily available either at the web or via specialized software. In terms of fans' popularity, football (soccer) and basketball are the most famous sports in Europe. However, volleyball, which is the sport of our interest in this paper, holds also a prominent position among the rest of the team sports.

Volleyball belongs to the category of Net and Ball games. The main features of this category of sports are: the set points and the absence of physical interaction. Despite the popularity of volleyball in several countries, statistical or mathematical approaches have not been developed, to a great extent, for modelling the volleyball game outcomes. We suspect that this is due to the hierarchical structure of a volleyball game and the complexity of the rules that one should take into consideration during the development of the appropriate model. More specifically, the hierarchical structure of volleyball in terms of the final score can be essentially summarized by the following procedure: the team winning first 25 points with two points margin from the opponent, wins the set. The team that collects three winning sets first earns the game. In the case that the set score is equal to 2–2 (two gained sets for each team), then the two teams compete in a final winning set which is called "tie-break". The required winning points in the "tie-break" is 15 in contrast to the 25 points of a usual set. Hence, the team that reaches first the 15 points in the "tie-break" (again with a margin of two points difference) is the final winner of the game. From the above rules, we obtain the following important characteristics of Volleyball. First of all, it is obvious that no draw can be observed, which is not often team sports but it is quite standard

in net and ball games. Second, the number of winning sets of each team are random variables that range from zero to three. Finally, the set difference determines also determines the number of league points earned by the two competing teams. To be more specific, when a win with a difference of three or two sets (i.e. a score of 3–0 or 3–1) attributes three points to the winning team and no point to the losing team. In the case of a score of 3–2, then the winning team get two points and the losing team one point.

Within the Markovian framework, the estimation of the winning probabilities of the set and/or the final match outcome has been addressed by Ferrante & Fonseca (2014). In their work, they estimate the winning set probabilities not only for the present rally scoring system (25 points for the set win) but also for the former side-out system (15 points for the set win). Moreover, the expected duration of a set, which is measured by the number of played rallies (total set points), is also modelled.

On the other hand, the logistic regression model is a standard approach for modelling the final match outcome (win/loss) between two competing teams in sports with absence of a draw (as in volleyball). In the work of Akarcesme (2017), the main purpose was the prediction of the final match outcome by using as covariates the performance indicators for each player role such as the libero, server, setter among others. Nevertheless, by using a binomial regression model, we cannot predict the number of league points earned by the two opponent teams in a game since the exact set difference remains unknown.

Poisson regression models is another usual alternative for modelling data from team sports such as football (soccer) or water polo (Lee, 1997; Karlis & Ntzoufras, 2003). Nevertheless, this choice is not appropriate for modelling the number of earned sets since such distributions cannot efficiently describe a random variable with possible outcomes in  $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ .

Additionally, Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008) used the Skellam (or Poisson difference) distribution to model the difference of goals directly in football (soccer). Again, this model is not appropriate for modelling the difference of sets in Volleyball since the response variable takes values in  $\{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$ . Nevertheless, modelling the difference of sets in Volleyball has an important benefit in comparison with football or other invasion team sports with only one level of scoring points (i.e. goals). In Volleyball if we know the difference we also know the final result of the game: values  $\{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$  correspond to scores  $\{0-3, 1-3, 2-3, 3-2, 3-1, 3-0\}$ , respectively. So essentially, no information is lost by modelling the difference in contrast to football where the exact score can not be predicted by modeling only the difference. Hence, the idea in this work, is to use the Skellam distribution to build a tailor made model/distribution for Volleyball sets by truncating it appropriately.

Hence, in this paper, interest lies on modelling the set differences of each volleyball game. Our approaches take into consideration the rules of a volleyball game which could not be addressed by models based either on the binomial or the Poisson distribution. We focus on two approaches: (a) a model based on a truncated version of Skellam distribution and (b) the more standard choice of the ordered multinomial logistic regression model.

The first model, the truncated version of Skellam model, accounts for the constrained range of the response variable of the set difference. The second model is an ordered multinomial logistic regression model. This is a standard extension of the multinomial logistic regression model which accounts for the ordinality of the six possible outcomes  $\{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$ . Both modelling approaches will be used for prediction. The aim of this paper is to validate and examine the appropriateness of these two models for set differences. Both of the models are implemented within the Bayesian framework. We use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm to estimate posterior densities and also reproduce the final league and evaluate both the goodness of fit and the prediction accuracy of the proposed models.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the proposed models and describes in detail some useful preliminary theoretical properties which provide intuition and better understanding of models' parameters. In Section 3, we implement the proposed methods and models to

data from the Greek A1 professional men's League of the regular season 2016/17. We provide full interpretation of model parameters. Focus is given in the estimated attacking and defensive abilities. Moreover, we use the posterior predictive distribution, obtained within the implemented MCMC runs, in order to re-generate the league and evaluate the fit of the model. Finally, by using again the posterior predictive distribution, we evaluate the predictive power of the proposed models under two scenarios: (i) in a mid-season (split-half) case where the first half games of the season are used for estimation/learning while the rest of them as test dataset, and (ii) in a playoff prediction scenario, where the data of the regular season are used to estimate the final results of the playoff games. Finally, Section 4 discusses the findings of this paper and we provide recommendations for further research.

## 2. Bayesian Modelling for the Set Difference

### 2.1 The dataset

In this article, we analyse data from the Greek Volleyball League (often called A1 Ethniki) for season 2016/17 which is the highest professional volleyball league in Greece. It is run by the Hellenic Volleyball Federation. It is considered one of the top national leagues in European volleyball, as its clubs have made significant success in European competitions. The data are subset of a larger dataset collected via a volleyball specific software where scout men are registering every touch of the ball during the game. For each set in the entire league, we record the data for both competing teams of the A1 men's regular season 2016/17. All data have been collected by the third author, Dr. Sotiris Drikos (former manager of the Greek National Volleyball team and expert on performance analysis).

