

# Identification of serve pacing strategies during five-set tennis matches

C Martin, B Bideau, P Touzard and R Kulpa

## Abstract

This study aims to investigate the prominence of different pacing strategies adopted by male professional tennis players during five-set matches and their relationship with match outcome, ATP ranking and Grand Slam tournament. Fifty five-set matches of the 2014 Grand Slam tournaments were analyzed. First and second serve velocities, percentages of first serve in, and percentages of first and second serve points won were collected for each of the five sets. According to the fluctuations of mean first serve velocity for each of the five sets, players were classified into five types of pacing strategies: 'variable', 'parabolic', 'constant', 'all-out' and 'negative-split'. Professional players mostly used 'variable' pacing strategy (45%), followed by 'parabolic' (20%), 'constant' (18%) and 'all-out' (15%) strategies, which are closely distributed. Finally, 'negative-split' strategy (2%) is infrequently used. The pacing strategy used by players tends to exert an influence on match outcome ( $P = 0.072$ ). There is no significant association between players' ranking and type of pacing strategy used ( $P = 0.384$ ). There is no significant association between Grand Slam tournaments and type of pacing strategy used ( $P = 0.875$ ). Serve velocity and serve points won are significantly decreased in losers, while they are increased or kept constant in winners during the fifth set of the match. 'Negative split', 'variable' and 'parabolic' strategies seem to be the most effective for winning five-set match, while 'all-out' strategy appears ineffective since when players used it, they lost the match in 73% of cases. Moreover, tennis players should consider physical conditioning programs to avoid decreases in serve velocity and percentage during the fifth set of a tennis match.

## Keywords

Professional players, performance, fatigue, serve velocity

## Introduction

The activity pattern of tennis match play is intermittent with players switching between short bouts of high intensity effort (<10 s), short recovery (10–20 s) and rest periods of longer duration (90–120 s).<sup>1</sup> A typical match duration is between 1 and 2 h, but this duration can be prolonged during five set matches (from 3 to 6 h).<sup>2</sup> Throughout an extreme five-set match, players can hit around 500–1000 groundstrokes and 200–400 explosive serves.<sup>2</sup> The margin between winning and losing a five-set match is small and may be related to serve performance. The ability to produce high ball velocity and to reach high first serve percentage is a key element of successful play because it puts the opponent under stress and may hinder its return.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the number of good returns decreases and the number of aces and first serve points won increase as serve velocity increases over  $44 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ .<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the percentages of first serves, first serve points

won and second serve points won impact the final match outcome.<sup>5</sup>

Serve velocity and accuracy (measured by a scoring system taking account target areas in the serve box) decline from the beginning to the end of a prolonged match or a strenuous training session on hard courts.<sup>6,7</sup> These decreases are generally attributed to fatigue, since studies have reported muscular force deficits in upper and lower limbs at the end of a prolonged tennis match.<sup>6–9</sup> Moreover, potential causes of fatigue during tennis match play are multiple: limitations in energy supply (phosphocreatine), intramuscular accumulation of metabolic products (lactate,  $\text{H}^+$  and inorganic

---

M2S Laboratory, University of Rennes 2, Bruz, France

### Corresponding author:

C Martin, M2S Laboratory, University of Rennes 2, ENS de Rennes, Avenue Robert Schuman, 35170 Bruz, France.  
Email: caromartin@numericable.fr

phosphate),<sup>10</sup> muscle damage,<sup>11</sup> sweat loss and thermal stress,<sup>12</sup> central activation failure and alterations in excitation-contraction coupling.<sup>13</sup> Alternatively, different studies observed no decreases in serve velocity between the beginning and the end of a prolonged match or competition.<sup>14–16</sup> Maquirriain et al. analyzed serve statistics from 15 five-set male professional tennis matches. Their results showed no statistical difference of serve velocity between the first and the fifth set on grass courts. One may hypothesize that the playing surface could influence the evolution of serve velocity during prolonged tennis matches.

During the five-set Wimbledon semi-final in 2013 between Djokovic and del Potro that lasted 4 h 43 s, del Potro's first serve velocity decreased by  $2\text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  between the first and the fifth set, whereas Djokovic's first serve velocity increased by  $1.5\text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  during the same time. Consequently, some theories suggest that performance variations could be the result of conscious or unconscious pacing strategies to preserve physical condition, prevent injuries and enable successful completion of the match.<sup>2</sup> Although this is an interesting hypothesis, no data exist in the literature to support or reject such a statement. Yet, fatigue and pacing in scientific literature about intermittent sport have become increasingly popular in recent years.<sup>17,18</sup> Pacing is described as the distribution of energy resources that optimize match performance, whereas fatigue is considered as an unidirectional construct that relates to eventual reduction in performance compared with baseline values.<sup>18</sup> Several studies in intermittent team sports quantified the evolution of sport performance during a match to determine if players fatigue or modulate their effort according to a pacing strategy.<sup>17,18</sup> By analyzing athletic performances, researchers have observed 'negative-split', 'all-out', 'positive', 'constant', 'parabolic-shaped' and 'variable' pacing strategies (defined in the Methods section) in different sports such as running, swimming, cycling, soccer and rugby.<sup>19</sup> However, no similar studies have been applied on tennis serve performance throughout prolonged (e.g. five sets) matches. Yet, analysis of pacing strategies employed by successful professional players might lend insight into the most desirable pacing strategy for a five-set match in Grand Slam tournaments. Indeed, in order to structure efficient and productive training programs, coaches must have a solid knowledge of their players' physical responses.<sup>20</sup> Serve performance statistics and pacing strategies are thus very useful for coaches because they give information about match period from or during which the player is more or less efficient.

The aim of this study is to investigate the prominence of different pacing strategies adopted by professional tennis players and their relationship with match outcome, ranking and Grand Slam tournament.

