

Final Report

Team name: YSAL

Captain: Min Sung Choi (alstjd122067@yonsei.ac.kr)

Team members: Hee Yeon Jeon (heeyeon930@yonsei.ac.kr), Hwa Yun Song (hwayun.song@yonsei.ac.kr)

1. Data

Data were collected from major domestic and international gymnastics competitions from the seasons leading up to the 2020 Tokyo and 2024 Paris Olympics and provided to contestants. Additional data was collected from the following source and used to clarify, standardize the location of competitions and nationality of athletes.

https://www.olympiandatabase.com/index.php?id=1670&L=1#google_vignette

2. Data Pre-Processing

Data pre-processing took the following path:

Data Cleaning

The follow procedures were applied in data cleaning to address missing values and outliers.

- Athlete Names: Data with missing values or erroneous entries in names of athletes was corrected
- Penalty: Rows consisting of a penalty greater than 1 were deleted
- Score: Rows consisting of in either E_Score or D_Score were deleted
- Round Names: some scores were recorded repeatedly due to different round names, so round names were organized.
- Apparatus Names(VT, HB): uniform terminology to facilitate smoother analysis
- Addition of full name column(ex: SIMONE Biles)

Host Advantage Test

Since aesthetics is an important criterion in judging artistic gymnastics, we presumed that home advantage could cause difference in scores.

- Using Nationality data, we revised terms in columns 'Location' and 'Country' so they could be compared
- The t-test findings show that there is a difference in the average scores of athletes from the host country and those from non-host countries
- Based on this result, we incorporated the variable 'Host' (1 for athletes from the host country and 0 otherwise) in the XGBoost model for score prediction.

Weighted Mean

In order to reflect the recent form, we calculated the weighted average of D and E Scores for each athlete and apparatus, giving more weight to competitions closer to the Paris Olympics.

Rank Contribution

Using the calculation method of WAR (Wins Above Replacement), we determined the contribution to D and E Ranks.

For instance, if four athletes achieved 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th with the score of 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, respectively,

the athlete in 1st place would have a contribution of $6 - \frac{1}{5} + 6 - \frac{2}{4} + 6 - \frac{3}{3} + 6 - \frac{4}{2} + 6 - \frac{5}{1}$,

the one in 2nd place would have a contribution of $6 - \frac{1}{5} + 6 - \frac{2}{4} + 6 - \frac{3}{3} + 6 - \frac{4}{2}$,

the one in 3rd place would have a contribution of $6 - \frac{1}{5} + 6 - \frac{2}{4} + 6 - \frac{3}{3}$,

the one in 4th place would have a contribution of $6 - \frac{1}{5} + 6 - \frac{2}{4}$,

the one in 5th place would have a contribution of $6 - \frac{1}{5}$,

and the athlete in 6th place would have a contribution of 0.

3. Ridge Regression

To determine the contribution of athletes' medal count for each competition, the regression approach method was employed. The total number of medals obtained by the United States in each competition would be the dependent variable, while the participation status of athletes (denoted as 0 or 1) was considered as the independent variable for conducting regression analysis. However, due to a

significantly lower number of data points (number of competitions) compared to the number of variables (number of U.S. athletes participating in one or more competitions), we experienced the issue of instability in the regression coefficients. We decided to use ridge regression in order to solve this problem.

- Creating the Design Matrix:

The design matrix consisted of the names of U.S. athletes in each column while the last column showed the total medal count for each competition. A design matrix was generated where each row represented a competition, and a binary value (1 or 0) indicated whether a particular athlete participated in that competition. The total medal count for the corresponding competition was appended to the last column.

- The 10-fold cross-validation method was employed to select the optimal ridge regression parameter(λ).

Through ridge regression, regression coefficients (β) were obtained for each athlete, representing how many additional medals the United States could potentially secure if and when the particular athlete participated in the competition.

4. Score Prediction

XGBoost

We utilized the XGBoost model to predict scores for athletes in the Paris Olympics. The D Score exhibits relatively low variability for each athlete, depending on the attempted skills. In contrast, the E Score reflects how well an athlete performed in the actual competition, resulting in significantly greater variability. Due to these distinct characteristics of D Score and E Score, we trained separate models for each.

The XGBoost model was selected because it showed the best performance among Randomforest, Multi Layer Perceptron method.

We included the following variables for score prediction: Gender, Country, Apparatus, Round, Weighted_Average_D, RankContribution, Host, Beta.

We then split the data into training and testing sets for both D Score and E Score, with random selection.

The prediction results showed a relatively high accuracy with a $rmse=0.278$ for D Score and $rmse=0.60$ for E Score.

5. Identify Best 5 Players

1. Team Medals

After predicting the scores for each apparatus(for each athlete), the top 10 scoring athletes for each apparatus were nominated for participating in the 2024 Paris Olympics. All possible combinations of 5 athletes were made into a list, and each combination(team) was made into a dataframe which consists of scores of each apparatus for each athlete.

The top 3 scores within the team for each apparatus were then added, and the sum of the corresponding scores for every apparatus became the team score. A higher team score indicates a higher possibility of winning the team medal.