In the regular season league, data of total sample size  $n = 132$  matches with 494 sets were available. Furthermore,  $p = 12$  teams were involved in this league which they compete each other every week (match day). During the regular season, each club competes with the rest of the teams twice in a double round-robin system, once at their home stadium and once at their opponents stadium. In other words, the regular season league has 22 match days and in every match day there are six matches. Additional play-off games between the first eight teams of the regular season as well as play-out games between the three teams holding the 9th–11th positions. According to the final ranking (which is finalized after the play-off games), the first team earns the championship title while the champion along with the second finalist team qualify to play in the Champions League European competition. The third and fourth teams qualify to play in the CEV Cup and the Challenge Cup, respectively, which are the second and third-tier level competitions for men's Volleyball clubs of Europe. The last team (position 12) in the end of the regular season game does not participate in the play-out games since it relegates directly to the second division.

### 2.2 Ordered multinomial logistic model

First we consider the standard ordered multinomial formulation for modelling the response  $Y$  which is here defined as the difference between the sets of the two competing teams in each game. This set-difference will be treated as our ordinal response variable with  $K = 6$  levels which are all the potential game outcomes. Hence, the response ( $Y$ ) is defined by

$$Y^{(k)} = k - 3 - \mathcal{I}(k \leq 3) \quad (2.1)$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, 6$ ; where  $\mathcal{I}(k \leq 3)$  takes the value of one when  $k \leq 3$  and zero otherwise. Hence,  $Y \in \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$ , while  $Y^{(1)}$  and  $Y^{(6)}$  refer to the set difference of  $-3$  (i.e. final game score  $0 - 3$

sets) and 3 (score: 3 – 0 sets), respectively. The multinomial distribution is specified by

$$Y_i \sim \text{Multinomial}(n_i = 1, \pi_i)$$

where  $\pi_i = (\pi_{i1}, \dots, \pi_{iK})$  is the vector probability of  $K = 6$  possible set differences for  $i = 1, \dots, n = 132$  games and  $\sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{ik} = 1$ . In other words, the  $\pi_{ik} = P(Y_i = y^{(k)})$  is the probability of set difference being equal to  $y^{(k)}$  in game  $i$ .

In our application, the linear predictor of the ordered-multinomial model is specified by

$$\log \frac{\gamma_{ik}}{1 - \gamma_{ik}} = c_k - (A_{ht_i} - A_{at_i}) \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\gamma_{ik} = P(Y_i \leq y^{(k)})$  is the probability that the response outcome falls in category  $k$  or in a lower category in game  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, 132$  and  $k = 1, \dots, K - 1$ ;  $c_k$  are constant parameters for  $k = 1, \dots, K - 1$  ( $c_k < c_{k+1}$ ) and  $A_{ht_i}$  as well as  $A_{at_i}$  are the “net” general abilities of the home and the away team in match  $i$  (denoted by  $ht_i$  and  $at_i$ , respectively). In the linear predictor (2.2), we consider the difference between the general abilities of the home and the away team since this will mainly determine the probability of winning and the final set difference in a game. The negative sign in front of the abilities difference in (2.2) is adopted in order to facilitate the interpretation of model parameters. Hence, by this formulation, a large difference in the abilities of two competing teams will result in an increase to the probabilities of larger differences in terms of game sets. This model is called proportional odds model in the statistical bibliography (Agresti, 2013). For the general ability parameters, we adopt a sum to zero constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^p A_j = 0$$

in order to express the ability of each team as a deviation from the performance or ability of an average team; where  $p$  denotes the number of teams in the league (in our case  $p = 12$ ). The general ability of the omitted team is calculated by

$$A_1 = - \sum_{j=2}^p A_j = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

As far as the specification of prior distributions is concerned, low informative priors for all parameters such as the normal distribution with mean equal to zero and large variance (e.g.  $10^4$ ) are adopted since we do not have beforehand information about the parameters of our interest.

### 2.3 A Skellam's variation model

Here we use the Skellam (or Poisson difference) distribution as the basis for modelling the set differences directly; see, for example, Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008). For this reason, it is necessary to mention briefly some details and properties of this distribution before proceeding with the presentation of our model based on a variation of the Skellam distribution.

First of all, Irwin (1937) have introduced the distribution of the difference between two independent Poisson random variables for the case of equal means. After a decade, Skellam (1946) has moved one step forward by specifying the case of unequal means. More recently, Karlis & Ntzoufras (2006) have introduced the distribution of the difference between two correlated random variables that follow the bivariate Poisson distribution. They have proved that this distribution reduces to the Skellam distribution. More specifically, assuming that  $X = W_1 + W_3$  and  $Y = W_2 + W_3$  with  $W_1 \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_1)$ ,

$W_2 \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_2)$  and the  $W_3$  follows any discrete distribution with parameter  $\lambda_3$ , they resort to the apparent result:  $Z = X - Y = W_1 - W_2 \sim \text{Sk}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ , where it does not depend anymore on  $W_3$  and consequently the correlation is eliminated. In essence, the joint distribution of  $(X, Y)$  is a bivariate distribution incorporating the correlation through the variable  $W_3$ . In the case that  $W_3$  is a Poisson random variable, both marginals  $X$  and  $Y$  follow Poisson distribution. The probability function of random variable  $Z$  is this:

$$f_{Sk}(z|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = P(Z = z|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = e^{-(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} \left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)^{\frac{z}{2}} I_{|z|} \left(2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}\right) \tag{2.4}$$

with  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$  and  $I_r(x)$  is the modified Bessel function of order  $x$  which is given by