## Methods

### *Experimental approach of the problem*

This study analyzed 50 main draw five-set men's singles matches from the 2014 Grand Slam tournaments (12 matches at Australian Open, 12 matches at French Open, 12 matches Wimbledon and 14 matches at US Open) by using the statistics published on official websites of Grand Slam tournaments. Serve performance parameters of professional players (ATP ranking from 1 to 406) were analyzed.

Mean values of first and second serve velocities, first serve in and first and second serve points won were collected for each of five sets by an IBM radar gun.

Abbiss and Laursen defined main pacing strategies for athletic events. The authors of the current study have adapted them for tennis competition (Table 1). According to fluctuations of mean first serve velocity for each of the five sets, players were classified into five types of pacing strategies: 'variable', 'parabolic', 'constant', 'all-out' and 'negative-split'<sup>19</sup> (Table 1).

Separately for pacing strategies, players were sorted into the following groups for comparison: (a) 'winners' versus 'losers' according to match's outcome, (b) '<Top 20' versus '>Top 20' according to player's Association of Tennis Professionals (ATP) ranking at the beginning of tournament. '<Top 20' means players who have a ranking number lower than 20, indicating a better player than the 20th ranked player. Similarly, '>Top 20' means players who have a ranking number greater than 20, indicating a worse player than the 20th ranked player.

### *Statistical analysis*

An analysis of variance with repeated measures and a Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc test were used to determine significant differences in serve performance between sets for all five-set tennis matches. To investigate data differences between winners and losers, two-way mixed analyses of variance with repeated measures (match outcome  $\times$  set) and Student-Newman-Keuls post hoc tests were used. A two-way mixed analyses of variance with repeated measures (tournaments  $\times$  set) was used to investigate data differences between tournaments (Australian Open, French Open, Wimbledon, US Open).

Fisher exact tests were used to analyze:

- effect of pacing strategies on match outcome
- effect of players' ATP ranking on pacing strategies
- effect of Grand Slam tournament on pacing strategies.

Statistical significance was accepted as  $P < 0.05$ . Effect size (ES) (Cohen's  $d$ ) was calculated to document the size of statistical effects observed and defined as

**Table 1.** Definition of the pacing strategies in athletic events according to Abbiss and Laursen<sup>19</sup> and their adaptation for tennis competition.

Pacing strategy	Athletic competition <sup>19</sup>	Tennis competition
Variable strategy	Variable pacing strategy is a term that has been used to define the fluctuations exercise intensity or work rate (i.e. power output) observed during exercise	Mean serve velocity highly fluctuates from one set to another
All-out strategy	After an athlete has reached peak velocity, speed gradually decreases	After a player has reached peak of mean first serve velocity during one of the sets, his performance gradually decreases until the end of the match, set after set.
Constant strategy	The athlete maintains constant pace during an event	Mean first serve velocity is constant set after set. Difference of mean first serve velocity between sets is less than $0.8 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$
Parabolic strategy	Athletes may progressively reduce speed during an endurance trial but tend to increase speed during the latter portion of the distances	This strategy concerns a player who temporarily reduces its first serve velocity during a match's period (1, 2 or 3 sets) but increases it during the latter part of match. This tactic ultimately results in U, J or reverse J-shaped behavior
Negative-split strategy	An event is considered to have been performed with a negative-split, or through use of a negative pacing strategy, when there is an increase in speed observed over the duration of the event	There is a gradual increase in first serve velocity observed set after set

**Table 2.** Duration and serve performance parameters for all five-set matches analyzed (n = 50).

	Whole match	First set	Second set	Third set	Fourth set	Fifth set
Duration (min)						
Whole players	212 ± 27	39 ± 12	43 ± 10	43 ± 11	40 ± 11	47 ± 22
First serve velocity ( $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )						
Whole players	50.5 ± 2.7	51.1 ± 3.0	50.7 ± 3.0	50.5 ± 2.7**	50.4 ± 2.7**	50.5 ± 3.0*
Second serve velocity ( $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )						
Whole players	41.2 ± 2.5	41.4 ± 2.6	41.4 ± 2.5	41.3 ± 2.9	41.3 ± 2.9	40.9 ± 2.8
First serve in (%)						
Whole players	62 ± 7	62 ± 11	62 ± 10	63 ± 10	61 ± 11	64 ± 11
Winners		62 ± 12	62 ± 9	63 ± 9	61 ± 9	65 ± 11
Losers		62 ± 10	61 ± 10	62 ± 11	61 ± 13	63 ± 10
First serve points won (%)						
Whole players	71 ± 8	71 ± 12	74 ± 13	72 ± 11	71 ± 16	72 ± 14
Winners		71 ± 11 <sup>\$\$</sup>	74 ± 12	72 ± 10 <sup>\$\$</sup>	73 ± 15	78 ± 12£££
Losers		71 ± 13 <sup>\$</sup>	75 ± 13 <sup>\$\$\$</sup>	72 ± 12 <sup>\$</sup>	69 ± 16	65 ± 14
Second serve points won (%)						
Whole players	51 ± 9	51 ± 16	53 ± 16	51 ± 18	49 ± 17	53 ± 21
Winners		50 ± 14 <sup>\$\$\$</sup>	52 ± 17 <sup>\$\$\$</sup>	54 ± 17 <sup>\$\$</sup>	49 ± 17 <sup>\$\$\$</sup>	66 ± 15£££
Losers		52 ± 18 <sup>\$</sup>	54 ± 15 <sup>\$\$\$</sup>	48 ± 19 <sup>\$</sup>	49 ± 16 <sup>\$\$</sup>	39 ± 18

Note: Data are presented as means and standard deviation of the mean. Significantly different from first set: \* $P < 0.05$ ; \*\* $P < 0.01$ ). Significantly different from fifth set: <sup>\$</sup> $P < 0.05$ ; <sup>\$\$\$</sup> $P < 0.001$ . £££: significantly different from losers ( $P < 0.001$ ).

small for  $ES > 0.1$ , medium for  $ES > 0.3$  and large for  $ES > 0.5$ .<sup>21</sup> Cramer's V was computed to complement the Fisher's exact test results.

