

In the last six years only 40 studies work with this dataset in their publications. It does not seem like much at first, but it is hard to say for sure because approaches for evaluating the scientific use of large, publicly available datasets in the field of football does not seem to exist. To classify this more precisely, further dataset evaluation studies about event data from \name{StatsBomb Open Data} \parencite{StatsBomb2024} or position data from the \name{SoccerNet} \parencite{somers2024soccernet} dataset could be useful. One of the reasons of the limited use may be the low level of trust and not being well established to work with good quality open-source datasets, which is mentioned by \textcite{zuiderwijk2020drives}. kannst du den text grammatikalisch korrigieren und evtl. flüssiger gestalten. aber bitte struktur beibehalten

Hier ist dein Text mit korrigierter Grammatik und etwas flüssigerem Ausdruck, aber die Struktur bleibt erhalten:

---

In the last six years, only 40 studies have used this dataset in their publications. At first, this does not seem like much, but it is difficult to assess for sure, since approaches for evaluating the scientific use of large, publicly available datasets in the field of football do not appear to exist. To classify this more precisely, further dataset evaluation studies on event data from \name{StatsBomb Open Data} \parencite{StatsBomb2024} or positional data from the \name{SoccerNet} \parencite{somers2024soccernet} dataset could be useful. One possible reason for the limited use may be the low level of trust and the fact that working with high-quality open-source datasets is not yet well established, as mentioned by \textcite{zuiderwijk2020drives}.

---

Möchtest du, dass ich den Text zusätzlich auch **stilistisch wissenschaftlicher** (also etwas formeller und objektiver) umformuliere, oder soll er so relativ nah am Original bleiben?

When it comes to the co-authorship network, it can be seen that the collaboration between different research groups is insufficient. Although 40 studies may not be sufficient to draw definitive conclusions but similar issues have already been demonstrated in the field of medicine by \parencite{guo2023mapping}. Lack of collaboration between scientific groups could hinder knowledge exchange and transfer. In contrast, \textcite{...} found the complete opposite, with high levels of collaboration and one particularly prominent author. However, this case may be highly vulnerable to errors, as mistakes made by the prominent author could affect a large number of publications.

It is difficult to make clear recommendations based on these conflicting results. kannst du die sätze grammatikalisch verbessern und flüssiger machen. aber behalte die struktur

Hier ist dein Text mit korrigierter Grammatik und flüssigerem Ausdruck, die Struktur bleibt erhalten:

---

When it comes to the co-authorship network, it can be observed that collaboration between different research groups is insufficient. Although 40 studies may not be enough to draw definitive conclusions, similar issues have already been demonstrated in the field of medicine by \parencite{guo2023mapping}. A lack of collaboration between scientific groups could hinder knowledge exchange and transfer. In contrast, \textcite{...} found the complete opposite, reporting high levels of collaboration and one particularly prominent author. However, this case may be highly vulnerable to errors, as mistakes made by the prominent author could affect a large number of publications.

It is therefore difficult to make clear recommendations based on these conflicting results.

---

Möchtest du, dass ich dir auch eine **etwas stilistisch wissenschaftlichere**

**Variante** schreibe, die weniger umgangssprachlich klingt (z. B. „insufficient collaboration“

→ „limited collaboration“)?