$$I_r(x) = \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^r \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\frac{x^2}{4}\right)^k}{k! \Gamma(r+k+1)};$$

see Abramowitz & Stegun (1965) for more details. The support of this random variable is the set of integer numbers and can be used for modelling differences between discrete counts. The main difference between the two cases of independent and the dependent Poisson variates is the interpretation of the parameters  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ . The expected value and the variance of  $Z$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} E(Z_{Sk}) &= \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \\ \text{Var}(Z_{Sk}) &= \lambda_1 + \lambda_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The Skellam distribution is useful for modelling sport outcomes, since, by this way, we can eliminate any linear correlation between the score outcomes of the two competing teams. When modelling the set differences of volleyball games, essentially we model the full set score. This is in contrast to other other team sports such as football or basketball where using the goal or point difference is not equivalent to modelling the full game score. This is due to the fact that portion of the final score information is lost by using only the differences. However, the use of the Skellam distribution for modelling set differences in a similar manner as Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008) fitted this model for goal differences in football, is not appropriate. This is due to the restrictions imposed on the set difference by the scoring rules of the Volleyball game. Firstly, the random variable of our response (the set difference) cannot be equal to zero (draw). Secondly, the set difference cannot be greater than three or smaller than minus three. The first case refers to the non-existence of ties (draws) in a volleyball game while the latter case refers to the fact that one of either home or away team wins with maximum three sets margin, respectively. In other words, the response  $Z = X - Y$  of set difference (with  $X$  and  $Y$  being the sets scored by the home and the away team, respectively) is strictly defined to  $\{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$ . The negative values of this support correspond to the win of the away team and the positive correspond to the win of the home team. For this reason, a new model version based on the Skellam distribution is proposed in order to take into consideration the above mentioned constraints. To fit this new version of Skellam model, firstly we have to define the corresponding distribution of this model. Hence, we define the **Zero-Deflated and Truncated Skellam distribution (ZDTS)** as the one with probability mass function

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ZDTS}(z|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \frac{P(Z = z|Z \in \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\})}{\sum_{x \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \{f_{Sk}(-x|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + f_{Sk}(x|\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\}} \\ &= \frac{f_{Sk}(z|\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}{\sum_{x \in \{1, 2, 3\}} \{f_{Sk}(-x|\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + f_{Sk}(x|\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\}} \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

for  $z \in \{-3, -2, -1, 1, 2, 3\}$ . As you may observe by (2.6), the truncation of the Skellam distribution is in both minus four (lower truncation) and four (upper truncation).

Hence, the zero-deflated and truncated model version is used for the modelling of set differences

$$Y_i \sim ZDTS(\lambda_{i1}, \lambda_{i2}) \quad (2.7)$$

where  $Y_i$  is the set difference in game  $i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, 132$  regular season games.

For this model we have used the linear predictor formulation

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\lambda_{i1}) &= \mu + home + att_{ht_i} + def_{at_i} \\ \log(\lambda_{i2}) &= \mu + att_{at_i} + def_{ht_i} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

where  $\mu$  is a constant parameter, *home* is the common home effect,  $att_{ht_i}$  as well as  $att_{at_i}$  are the “net” attacking abilities of the home and the away team in game  $i$ . In the same way,  $def_{ht_i}$  and  $def_{at_i}$  are used to capture the “net” defensive abilities of the home and the away team in game  $i$ . For both ability parameters, sum-to-zero constraints (as in the ordered-multinomial model) are used

$$\sum_{j=1}^p att_j = 0, \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^p def_j = 0 \quad (2.9)$$

where  $j = 1, \dots, p$  denotes the team  $j$  participating in the league. Both abilities of the omitted team are calculated as in (2.3).

In the above formulation we have used the standard expression connecting the team ability parameters directly with  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  rather than the mean of ZDTS distribution; see Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008) for a similar treatment when using the original Skellam distribution. This was mainly due to the complexity of the expected value of  $Z$  given by

$$E(Z_{ZDTS}) = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \frac{I_1 + \frac{2I_2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}{(\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{3I_3(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 + \lambda_2^2)}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}}{I_1(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \frac{I_2(\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2)}{(\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{I_3(\lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3)}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}} \text{ with } I_\ell = I_\ell(2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}) \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2, 3, \quad (2.10)$$

which makes the direct modelling of  $E(Z_{ZDTS})$  extremely difficult. Nevertheless, the above expression provides us an insight about this mean value which is proportional to the difference  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ , which is the mean of the original Skellam distribution. Moreover, the mean of the ZDTS distribution is also multiplied by a correction factor which keeps this expectation within the range of acceptable values (i.e. between  $-3$  and  $3$ ). According to Figure 1, the expected values of  $E(Z_{Sk})$  and  $E(Z_{ZDTS})$  for various combinations of values of  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in [-3, 3]^2$  are quite close implying that the interpretation based on the simplified model formulation (2.8) will be similar to the corresponding interpretation of the parameters for the original Skellam distribution.

The prior specification for the parameters of this model is not a straightforward task since we have observed numerical problems related with the scale of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ . This is due to the fact that several combinations of values for  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  will result to realistic differences of sets which lie in the interval  $[-3, 3]$ . For this reason, we have calibrated the prior distributions of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  in order to be roughly in agreement with the model assumption:  $-3 \leq E(Z_{ZDTS}) \leq 3$ . Using the latent variable interpretation of the Skellam distribution, and in order to restrict the scaling of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  we have decided to use the assumptions of  $0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq 3$  and  $0 \leq \lambda_2 \leq 3$ .