## Results

Mean first serve velocity was significantly higher for the first set of match than for the third, the fourth and the fifth sets (main effect:  $P = 0.020$ , first and third sets comparison:  $P = 0.006$ ,  $ES = 0.27$ ; first and fourth sets comparison:  $P = 0.008$ ,  $ES = 0.26$ ; first and fifth sets comparison:  $P = 0.032$ ,  $ES = 0.21$ ) (Table 2). On average, players lost  $0.6 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  between the first and the fifth set. Conversely, set duration (main effect:  $P = 0.449$ ), second serve velocity (main effect:  $P = 0.083$ ), first serve in (main effect:  $P = 0.365$ ), first serve points won (main effect:  $P = 0.533$ ) and second


serve points won (main effect:  $P = 0.758$ ) were not significantly different from one set to another.

'Variable' pacing strategy was incorporated the most (45%), followed by 'parabolic' (20%), 'constant' (18%) and 'all-out' (15%) strategies, which were closely distributed (Figure 1). Finally, 'negative-split' strategy was infrequently used among the 64 players observed (2%).


### Differences between serve performance of winners and losers during five-set matches

Winners' first serve velocity did not significantly differ across the five sets (main effect:  $P = 0.355$ ), while losers' first serve velocity changed significantly between sets (main effect:  $P = 0.023$ ). First serve velocity significantly decreased for losers between first and third sets ( $P = 0.002$ ,  $ES = 0.15$ ), a further decrease at the fourth ( $P = 0.002$ ,  $ES = 0.24$ ) and fifth sets ( $P = 0.002$ ,  $ES = 0.28$ ) and between second and fifth sets ( $P = 0.013$ ,  $ES = 0.14$ ) (Figure 2(a)). On average, losers lost  $1.2 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  between first and fifth sets. Moreover, for the fifth set, mean first serve velocity was significantly higher ( $+1.4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) for winners than for losers ( $P = 0.021$ ,  $ES = 0.22$ ).

Winners' second serve velocity did not significantly differ across the five sets (main effect:  $P = 0.943$ ), while second serve velocity significantly decreased during match for losers (main effect:  $P = 0.023$ , comparison of first and fifth sets:  $P = 0.003$ ,  $ES = 0.41$ ) (Figure 2(b)). Concerning percentage of first serve points won, results significantly decreased for losers during the match (main effect:  $P = 0.013$ , comparison of first and fifth sets:  $P = 0.013$ ,  $ES = 0.32$ , comparison of second and fifth sets:  $P < 0.001$ ,  $ES = 0.53$ , comparison of third and fifth sets:  $P = 0.007$ ,  $ES = 0.37$ ), while results significantly increased for winners during the match (main



**Figure 1.** Proportion of pacing strategies about the first serve velocity for all players.



**Figure 2.** Evolution of first serve (a) and second serve, (b) velocities in winners and losers throughout the five-set matches. Significantly different from the first set (\*\* $P < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* $P < 0.001$ ). Significantly different from the second set (£ $P < 0.05$ ). Significantly different from losers (£ $P < 0.05$ ). Data are presented as means and standard error of the mean.

effect:  $P=0.016$ , comparison of first and fifth sets:  $P=0.002$ ,  $ES=0.39$ , comparison of third and fifth sets:  $P=0.002$ ,  $ES=0.42$ ). Furthermore, the percentage of first serve points won was significantly higher for winners (+13%) than for losers for the fifth set ( $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.35$ ). In the fifth set, winners were able to significantly increase their percentage of second serve points won in comparison with all of other sets (main effect:  $P<0.001$ , first and fifth sets comparison:  $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.62$ ; second and fifth sets comparison:  $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.52$ ; third and fifth sets comparison:  $P=0.001$ ,  $ES=0.44$ ; fourth and fifth sets comparison:  $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.63$ ). For losers, the percentage of second serve points won in the fifth set was significantly lower than in all other sets (main effect:  $P=0.006$ , first and fifth sets comparison:  $P<0.06$ ,  $ES=0.48$ ; second and fifth sets comparison:  $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.51$ ; third and fifth sets comparison:  $P=0.019$ ,  $ES=0.33$ ; fourth and fifth sets comparison:  $P=0.004$ ,  $ES=0.39$ ). During the fifth set, winners won significantly more points (+27%) on their second serve than losers ( $P<0.001$ ,  $ES=0.55$ ).

#### Comparison of pacing strategies used by winners and losers during five-set matches

Fisher exact test (pacing strategy  $\times$  match outcome) demonstrates a trend towards an association between pacing strategy and match outcome (Fisher exact test = 7.99,  $P=0.074$ ,  $ES=0.29$ ). Winners and losers use 'variable' (50 vs. 40%), 'parabolic' (22 vs. 18%) and 'constant' (16 vs. 20%) in similar proportions. 'All-out' strategy was twice as common for losers (22%) than for winners (8%). 'Negative-split' was only observed in winners (4%). When players used


'variable' or 'parabolic' strategies, they won match in 55 and 56% of the cases. But, when they used 'all-out' strategies, they lost match in 73% of the cases (Figure 3(a)).

#### Comparison of pacing strategies according to players' ATP ranking

There was no significant association between players' ATP ranking and type of pacing strategy used (Fisher exact test = 4.15,  $P=0.384$ ,  $ES=0.04$ ). 'Variable' (42 vs. 46%), 'parabolic' (18 vs. 19%), and 'negative split' (3 vs. 1.5%) pacing strategies were used in similar proportions in <Top 20 and >Top 20 players (Figure 3(b)). 'All-out' strategy was used two times more by >Top 20 (18%) than by <Top 20 players (9%). 'Constant' strategy was more frequently observed in <Top 20 (27%) than in >Top 20 players (15%).