Woman

	p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	Score
0	BILES Simone	CAREY Jade	JONES Shilese	LEE Sunisa	LINCOLN Kaliya	173.842777
0	BILES Simone	CAREY Jade	DICELLO Kayla	JONES Shilese	LEE Sunisa	173.551659
0	BILES Simone	DICELLO Kayla	JONES Shilese	LEE Sunisa	LINCOLN Kaliya	173.512294
0	BILES Simone	CHILES Jordan	JONES Shilese	LEE Sunisa	LINCOLN Kaliya	173.507164
0	BILES Simone	CAREY Jade	JONES Shilese	LEE Sunisa	MCCLAIN Konnor	173.483410

Man

	p1	p2	p3	p4	p5	Score
0	HONG Asher	MALONE Brody	WISKUS Shane	YOUNG Khoi	PHILLIPS Curran	257.149549
0	HONG Asher	RICHARD Frederick Nathaniel	WISKUS Shane	YOUNG Khoi	PHILLIPS Curran	256.936239
0	MALONE Brody	WHITTENBURG Donnell	WISKUS Shane	YOUNG Khoi	PHILLIPS Curran	256.738977
0	LOOS Riley	MALONE Brody	WISKUS Shane	YOUNG Khoi	PHILLIPS Curran	256.648462
0	HONG Asher	MALONE Brody	RICHARD Frederick Nathaniel	YOUNG Khoi	PHILLIPS Curran	256.622599

2. Individual Medals

Individual medal prediction was based on the predicted scores. The top 3 scoring athletes for each apparatus were each given a medal.

Athlete	Round	Apparatus	Score_Prediction	Medal_Prediction
CAREY Jade	AAfinal	BB	13.513639	0
CAREY Jade	final	BB	12.898303	0
CAREY Jade	AAfinal	FX	14.020990	0
CAREY Jade	final	FX	13.946219	0
CAREY Jade	AAfinal	UB	13.112485	0
CAREY Jade	AAfinal	VT	14.438005	0
CAREY Jade	final	VT	14.550428	1
LINCOLN Kaliya	AAfinal	BB	13.351761	0
LINCOLN Kaliya	final	BB	13.200818	0
LINCOLN Kaliya	AAfinal	FX	14.178653	0
LINCOLN Kaliya	final	FX	14.280256	0
LINCOLN Kaliya	AAfinal	UB	13.193085	0
JONES Shilese	AAfinal	BB	13.731583	0
JONES Shilese	final	BB	13.446031	0
JONES Shilese	AAfinal	FX	13.636383	0
JONES Shilese	final	FX	13.785485	0
JONES Shilese	AAfinal	UB	14.903877	1
JONES Shilese	final	UB	14.480194	1
JONES Shilese	AAfinal	VT	14.176430	0
BILES Simone	AAfinal	BB	14.419993	0
BILES Simone	final	BB	14.193394	0
BILES Simone	AAfinal	FX	14.892567	1
BILES Simone	final	FX	14.545826	1
BILES Simone	AAfinal	UB	14.033108	0
BILES Simone	final	UB	14.317711	0
BILES Simone	AAfinal	VT	15.420900	1
BILES Simone	final	VT	13.999699	0
LEE Sunisa	AAfinal	BB	13.869656	0
LEE Sunisa	final	BB	13.841568	0
LEE Sunisa	AAfinal	FX	13.371685	0
LEE Sunisa	AAfinal	UB	14.652035	1
LEE Sunisa	final	UB	14.872469	1
LEE Sunisa	AAfinal	VT	14.562347	1

Athlete	Round	Apparatus	Score_Prediction	Medal_Prediction
HONG Asher	AAfinal	FX	14.062750	0
HONG Asher	AAfinal	HB	12.530790	0
HONG Asher	AAfinal	PB	14.290291	0
HONG Asher	final	PB	14.041542	0
HONG Asher	AAfinal	PH	12.706124	0
HONG Asher	final	PH	12.962471	0
HONG Asher	AAfinal	SR	14.072449	0
HONG Asher	final	SR	13.879915	0
HONG Asher	AAfinal	VT	14.178295	0
HONG Asher	final	VT	14.869057	1
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	FX	13.443098	0
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	HB	13.307528	0
MALONE Brody	final	HB	14.337938	0
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	PB	14.031466	0
MALONE Brody	final	PB	14.203604	0
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	PH	13.676336	0
MALONE Brody	final	PH	13.666485	0
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	SR	13.662375	0
MALONE Brody	final	SR	13.950905	0
MALONE Brody	AAfinal	VT	14.412266	0
PHILLIPS Curran	AAfinal	HB	14.172194	0
PHILLIPS Curran	final	HB	13.992470	0
PHILLIPS Curran	AAfinal	PB	14.299543	0
PHILLIPS Curran	final	PB	15.132078	1
PHILLIPS Curran	AAfinal	VT	14.625566	1
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	FX	14.447371	0
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	HB	12.322660	0
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	PB	14.746084	1
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	PH	13.602676	0
YOUNG Khoi	final	PH	13.674330	0
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	SR	13.290311	0
YOUNG Khoi	AAfinal	VT	14.972307	1
YOUNG Khoi	final	VT	15.114654	1
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	FX	14.017761	0
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	HB	14.041380	0
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	PB	14.633082	1
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	PH	13.508825	0
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	SR	14.066788	0
WISKUS Shane	AAfinal	VT	14.409405	0

Final Result

bases on the above result,

woman team:

Simon Biles, Jade Carey, Shilese Jones, Sunisa Lee, Kaliya Lincoln with 7 expected medals

man team:

Asher Hong, Brody Malone, Shane Wiskus, Khoi Young, Curran Philips with 6 expected medals