FIG. 1. The linear relationship between the expected values  $E_{ZDTs}$  and  $E_{Sk}$ ;  $E_{ZDTs}$  and  $E_{Sk}$  are denoted as  $y$  and  $x$  in equation, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq \lambda_2 \leq 3 & 0 &\leq \lambda_1 \leq 3 \\
 \Rightarrow 0 &\leq \exp(\mu) \leq 3 & \Rightarrow 0 &\leq \exp(\mu + home) \leq 3 \\
 \Rightarrow -\infty &\leq \mu \leq 1.10 & \Rightarrow -\infty &\leq \mu + home \leq 1.10
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the value of 1.1 can act as a rough upper bound for the constant parameter  $\mu$  and the home effect. Following this logic, we have used the three-sigma rule (Pukelsheim, 1994) for  $\mu$  and *home* in order to specify their prior standard deviation. Moreover, we assume prior variance equal to one for the ability parameters. Although smaller prior variances are also plausible, we have adopted this choice to ensure that our analysis will be non-informative and on the same time will avoid extremely large prior values for  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ . Hence, the prior distributions we have finally used in our approach are the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu &\sim N(0, 0.37^2), & att &\sim N(0, 1^2), \\
 home &\sim N(0, 0.37^2), & def &\sim N(0, 1^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

Sensitivity analysis over the prior variance choices have shown that posterior results are quite robust indicating that our prior is indeed of low information.

### 3. Results for the Greek Volleyball League 2016/17

#### 3.1 Posterior analysis and interpretation

In this section we present the most important results for both models under consideration. The posterior results of each model have been produced by running Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) algorithm via STAN software for both models by using three parallel chains. In each chain, we have used 5000 iterations for sampling after discarding additional 1000 iterations as a warm-up (burn-in) period. At

first, we refer to the results of the ordered multinomial logistic model followed by the results of the ZDTS model.

The constant parameters in the ordered-multinomial model (Eq. 2.2) express the log cumulative odds ratio of each set difference threshold ( $K - 1$ ) to the remaining set differences when two teams of equal strength are competing each other. According to Table 1, we observe that

1. The home team has greater probability to win than the away team (which reflects a latent common home effect).
2. The most frequent difference is the one of two sets in favour of the home team (i.e. 3–1 score) with relative frequency equal to 29% followed by scores 3–2, 2–3 and 1–3 with relative frequencies ranging from 15% to 20%. The probability of observing set differences equal to three is much lower ( $\sim 12\%$  and  $\sim 5.5\%$  for home and away teams, respectively) which is reasonable when the two competing teams are of equal strength.

Model	Set differences					
	-3	-2	-1	1	2	3
ordered-multinomial	5.47	17.04	16.73	19.83	29.01	11.92
ZDTS	6.21	11.35	17.60	24.82	22.60	17.42

Table 1. Percentages (%) of set differences in a game between two competing teams of equal strength based on the ordered-multinomial and ZDTS model (results are based on transformation of the posterior means of  $c_k \mu$  and *home*, respectively).

For the overall ability parameters of the ordered-multinomial model ( $A_j$ , for  $j = 1, \dots, 12$ ), the 95% posterior intervals are presented in Figure 2 in descending order. Generally, the estimated abilities are in agreement with the final ranking of the league. The only discrepancies we observe between the overall abilities and the final ranking positions of teams concern the following teams: Foinikas Syrou (+2), Pamvochaikos (-1) and Kifisia (-1).




FIG. 2. 95% Posterior intervals of the “net” general ability of all teams for the ordered multinomial model (parameters  $A_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, 12$ ). The points are the posterior means; within brackets the observed ranking.

Concerning the ZDTS, Table 1 also presents the probabilities of set difference for two teams of equal strength based on this model. The picture is similar to the results of the ordered multinomial model, but



more weight is now given on the 3–2 difference which now has almost 25% probability versus the 20% observed with the ordered-multinomial model. Furthermore, the corresponding probabilities of set differences two and three in favor of home team are almost equal to 23% and 17%, respectively. Hence the ZDTS seems to suggest slightly higher values for the overall home effect.

Moreover, Table 2 presents the posterior means of the constant term and the home effect both in log-set scale and in the original scale of the sets. From this table, we observe that the home effect increases the parameter  $\lambda_1$  against  $\lambda_2$  by 41%. Note that parameters  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  of the ZDTS are linked with sets earned by each team but their interpretation is not exactly the same since they refer to latent unknown quantities (after removing a common correlation component). Finally, we present the differences of the lambda parameters and the corresponding actual expected value when two teams of equal strength play to each other. Concerning, the latter quantity we observe that the posterior mean of the expected difference in sets is about 0.63 sets ranging from 0.19 to one set with posterior probability 95%.

Parameter Description		mean	median	sd	Posterior Interval	
					2.5%	97.5%
Constant (in log-sets)	$\mu$	0.94	0.94	0.24	0.50	1.42
Home effect (in log-sets)	$home$	0.34	0.34	0.12	0.11	0.61
Constant (in sets)	$e^\mu$	2.64	2.56	0.64	1.64	4.14
Home effect (% in sets)	$e^{home}$	1.42	1.41	0.12	1.17	1.84
Parameters for teams of equal strength <sup>‡</sup>	$\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$	1.08	1.03	0.47	0.29	2.14
Expected value for teams of equal strength <sup>‡</sup>	$E(Z_{ZDTS})$	0.63	0.63	0.21	0.19	1.04

Table 2. Posterior summaries of constant  $\mu$  as well as common home effect  $home$  parameters and difference  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2$  and the corresponding expected set-difference between two equal strength teams based on ZDTS model; <sup>‡</sup> $\lambda_1 = e^{\mu+home}$  and  $\lambda_2 = e^\mu$ .