#### Differences of serve performance between Grand Slam tournaments during five-set matches

There was a statistically significant interaction between tournaments and sets concerning first serve velocity (main effect:  $P=0.008$ ) (Table 3). The results show no significant differences for second serve velocities and for second serve points won between tournaments (main effect:  $P=0.262$  for second serve velocity and  $P=0.261$  for second serve points won). Conversely, first serve in and first serve points won were significantly different between tournaments (main effect:  $P<0.001$ ). There was not significant interaction between tournaments and sets for first serve in ( $P=0.160$ ) and first serve points won ( $P=0.388$ ). In



**Figure 3.** Proportions of pacing strategies about the first serve velocity used according to the match outcome (a) and the ATP ranking of the players (b).



**Table 3.** Serve performance parameters for all Grand Slam tournaments. Data are presented as means and standard deviation of the mean.

	Whole match	First set	Second set	Third set	Fourth set	Fifth set
First serve velocity ( $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )						
Australian Open	50.5 $\pm$ 2.5	50.6 $\pm$ 2.6	50.8 $\pm$ 2.7	50.0 $\pm$ 2.3	50.5 $\pm$ 2.5	50.6 $\pm$ 2.4
Roland Garros	49.8 $\pm$ 3.2	50.0 $\pm$ 3.2**	49.4 $\pm$ 3.4**	49.9 $\pm$ 2.8	49.7 $\pm$ 3.0	49.8 $\pm$ 3.6
Wimbledon	50.7 $\pm$ 2.8	50.9 $\pm$ 2.9	50.6 $\pm$ 2.7	50.5 $\pm$ 2.9	50.7 $\pm$ 2.7	50.8 $\pm$ 2.8
US Open	51.4 $\pm$ 2.9	52.5 $\pm$ 2.8	51.8 $\pm$ 2.9	51.4 $\pm$ 2.7\$\$\$	50.8 $\pm$ 2.6\$\$\$\$€€	50.6 $\pm$ 3.3\$\$\$\$€€
Second serve velocity ( $\text{m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ )						
Australian Open	41.0 $\pm$ 2.8	41.1 $\pm$ 2.6	41.2 $\pm$ 2.9	41.3 $\pm$ 3.0	40.8 $\pm$ 2.7	40.8 $\pm$ 2.7
Roland Garros	40.6 $\pm$ 3.2	40.7 $\pm$ 2.4	40.5 $\pm$ 2.2	40.5 $\pm$ 2.3	40.6 $\pm$ 2.7	40.5 $\pm$ 2.6
Wimbledon	41.7 $\pm$ 3.0	41.8 $\pm$ 2.6	42.0 $\pm$ 2.3	41.5 $\pm$ 3.2	41.9 $\pm$ 3.2	41.3 $\pm$ 3.6
US Open	41.7 $\pm$ 2.6	42.1 $\pm$ 2.5	41.7 $\pm$ 2.6	41.9 $\pm$ 3.0	41.8 $\pm$ 2.8	41.2 $\pm$ 2.3
First serve in (%)						
Australian Open	62.4 $\pm$ 7.5@	66.6 $\pm$ 10.7	61.0 $\pm$ 8.7	61.0 $\pm$ 10.4	61.8 $\pm$ 11.0	62.2 $\pm$ 8.8
Roland Garros	61.4 $\pm$ 6.7@@	59.0 $\pm$ 10.6	60.5 $\pm$ 9.9	61.5 $\pm$ 10.1	55.8 $\pm$ 13.7	61.6 $\pm$ 11.4
Wimbledon	65.7 $\pm$ 4.8	66.2 $\pm$ 10.4	67.4 $\pm$ 9.0	66.3 $\pm$ 8.6	65.2 $\pm$ 8.9	67.2 $\pm$ 10.3
US Open	59.7 $\pm$ 5.7@@@	55.7 $\pm$ 11.1	57.0 $\pm$ 9.0	60.3 $\pm$ 9.1	59.8 $\pm$ 10.5	62.9 $\pm$ 10.7
First serve points won (%)						
Australian Open	72.7 $\pm$ 8.6#	73.8 $\pm$ 10.0	77.4 $\pm$ 11.7	73.6 $\pm$ 11.0	68.7 $\pm$ 16.6	70.9 $\pm$ 10.7
Roland Garros	66.4 $\pm$ 7.6	67.0 $\pm$ 13.0	68.3 $\pm$ 11.6	67.4 $\pm$ 11.3	66.0 $\pm$ 13.3	71.3 $\pm$ 16.1
Wimbledon	72.5 $\pm$ 6.7#	71.9 $\pm$ 13.9	70.8 $\pm$ 13.7	71.9 $\pm$ 9.2	70.3 $\pm$ 20.5	73.8 $\pm$ 15.5
US Open	72.7 $\pm$ 8.5####	71.4 $\pm$ 13.4	81.6 $\pm$ 9.4	72.0 $\pm$ 14.0	76.8 $\pm$ 10.4	72.8 $\pm$ 12.9
Second serve points won (%)						
Australian Open	50.9 $\pm$ 10.6	50.5 $\pm$ 14.6	51.2 $\pm$ 15.2	47.2 $\pm$ 18.8	50.3 $\pm$ 9.9	51.0 $\pm$ 18.3
Roland Garros	49.6 $\pm$ 7.9	50.4 $\pm$ 20.6	51.9 $\pm$ 17.6	50.9 $\pm$ 20.3	45.4 $\pm$ 20.1	52.5 $\pm$ 22.0
Wimbledon	52.8 $\pm$ 6.6	54.2 $\pm$ 17.2	56.3 $\pm$ 17.5	54.4 $\pm$ 15.3	49.1 $\pm$ 19.5	53.8 $\pm$ 21.7
US Open	51.8 $\pm$ 11.4	52.3 $\pm$ 13.1	51.0 $\pm$ 13.3	53.6 $\pm$ 17.4	52.3 $\pm$ 14.9	54.1 $\pm$ 22.4

Significantly different from the first set: \$ $P < 0.05$ ; \$\$ $P < 0.01$ ; \$\$\$ $P < 0.001$ ). Significantly different from the second set: € $P < 0.05$ ; €€ $P < 0.01$ ; €€€ $P < 0.001$ . Significantly different from US Open: \*\* $P < 0.01$ . Significantly different from Wimbledon: @ $P < 0.05$ ; @@ $P < 0.01$ ; @@@ $P < 0.001$ . Significantly different from Roland Garros: # $P < 0.05$ ; #### $P < 0.001$ .

Wimbledon, first serve in was significantly higher in comparison with all other Grand Slam tournaments (Australian Open  $P = 0.031$ , Roland Garros  $P = 0.006$ , and US Open  $P < 0.001$ ). In Roland Garros, first serve points won was significantly lower in comparison with all other Grand Slam tournaments (Australian Open  $P = 0.017$ , Wimbledon  $P = 0.029$ , and US Open  $P < 0.001$ ).

### Comparison of pacing strategies according to Grand Slam tournaments


There was no significant association between Grand Slam tournaments and type of pacing strategy used ( $P = 0.875$ ). ‘Variable’ (around 45%), ‘all-out’ (between 12.5 and 16.7%) and ‘negative split’ (between 0 and 4.2%) pacing strategies were used in similar proportions all Grand Slam tournaments (Figure 4). ‘Parabolic’ strategy was used two times more in Roland Garros (29%) than in Wimbledon (12%).

‘Constant’ strategy was three times more used in Wimbledon (27%) than in Roland Garros (8%).

### Discussion

This study was conducted to establish the prominence of different serve pacing strategies in professional tennis players and their relationship with performance outcome by retrospectively analyzing five-set matches. The main result was that Fisher exact test (pacing strategy  $\times$  match outcome) demonstrates a trend towards an association between pacing strategy used and match outcome. There is no significant association between players’ ATP ranking and type of pacing strategy used. Serve velocity and serve points won are decreased in losers while they are increased or kept constant in winners during the fifth set of match.

There was no significant difference across the five sets in percentage of ‘first serve in’ between sets for winners and losers. However, our findings show



**Figure 4.** Proportions of pacing strategies about the first serve velocity used according to the Grand Slam tournaments.

significant differences in percentages of first and second serve points won for winners and losers. During the fifth set, winners won significantly more points after their first (+13%) and second serves (+27%) than losers. This may relate to serve velocity, given that, first serve velocity is significantly higher ( $+1.4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) for winners than for losers for the fifth set. Moreover, between the first and last sets, mean second serve velocity for losers shows a  $0.9 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  decrease. These results are in line with previous findings who noted a significant relationship between serve velocity and probability of winning the point.<sup>22</sup> By executing faster serves, winners are logically placing greater time constraints on their opponent's return, potentially affording them an advantage for winning the point.<sup>23</sup> However, the higher percentages of points won after first and second serves in winners reported in this study were probably caused not only by faster serves but also by the interaction between serve velocity and spin rate or serve location.<sup>24,25</sup>

Repartition of different serve pacing strategies is meaningful for tennis players and coaches. Muscle activation and exercise intensity are centrally regulated in response to intrinsic (i.e. physiological, biomechanical and cognitive) and extrinsic sensory feedbacks necessary to maintain physiological homeostasis.<sup>26,27</sup> Based on the 'central governor hypothesis', it seems logical that the uppermost players select 'variable' strategy to adjust their serve velocity to match circumstances (score evolution, match duration, power struggle and fatigue feelings). Indeed, whatever the Grand Slam tournament and the playing surface, players mainly used 'variable' pacing strategy (45%) and with this strategy, they won the match in 56% of the cases. A lot of questions and/or feelings cross players' minds between points and during change-overs throughout a long tennis match.<sup>28</sup> According to Noakes, athletes could regulate their effort due to afferent sensory

feedbacks and questions such as: 'Have I sufficient energy reserves to finish the match?', 'Am I able to win a 5-set match, have I done this before?', 'Will my muscles be damaged?', 'How much effort do I still have to do to win the match?', etc.<sup>29</sup> Consequently, the variable strategy appears effective since it could allow tennis players to continuously adapt and regulate their serve velocity based on this complex process involving peripheral sensory feedbacks and anticipated workload remaining.

'Constant' pacing strategy is mainly used when exercise duration is unknown.<sup>30</sup> In our study, players frequently use this strategy (18%). The percentage of this strategy increases to 27% in best-ranked players. Those results are the consequence that tennis match duration is hard to predict. Under stable external conditions, a constant pace is 'optimal' for prolonged events such as running, swimming, rowing and cycling<sup>19</sup> because metabolic resources are conserved during exercise to improve athletes' energy efficiency. In rugby, 'constant' strategy has been observed in studies that reported no evident deterioration in high-intensity activity performed during match.<sup>31,32</sup> Moreover, more successful Canadian national and international caliber pursuit and track cyclists used more constant pace race profiles, whereas less successful riders did not.<sup>33</sup> Our results are in accordance with this previous study since the 'constant' strategy is more frequently observed in best-ranked players (<Top 20: 27%) than in others (>Top 20: 15%). Moreover, first and second serve velocities do not significantly change between sets for winners. All these findings suggest that best tennis players are able to spread their energy to conserve a constant first serve velocity throughout the match. One may also hypothesize that the best-ranked players have a better experience of five-set matches that helps them to more frequently choose constant strategy. Indeed, experience has been suggested to influence pacing strategy of athletes.<sup>34</sup> 'Constant' strategy greatly varies from one Grand Slam tournament to the other (only 8% in Roland Garros vs. 27% in Wimbledon). Different factors may explain this result. Firstly, rallies and match duration are usually shorter in Wimbledon than in Roland Garros.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, it has been shown that the serve has a greater importance for winning a match on grass courts than on clay.<sup>36,37</sup> Consequently, it appears easier and much more crucial for tennis players to maintain constant their serve performance in Wimbledon than in Roland Garros.