Figure 3 presents the 95% posterior intervals for the attacking and defensive team abilities based on the ZDTS model, that is parameters  $att_j$  and  $def_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 12$ . We further present the differences between the attacking and defensive abilities for each team (calculated as  $o_j = att_j - def_j$ ) which can play the role of overall team abilities and therefore they are comparable, in terms of interpretation but with different scaling, to the abilities of the ordered multinomial model; see Figure 4. From this Figure, it is obvious that the estimated overall abilities based on the ZDTS model have the exact same behavior with the corresponding ones based on the ordered-multinomial model. Concerning the attacking and defensive specific abilities  $att_j$  and  $def_j$  (for  $j = 1, \dots, 12$ ), we observe a different picture for most teams since the final rankings are in disagreement with the corresponding parameters. The case of Olympiacos is notable since it is the best performed team concerning both the attacking and defensive abilities. For many teams, their final ranking position is in agreement with either their attacking or their defensive abilities. For instance, the attacking ability of Pamvochaikos is in agreement with the corresponding final ranking position while its defensive ability is underestimated compared to the corresponding final ranking position. A characteristic example of such discordance is Foinikas Syrou since it has the second best defensive ability but also the worst attacking ability. In essence, its excellent defensive performance compensates, in some extent, for its worst attack and for this reason the overall ability of this team is slightly overestimated (see also the final expected ranking in Section 3.2).




FIG. 3. 95% Posterior intervals of both “net” attacking and defensive parameters for the ZDTS model (parameters  $att_j$  and  $def_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, 12$ ). The points are the posterior means; within brackets the observed ranking.




FIG. 4. 95% Posterior intervals of the overall team abilities ( $o_j = att_j - def_j$ ) for all teams  $j = 1, \dots, 12$  based on the ZDTS model. The points are the posterior means; within brackets the observed ranking.

### 3.2 Predictive checking and league regeneration

One of the most interesting and challenging tasks in sports is the prediction of future games. From the Bayesian perspective, the generation of the outcome of a future volleyball match  $i'$  between a home and away team (denoted by  $ht_{i'}$  and  $at_{i'}$ ) can be implemented via the posterior predictive distribution

$$f(y_{i'}^{pred} | \mathbf{y}) = \int f(y_{i'}^{pred} | ht_{i'}, at_{i'}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}} \left[ f(y_{i'}^{pred} | ht_{i'}, at_{i'}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \quad (3.1)$$

where  $y_{i'}^{pred}$  is the future (predicted) set difference for game  $i'$  where teams  $ht_{i'}$  and  $at_{i'}$  compete to each other at the home stadium of the first team. Moreover,  $f(y_{i'}^{pred} | ht_{i'}, at_{i'}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$  denotes the model's sampling distribution of the future game  $i'$  and  $f(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y})$  the posterior distribution of observed data vector  $\mathbf{y}$ . From the above, it is obvious that the posterior predictive distribution is simply the posterior expectation of the probability function of the set difference for future game  $i'$ .

We can generalize the above expression for  $n'$  future games by

$$f(\mathbf{y}^{pred} | \mathbf{y}) = \int f(\mathbf{y}^{pred} | \mathbf{X}^{pred}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = E_{\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}} \left[ f(\mathbf{y}^{pred} | \mathbf{X}^{pred}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \right] \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}^{pred} = (y_1^{pred}, \dots, y_{n'}^{pred})^T$  is a vector of length  $n'$  with elements the future (predicted) values,  $n'$  is the number of future games and  $\mathbf{X}^{pred}$  contains the game specific information related with the future (to be predicted) games. In our case  $\mathbf{X}^{pred}$  simply contains the dummy variables indicating the home and the away teams for each game. Moreover,  $f(\mathbf{y}^{pred}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$  denotes the likelihood of the future values  $\mathbf{y}^{pred}$  which is averaged over the posterior distribution  $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})$ . Note that for the ordered-multinomial model (2.2),  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (c_1, \dots, c_{K-1}, A_1, \dots, A_p)$  while for the ZDTS, the parameter vector is given by  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, home, att_1, \dots, att_p, def_1, \dots, def_p)$ .

Although the computation of the predictive distribution (3.2) may look cumbersome due to (multivariate) integral involved in this equation, in practice it is very easy to estimate it through MCMC methods. We simply introduce an additional step in our algorithm where we generate samples of the possible future outcomes  $\mathbf{y}^{pred}$  from the model's sampling distribution  $f(\mathbf{y}^{pred}|\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})$  for the given parameter values  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$  generated at the  $t$  iteration of the MCMC algorithm. Thus, in a similar manner as in Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008), we obtain a sample from the predictive distribution for the ordered multinomial model by using the following steps:

- Update the model parameters for the  $t$  iteration of the MCMC algorithm  $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)} = (c_1^{(t)}, \dots, c_{K-1}^{(t)}, A_1^{(t)}, \dots, A_p^{(t)})$  by obtaining a single MCMC iteration from Stan using as initial values the parameter values  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t-1)}$  of the previous iteration.
- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$ , calculate the probabilities of the multinomial distribution for future game  $i'$   $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i'}^{(t)} = (\pi_{i'1}^{(t)}, \dots, \pi_{i'K}^{(t)})$  as a function of  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$  using the inverse cumulative logit link functions of (2.2).
- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$ , generate predictive values  $y_{i'}^{rep}$  from the multinomial distribution with probability parameters  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i'}^{(t)}$ , that is  $y_{i'}^{rep} \sim \text{Multinomial}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i'}^{(t)})$ .

For the second modelling approach, since the ZDTS is not a standard distribution available by Stan, we have specified a user-defined distribution. Hence the generation of the predictive values can be summarized by the following steps:

- Update the model parameters for the  $t$  iteration of the MCMC algorithm

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)}, home^{(t)}, att_1^{(t)}, \dots, att_p^{(t)}, def_1^{(t)}, \dots, def_p^{(t)})$$

by obtaining a single MCMC iteration from Stan using as initial values the parameter values  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t-1)}$  of the previous iteration.

- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$ , calculate the parameters of ZDTS by  $\lambda_{i'1}^{(t)} = \exp(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} + home^{(t)} + att_{hu_{i'}}^{(t)} + def_{at_{i'}}^{(t)})$  and  $\lambda_{i'2}^{(t)} = \exp(\boldsymbol{\mu}^{(t)} + att_{at_{i'}}^{(t)} + def_{hu_{i'}}^{(t)})$ .
- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$  and  $k = 1, \dots, 6$ , calculate  $\pi_{i'k}$  from

$$\pi_{i'k}^{(t)} = \frac{f_{Sk}(z_k|\lambda_{i'1}^{(t)}, \lambda_{i'2}^{(t)})}{\sum_{z \in \{1,2,3\}} \left\{ f_{Sk}(-z|\lambda_{i'1}^{(t)}, \lambda_{i'2}^{(t)}) + f_{Sk}(z|\lambda_{i'1}^{(t)}, \lambda_{i'2}^{(t)}) \right\}}, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $z_k = k - 3 - \mathcal{I}(k \leq 3)$ .

- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$ , generate  $w_{i'}$  from a multinomial distribution with parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i'}^{(t)}$  where each element is calculated by (3.3). Hence,  $w_{i'} \sim \text{Multinomial}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_{i'}^{(t)})$ .
- For  $i' = 1, \dots, n'$ , set  $y_{i'}^{rep} = w_{i'} - 3 - \mathcal{I}(w_{i'} \leq 3)$ .

Through the predictive distribution, we can also reproduce the final league ranking table which is an important tool to evaluate the goodness of fit of the implemented models. This approach was introduced by Lee (1997) within the classical frequentist approach was further adopted by Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008) for the simulation of the final league ranking table within the Bayesian framework. In essence, a model has a satisfying fit to the data when the ranking from its posterior predictive distribution is in general agreement with the observed ranking. Thus, the model with the smallest discrepancies between the observed and predicted ranking is the one with the best fit in terms of the final league ranking.

In essence, we can obtain the predictive distribution of the ranking table by generating each match outcome of the whole regular season according to the previously mentioned procedure for the prediction of match outcomes. Once we get the predictive density of each match outcome, we can construct the predictive final league ranking distribution. The key feature here is that we obtain predictions for the games that we have already observed. Hence  $n' = n$  and  $\mathbf{X}^{pred}$  is exactly the same with the pre-game information available for the observed games. Moreover, each  $y_i^{rep}$  now corresponds to the ‘‘predicted’’ set difference for the observed game  $i$  with observed set difference  $y_i$ . Having generated  $\mathbf{y}^{pred(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{pred(T)}$  as a sample of size  $T$  from the predictive distribution  $f(\mathbf{y}^{pred} | \mathbf{y})$ , then we obtain a sample from re-generated leagues by the following procedure:

For every iteration  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$

- Calculate

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{i1}^{(t)} &= 3 \times \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} \geq 2) + 2 \times \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} = 1) + \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} = -1), \text{ and} \\ \psi_{i2}^{(t)} &= 3 \times \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} \leq -2) + 2 \times \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} = -1) + \mathcal{I}(y_i^{pred(t)} = 1),\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{I}(A)$  is the indicator function which takes the value of one if statement  $A$  is true and zero otherwise.

- For  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , calculate the points of each team  $j$  at league (or iteration)  $t$  by

$$P_j^{(t)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \psi_{i1}^{(t)} \times \mathcal{I}(ht_i = j) + \psi_{i2}^{(t)} \times \mathcal{I}(at_i = j) \right\}.$$

- For  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , obtain the final ranking  $R_j^{(t)}$  (in descending order) of each team  $j$  at league (or iteration)  $t$  that correspond to the final set of points  $P_1^{(t)}, \dots, P_p^{(t)}$ .

Then, the posterior predictive distribution of both league points and ranking of each team are readily available. Here, for the goodness-of-fit purposes, we use the posterior means of the points but also more thorough analysis can be based on the frequency distribution of the final ranking of each team; see for examples in Karlis & Ntzoufras (2008).

### 3.3 Goodness-of-fit model comparison

Figure 5 presents the 95% posterior intervals of the predicted frequencies of set differences compared with the corresponding observed ones. Both models provide good fit to the data since the posterior medians (dark points) are very close to the observed frequencies. Furthermore, the 95% posterior intervals in both models belong to the corresponding observed ones in each set difference. Nevertheless, the ordered-multinomial model seems to “capture” more precisely all the observed set differences than the ZDTS one. Concerning the ZDTS model, the observed frequencies are included in the 95% posterior intervals. Small differences are observed between the posterior medians and the observed frequencies for values of  $|Z| \geq 2$ . On the other hand, for  $|Z| = 1$  (i.e., for tie-break games), these differences are greater and the observed frequencies are marginally included in the reported posterior intervals. Note that the better predictive performance of the ordered-multinomial model with regard to the marginal frequencies of the differences is expected since this model focuses on the estimation of the probabilities (and consequently the frequencies) of set differences rather than the estimation of expected differences which is the focus of the ZDTS model.