'All-out' strategy is twice as common in >Top 20 (18%) than by <Top 20 players (9%) and twice as common for losers (22%) than for winners (8%). When players used 'all-out' strategies, they lost the match in 73% of cases. It is difficult to know if players voluntarily chose this kind of strategy before match

according to situational influences (i.e. level of opponent, number of consecutive matches already played in tournament for example) or if 'all-out' strategy is primarily a consequence of fatigue generated by the current five-set match. That risk-taking could be a resolute strategy for players with reduced physical abilities caused by previous strenuous matches or injuries. Since they know that their energy stocks are limited, they try to shorten match duration. This behavior could also be a conscious strategy chosen by players who think that their best chance to win the match needs a relatively fast starting serve pacing strategy and to maintain that level performance as long as possible to put pressure on their opponent. It seems that low-ranked players (>Top 20) give priority to this strategy when they compete against best-ranked players (<Top 20), maybe because they underestimate their chance to win the match if its duration is prolonged. Adoption of this tactic has been seen during a number of high-level competition events. For example, cyclists are often seen attempting to break away from the main group of riders during numerous road cycling events (such as Tour de France), presumably for the purpose of winning the race stage.<sup>19</sup> However, such a tactic is seldom successful (only 27% players in this study won their match with this strategy) and instead often results in a progressive decrease in exercise intensity (from the second set to the last one for first serve ball velocity), maybe due to disturbances in physiological homeostasis. This progressive decrease in ball velocity observed with 'all-out' strategy is meaningful for coaches because it may indicate player's physical limitation, his inability to repeat powerful serves during a prolonged period. 'All-out' strategy does not seem influenced by the playing surface, since it varies between 12 and 17% of all strategies used in the different Grand Slam tournaments.

The First and second serve velocities significantly decrease in the last sets of match for losers. These results are in line with previous findings reporting increases in RPE, decreases in EMG activity and modifications in serve biomechanics responsible for velocity decline during prolonged tennis events.<sup>6-9,13</sup> Moreover, Gomes et al. reported an increase in muscle soreness and muscle damage appearance that impairs players' performance after a 3-h tennis match.<sup>11</sup> None of the previous studies cited about fatigue influence on serve performance compared winners and losers' data. Consequently, we can only express a hypothesis about the fact that five-set matches did not affect winners' serve velocities in this study. We may suppose that winners were physically stronger and better prepared for prolonged matches than losers. Consequently, they could better delay the onset of fatigue and thus its appearance. One may also suppose that winners

managed their effort in a better way during five-set matches than losers.

'Parabolic' strategy concerns 20% of players and 22% of winners. This strategy is two times more used in Roland Garros (29%) than in Wimbledon (12%). In tennis, one may suppose that this strategy reflects the concept of 'transient' or 'temporary' fatigue previously observed in soccer.<sup>17</sup> This term refers to a period of deliberately reduced intensity in performance after the most intense period of sport matches.<sup>38</sup> During that reduced intensity period, a player may down-regulate energy output for serve during the third and/or fourth sets to preserve energy for later and crucial match periods (fifth set for example). One of the best examples of this strategy is the success of Santoro against Safin during Roland Garros 2001. After the match, Santoro admitted that he has voluntarily decreased his effort during the fourth set to recover and be ready to win the fifth set. He said 'at the end of the third set I felt I had to drop the fourth. I know it was a risk but I needed a rest. After that it was a flawless performance' (<http://www.rediff.com/sports/2001/jun/02sfin.htm>). According to the flush model,<sup>39</sup> there is always a reserve for muscle recruitment (the security reserve) that can be used for the so-called 'end-spurt' when the athlete is at his highest level of peripheral fatigue. One may suppose that an increased motivation in the fifth set counteracts fatigue sensations and allows players to dip into his security reserve to increase serve velocity.

'Negative split' strategy concerns only 4% of players for which an increase in the first serve velocity is observed over the duration of match, set after set. However, all players who adopt this strategy won their match. Indeed, adoption of such a pacing strategy is thought to be efficient in prolonged exercise performance by reducing rate of carbohydrate depletion,<sup>40</sup> lowering excessive oxygen consumption<sup>41</sup> and/or limiting accumulation of fatigue-related metabolites (i.e. inorganic phosphate, potassium and hydrogen ions) early on in the exercise task.<sup>40,42</sup> It is believed that this strategy may be the result of an increase in motor unit recruitment<sup>43</sup> and the use of the anaerobic energy reserve.<sup>44</sup> However, it is curious that relatively few players used 'negative split' strategy, given the attention this type of pacing has received in previous literature for different sports.<sup>19</sup> Further studies are necessary to confirm our results about the use of 'negative split' strategy in tennis players and its influence on success.

Our results reveal differences of serve performance between Grand Slam tournaments. In Wimbledon, first serve in was significantly higher in comparison with all other Grand Slam tournaments. In Roland Garros, first serve points won was significantly lower in comparison with all other Grand Slam tournaments. Those results are similar to previous studies about serve



performance parameters of professional players in different playing surfaces.<sup>45,46</sup> Indeed, the speed of playing surfaces influences the players' tactical behavior. For example, at Wimbledon, increasing the percentage of first serve in is a key element of successful play on grass because it puts the opponent under stress and may hinder its return. A more aggressive and attacking game is commonly associated with faster surface, such as grass.<sup>47</sup> Conversely, the clay of Roland Garros slows the ball down and reduces the advantage of the server.

This study presents limitations. First, our results reveal only a trend towards an association between pacing strategy used and match outcome. It is well known that *P* values depend upon sample size, but our study provides a retrospective analysis of pacing profiles in professional tennis players only for data limited to a single year. As a consequence, some flexibility is desirable to interpret our *P* value. Moreover, the comparison of pacing strategies between the intermittent tennis activity and the continuous effort of other sports (cycling, rowing and running) may be delicate. No intervention was performed, and no physiological, biomechanical or psychological data were collected; therefore, mechanisms underpinning the observed results are hypothetical. More research is required to establish if perturbations in serving performance are primarily a consequence of fatigue, pacing or tactical and situational influences. Further studies focusing on the relationships between pacing strategies, court surfaces and match outcome are necessary.