The posterior predictive league table for both fitted models is presented in Table 3. In this table, both the posterior ranking and points (based on the posterior means) along with their observed ones are presented. According to this table, the only differences between the predicted and the observed ranking concern positions 4–6. More specifically, Foinikas Syrou was overestimated while Pamvochaikos was underestimated by both models. Foinikas Syrou has gained three and one point more than the expected ones (ranked to position 4) according to the ordered-multinomial and the ZDTS models, respectively. On the other hand, Pamvochaikos was predicted to have four and one point lower than the observed ones ranked in positions 6 and 5 for the two models, respectively. Finally, then points of Kifisia were predicted accurately by the ordered-multinomial model (ranked correctly at position 5) and with one point less than observed ones for the ZDTS (ranked at position 6 instead of the 5th). Overall, when focusing




FIG. 5. 95% Posterior intervals of predicted frequencies of set differences.  $y_{rep}$  and  $y$  are the generated (median) and observed quantities, respectively.

on expected points, it seems that the ZDTS is more accurate than the ordered-multinomial. These differences in terms of points, are even more obvious in teams in positions 8–9 where the absolute difference between their predicted and observed points is greater than five points for the ordered-multinomial while it is about three points for the ZDTS model.

Model					
Ordered-Multinomial			Zero Deinflated & Truncated Skellam (ZDTS)		
Ranking		Points	Ranking		Points
Pred. <sup>†</sup> (Obs.) <sup>‡</sup>	Teams	Post.Mean (Obs.) <sup>‡</sup>	Pred. <sup>†</sup> (Obs.) <sup>‡</sup>	Teams	Post.Mean (Obs.) <sup>‡</sup>
1 (1)	Olympiacos	58.87 (62)	1 (1)	Olympiacos	59.98 (62)
2 (2)	Paok	53.00 (53)	2 (2)	Paok	52.97 (53)
3 (3)	Panathinaikos	49.20 (50)	3 (3)	Panathinaikos	49.87 (50)
4 (6)	Foinikas Syrou	40.28 (37)	4 (6)	Foinikas Syrou	38.04 (37)
5 (5)	Kifisia	36.89 (37)	5 (4)	Pamvochaikos	37.88 (39)
6 (4)	Pamvochaikos	35.06 (39)	6 (5)	Kifisia	36.17 (37)
7 (7)	Ethnikos Alexan.	34.81 (36)	7 (7)	Ethnikos Alexan.	35.64 (36)
8 (8)	Iraklis Petosfairisis	22.51 (28)	8 (8)	Iraklis Petosfairisis	24.88 (28)
9 (9)	Iraklis Chalkidas	21.17 (16)	9 (9)	Iraklis Chalkidas	19.54 (16)
10 (10)	Panachaiki	19.70 (16)	10 (10)	Panachaiki	18.82 (16)
11 (11)	Kyzikos Peramou	16.34 (14)	11 (11)	Kyzikos Peramou	15.67 (14)
12 (12)	Orestiada	05.70 (7)	12 (12)	Orestiada	06.55 (7)

<sup>†</sup>predictive ranking is according to the expected points; <sup>‡</sup>observed ranking and points are given within brackets

Table 3. Posterior predicted mean and observed points and ranking for the regular season data for both models with team abilities (Eq. 2.2 and 2.8).

In order to quantify the overall goodness-of-fit, we have calculated the mean absolute deviances (MAD) based on predictive quantities of interest including results presented in Figure 5 and Table 3. The mean absolute deviances (MAD) are calculated by

$$MAD(Q) = \frac{1}{|Q|} \sum_{j=1}^{|Q|} |E(Q_j^{pred} | \mathbf{y}) - Q_j| \quad (3.4)$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, |Q|$  where  $|Q|$  is the length of vector  $Q$  on which the corresponding measure is based. We have considered the following five different quantities as  $Q$  in the calculation of MAD:

1. the number of games (frequencies) of each set difference as given in Figure 5 ( $|Q| = 6$ ),
2. the proportion of games (relative frequencies) of each set difference corresponding to the results of Figure 5 ( $|Q| = 6$ ),
3. the set differences ( $Q_i = Z_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $|Q| = n = 132$ ),
4. the team points of each team given in Table 3 ( $Q_j = P_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, p$  &  $|Q| = p = 12$ ), and
5. the total set differences of each team obtained from the final league table at the end of the regular season ( $|Q| = p = 12$ ).

The first two measures of Table 4 confirm (and quantify) the superiority of the ordered multinomial with regard to the marginal distribution of possible differences as already stressed from Figure 5. On the other hand, the ZDTS performs better in terms of overall points and set differences indicating that it can reconstruct the final league rankings in a more accurate way (measures 4 and 5). Finally, in terms of overall set differences, the two models perform similarly with the ZDTS being slightly better with a average absolute difference of about one set per team.

Goodness of Fit Predictive Measures (in-sample diagnostics)			
Comparison	$ Q $	Ordered multinomial	ZDTS
1. Frequencies of set differences	6	<b>0.50</b>	4.04
2. Relative frequencies of set differences (%)	6	<b>0.38</b>	3.06
3. Expected set difference	132	1.14	<b>1.10</b>
4. Expected total points of each team	12	2.41	<b>1.51</b>
5. Expected total set differences of each team	12	2.19	<b>0.98</b>

Table 4. Mean Absolute Differences between observed and predicted measures for the regular season.

### 3.4 Out-of-sample prediction: Mid-Season Analysis

Sections 3.2 and 3.3 focused attention on the presentation of in-sample goodness-of-fit diagnostic measures based on the posterior predictive distribution. In this section, we proceed further by evaluating the predictive performance of the proposed models by calculating the same measures as in Section 3.3 in out-of-sample scenarios. Here we focus on mid-season scenario where the first half of the season results are used for estimation (or learning) of the model parameters and the second half for testing the predictive performance of the models. Hence we consider as the observed data  $\mathbf{y}$  all set differences  $y_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 66$  (sample size equal to  $n/2$ ) as the training observed dataset (along with the corresponding  $\mathbf{X}_i$ ) while the test or predictive data  $\mathbf{y}^{pred}$  has elements  $y_i^{pred} = y_{i+66}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 66$ .