## Conclusion

This is the first study that provides an insight into pacing behavior in professional tennis players during five-set Grand Slam matches. For players and coaches, pacing strategy may be a variable to take into account during pre-match strategy or post-match analyses. Authors are conscious that it is really difficult for a tennis player to know if the match will last three, four or five sets. However, in some cases, players may anticipate duration and difficulty of match according to their opponent's level, their head-to-head opponent. For example, if ATP number 1 is drawn to play a qualifier in first round of a Grand Slam tournament, he should choose a pacing strategy that suits a three-set match, but if he is going to play against one player member of the ATP top 5 in a semi-final for example, he may expect a tough and long match. Consequently, he could adopt a pacing strategy that suits a five-set match. In this case, defining strategic recommendations is instructive for tennis players. The current results can provide guidelines for coaches and competitors to follow when they expect a long tennis match, since pacing strategy used by players tends to exert an

influence on five-set match outcome. It appears that players should favor 'negative-split', 'variable' and 'parabolic' strategies in order to win five-set matches and avoid 'all-out' strategy. Indeed, according to the data of this study, when players used 'variable' and 'parabolic' or 'negative-split' strategies; they, respectively, win the match in 56–100% of cases. But, when they used 'all-out' strategy, they lost the match in 73% of cases. Consequently, 'all-out' strategy appears inefficient. Finally, data show that serve velocity and serve points won are decreased for losers, while they are increased or kept constant for winners during the fifth set of the match. Post-match analysis of serve statistics (serve velocity, percentage of serve in, points won) during five-set matches is meaningful for tennis coaches because it can provide insight and information about player's physical fitness level. For example, an acute decrease in first serve velocity during the fifth set may reveal a player's physical weaknesses. In this way, pacing strategy used should be a key factor for consideration when coaches determine specific training programs to prepare high level tennis players for five-set tennis matches.<sup>48</sup> A conditioning program should focus on power endurance development to delay fatigue effects<sup>49</sup> and avoid decreases in serve velocity during the fifth set. In this way, explosive tennis-specific strength training with medicine balls and dumb-bells are recommended with emphasis on leg drive, trunk and shoulder rotations,<sup>49</sup> since they are important contributors to serve velocity.<sup>50,51</sup> Moreover, motor imagery can be an interesting tool for helping players to maintain their serve performance. Indeed, it has been shown that motor imagery improves serve performance during high intensity intermittent training in young tennis players.<sup>52</sup>

## Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## References

1. Martin C, Thevenet D, Zouhal H, et al. Effects of playing surface (hard and clay courts) on heart rate and blood lactate during tennis matches played by high-level players. *J Strength Cond Res Natl Strength Cond Assoc* 2011; 25: 163–170.
2. Reid M and Duffield R. The development of fatigue during match-play tennis. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; 48: i7–i11.

3. Johnson C, McHugh M, Wood T, et al. Performance demands of professional male tennis players. *Br J Sports Med* 2006; 40: 696–699.
4. Haake S, Rose P and Kotze J. *Tennis Science and Technology*. Oxford: Blackwell Science, 2000.
5. Filipčič T, Filipčič A and Berendijaš T. Comparison of game characteristics of male and female tennis players at Roland Garros 2005. *Acta Gymnica* 2008; 38: 21–28.
6. Martin C, Bideau B, Delamarche P, et al. Influence of a prolonged tennis match play on serve biomechanics. *PloS One* 2016; 11: e0159979.
7. Rota S, Morel B, Saboul D, et al. Influence of fatigue on upper limb muscle activity and performance in tennis. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 2014; 24: 90–97.
8. Fabre J-B, Martin V, Gondin J, et al. Effect of playing surface properties on neuromuscular fatigue in tennis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2012; 44: 2182–2189.
9. Girard O, Lattier G, Micallef J, et al. Changes in exercise characteristics, maximal voluntary contraction, and explosive strength during prolonged tennis playing. *Br J Sports Med* 2006; 40: 521–526.
10. Mendez-Villanueva A, Fernandez-Fernandez J and Bishop D. Exercise-induced homeostatic perturbations provoked by singles tennis match play with reference to development of fatigue. *Br J Sports Med* 2007; 41: 717–722.
11. Gomes RV, Santos RCO, Nosaka K, et al. Muscle damage after a tennis match in young players. *Biol Sport* 2014; 31: 27–32.
12. Périard JD and Bergeron MF. Competitive match-play tennis under heat stress: a challenge for all players. *Br J Sports Med* 2014; 48: i1–i3.
13. Girard O, Lattier G, Maffiuletti N, et al. Neuromuscular fatigue during a prolonged intermittent exercise: application to tennis. *J Electromyography Kinesiol* 2008; 18: 1038–1046.
14. Gescheit DT, Cormack SJ, Reid M, et al. Consecutive days of prolonged tennis matchplay: performance, physical, and perceptual responses in trained players. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 2015; 10: 913–920.
15. Maquiritain J, Baglione R and Cardey M. Male professional tennis players maintain constant serve speed and accuracy over long matches on grass courts. *Eur J Sport Sci* 2016; 16: 845–849.
16. Girard O, Millet G and Micallef J. La vitesse du service et les forces de réaction du sol sont-elles modifiées suite à une session de tennis prolongée? *ITF Coach Sport Sci Rev* 2012; 20: 18–20.
17. Bradley PS and Noakes TD. Match running performance fluctuations in elite soccer: indicative of fatigue, pacing or situational influences? *J Sports Sci* 2013; 31: 1627–1638.
18. Waldron M and Highton J. Fatigue and pacing in high-intensity intermittent team sport: an update. *Sports Med* 2014; 44: 1645–1658.
19. Abbiss CR and Laursen PB. Describing and understanding pacing strategies during athletic competition. *Sports Med* 2008; 38: 239–252.
20. Kovacs MS. Tennis physiology: training the competitive athlete. *Sports Med Auckl NZ* 2007; 37: 189–198.
21. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences*, 2nd ed. New York, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
22. O' Donoghue P and Ballantyne A. The impact of speed of serve in Grand Slam singles tennis. In: Lees A, Khan JF and Maynard IW (eds) *Proceedings of the science and racket sports III*. London: 2003, pp.179–184.
23. Gillet E, Leroy D, Thouvenecq R, et al. A notational analysis of elite tennis serve and serve-return strategies on slow surface. *J Strength Cond Res Natl Strength Cond Assoc* 2009; 23: 532–539.
24. Sakurai S, Reid M and Elliott B. Ball spin in the tennis serve: spin rate and axis of rotation. *Sports Biomech Int Soc Biomech Sports* 2013; 12: 23–29.
25. Whiteside D and Reid M. Spatial characteristics of professional tennis serves with implications for serving aces: a machine learning approach. *J Sports Sci* 2016; 1–7.
26. Noakes T, St C and Lambert E. From catastrophe to complexity: a novel model of integrative central neural regulation of effort and fatigue during exercise in humans: summary and conclusions. *Br J Sports Med* 2005; 39: 120–124.
27. St Clair Gibson A, Lambert EV, Rauch LHG, et al. The role of information processing between the brain and peripheral physiological systems in pacing and perception of effort. *Sports Med* 2006; 36: 705–722.
28. Crespo M, Reid M and Quinn A. *Tennis psychology: practical drills and the latest research*. London: International Tennis Federation, 2006.
29. Noakes T. The central governor model: evolution and update. In: *4th Symposium of the Biomedical Research Institute of Sports Epidemiology*, Biarritz, France, 2009.
30. Baden D, McLean T, Tucker R, et al. Effect of anticipation during unknown or unexpected exercise duration on rating of perceived exertion, affect, and physiological function. *Br J Sports Med* 2005; 39: 742–746.
31. Lacombe M, Piscione J, Hager J-P, et al. A new approach to quantifying physical demand in rugby union. *J Sports Sci* 2014; 32: 290–300.
32. Roberts SP, Trewartha G, Higgitt RJ, et al. The physical demands of elite English rugby union. *J Sports Sci* 2008; 26: 825–833.
33. Wilberg RB and Pratt J. A survey of the race profiles of cyclists in the pursuit and kilo track events. *Can J Sport Sci J Can Sci Sport* 1988; 13: 208–213.
34. Micklewright D, Papadopoulou E, Swart J, et al. Previous experience influences pacing during 20 km time trial cycling. *Br J Sports Med* 2010; 44: 952–960.
35. O' Donoghue P and Ingram B. A notational analysis of elite tennis strategy. *J Sports Sci* 2001; 19: 107–115.
36. Furlong J. The service in lawn tennis: how important is it? In: Reilly T, Hughes M and Lees A (eds) *Science and racket sports*. London: E. & F.N. Spon, 1995, pp.266–271.
37. Mecheri S, Rioult F, Mantel B, et al. The serve impact in tennis: first large-scale study of big Hawk-Eye data. *Stat Anal Data Min* 2016; 9: 310–325.
38. Mohr M, Krstrup P and Bangsbo J. Match performance of high-standard soccer players with special reference to development of fatigue. *J Sports Sci* 2003; 21: 519–528.

39. Millet GY. Can neuromuscular fatigue explain running strategies and performance in ultra-marathons?: the flush model. *Sports Med* 2011; 41: 489–506.
40. Abbiss CR and Laursen PB. Models to explain fatigue during prolonged endurance cycling. *Sports Med* 2005; 35: 865–898.
41. Sandals LE, Wood DM, Draper SB, et al. Influence of pacing strategy on oxygen uptake during treadmill middle-distance running. *Int J Sports Med* 2006; 27: 37–42.
42. Mattern CO, Kenefick RW, Kertzer R, et al. Impact of starting strategy on cycling performance. *Int J Sports Med* 2001; 22: 350–355.
43. Tucker R, Rauch L, Harley YXR, et al. Impaired exercise performance in the heat is associated with an anticipatory reduction in skeletal muscle recruitment. *Pflüg Arch Eur J Physiol* 2004; 448: 422–430.
44. Foster C, deKoning JJ, Hettinga F, et al. Effect of competitive distance on energy expenditure during simulated competition. *Int J Sports Med* 2004; 25: 198–204.
45. Barnett T and Pollard G. How the tennis court surface affects player performance and injuries. *J Med Sci Tennis* 2007; 12: 34–37.
46. Barnett T, Meyer D and Pollard G. Applying match statistics to increase serving performance. *J Med Sci Tennis* 2008; 13: 24–27.
47. Hughes M and Clarke S. Surface effect on elite tennis strategy. In: Reilly T, Hughes M and Lees A (eds) *Science and racket sports II*. London: E. & F.N. Spon, 1995, pp. 10–13.
48. Kovacs MS. Applied physiology of tennis performance. *Br J Sports Med* 2006; 40: 381–386.
49. Verstegen M. Developing strength. In: Reid M, Quinn A and Crespo M (eds) *Strength and conditioning for tennis*. London: International Tennis Federation, 2003, pp. 113–135.
50. Girard O, Micallef J and Millet G. Influence of restricted knee motion during the flat first serve in tennis. *J Strength Cond Res* 2007; 21: 950–957.
51. Martin C, Kulpa R, Delamarche P, et al. Professional tennis players' serve: correlation between segmental angular momentums and ball velocity. *Sports Biomech* 2013; 12: 2–14.
52. Guillot A, Desliens S, Rouyer C, et al. Motor imagery and tennis serve performance: the external focus efficacy. *J Sports Sci Med* 2013; 12: 332–338.