According to Table 5, we surprisingly observe that the picture is reversed in comparison to the corresponding in-sample measures of Table 4. Now the ordered-multinomial model is better on the expected set differences, on the total league points and on the total league set differences while it is slightly worse on the marginal frequencies and proportions of set differences.

### 3.5 Out-of-sample prediction: Play-offs analysis

Another way to assess further the predictive performance of models is to estimate their performance in the play-off games which follow after the end of the regular season. In play-off games, the interest is not focused on the exact set difference result but on the final result since the team which reaches first a pre-specified number of wins in a sequence of games is qualified to the next play-off round. In other words, the teams compete in each play-off round until one team of each pair reaches the necessary number of wins needed for the next round qualification. The required number of wins for the quarter-finals is two while for the other rounds (semi-finals and final) is three. For this reason, in each play-off round (Quarter finals, Semi finals and Finals), our purpose is to estimate how many times from the

Mid-Season Predictive Measures (out-of-sample diagnostics)			
Comparison	$ Q $	Ordered multinomial	ZDTS
1. Frequencies of set differences	6	2.12	<b>2.10</b>
2. Relative frequencies of set differences (%)	6	3.22	<b>3.20</b>
3. Expected set difference	132	<b>1.31</b>	1.38
4. Expected total points of each team	12	<b>1.91</b>	2.71
5. Expected total set differences of each team	12	<b>3.52</b>	4.55

Table 5. Mean absolute deviance between predicted and observed measures for the second half of regular season.

total number of MCMC iterations we predict correctly the observed qualifications. In essence, in each play-off round, the best model is the one with the greatest probability of correct predictions.

From Table 6, the ZDTS model demonstrates better predictive performance for both Quarter and Semi finals than the ordered-multinomial one. However, in the Final stage, both models failed to predict the finally observed winner. More specifically, in the final games both models indicate Olympiacos as the winner with three consecutive wins (i.e. 3–0). However, in the observed data, Paok has beaten Olympiacos against all odds since the latter was better in terms of performance in both the regular season and the play-off games winning easily all his competitors.

Play-offs Predictive Measures (out-of-sample diagnostics)		
Comparison	Ordered multinomial	ZDTS
1. Quarter finals (1-8)	66.63%	<b>73.91%</b>
2. Semi finals (1-4)	66.83%	<b>84.81%</b>
3. Finals (1-2)	1.05%	0.15%

Table 6. Qualification percentages in each play-off round of both models with team abilities.

As in goodness-of-fit model comparison, the results in out-of-sample prediction are also contradictory in terms of the predictive ability of the two models under comparison. For the mid-season season analysis the ordered-multinomial with team abilities model demonstrated better predictive performance for specific predictive diagnostics while for the play-off procedure the ZDTS model has performed better in terms of prediction.

#### 4. Discussion

In the present paper, the ordered-multinomial and the zero deinflated and truncated Skellam (ZDTS) models based were proposed and implemented for the analysis of the set difference in Volleyball games. These two models were fitted in data from the Greek Volleyball league using the common vanilla structure used in other sports, especially in association football; see, for example, in Karlis & Ntzoufras



(2003). We have performed several goodness-of-fit and predictive comparisons in which it does not seem to be a clear winner between the two models. Both of them seem to re-construct well the final league while the ZDTS model seems to behave better in some occasions while in others the ordered multinomial.

As a next step to our work, we will consider building models that embody more detailed information about each game such as the number of specific skill events (this is work in progress by the authors). Such models can be used either for understanding the importance of each skill or for predicting the result of the next game. The two problems need different handling. For example the first one is more straightforward to implement since the final statistics and skill events for each game can enter directly in the predictor function of each model. Such models can assist the manager of each team to understand what team characteristics should be strengthened via strategic decisions (type of training, selection of specific player, transfer a new player) or for the calculation of xSets (in accordance to xGoals used in soccer).

On the other hand, if we are interested for building a prediction model, then the covariates should be related with information available before the game. In this case, we may want to use the average statistics over all or some games before the game of interest.

### Acknowledgements

This research is financed by the Research Centre of Athens University of Economics and Business, in the framework of the project entitled “Original Scientific Publications 2019”.

### References

- ABRAMOWITZ, M., & STEGUN, I. A. (1965) *Handbook of mathematical functions*, Dover Books on Mathematics, Dover Publications.
- AGRESTI, A (2013) *Categorical Data Analysis*, Third edition, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley-Blackwell publications.
- AKARCESME, C. (2017) Is it possible to estimate match result in volleyball: A new prediction model, *Central European Journal of Sport Sciences and Medicine*, **19** (3), 5–17.
- FERRANTE, M. & FONSECA, G. (2014) On the winning probabilities and mean durations of volleyball, *Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports*, **10** (2), 91–98.
- IRWIN, J. O. (1937) The frequency distribution of the difference between two independent variates following the same Poisson distribution, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **100** (3), 415–416.
- KARLIS, D. & NTZOUFRAS, I. (2003) Analysis of sports data by using bivariate Poisson models, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, **52** (3), 381–393.
- KARLIS, D. & NTZOUFRAS, I. (2008) Bayesian analysis of the differences of countdata, *Statistics in medicine*, **25** (11), 1885–1905.
- KARLIS, D. & NTZOUFRAS, I. (2008) Bayesian modelling of football outcomes: using the Skellam’s distribution for the goal difference, *IMA Journal of Management Mathematics*, **20** (2), 133–145.

18 of 18

LEE, A. J. (1997) Modeling scores in the Premier League: is Manchester United really the best?, *Chance*, **10** (1), 15–19.

PUKELSHEIM, F. (1994) The three sigma rule, *The American Statistician*, **48** (2), 88–91.

SKELLAM, J. G. (1946) The frequency distribution of the difference between two Poisson variates belonging to different populations, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General)* **109** (Pt 3), 296–296.