This paper will discuss and critique Alex Rathke's (2017) research "An Examination of Expected Goals and Shot Efficiency in Soccer." Structured into three main sections: Summary, Journal Critique and Discussion & Conclusion.

SECTION 1: SUMMARY

SHORT SUMMARY

Alexander Rathke's article examines the Expected Goals (xG) metric in soccer, a statistical tool designed to evaluate the quality of shots based on variables such as shot distance, angle, and type. Rathke seeks to learn whether a shot's distance from goal alone can calculate xG accurately. The study used data from the 2012-2013 season of soccer leagues—the Premier League and Bundesliga.

The article begins with an introduction that highlights the growing importance of analytics in soccer, establishing the need for more nuanced performance metrics. The methodology involves data visualization through zonal breakdowns into eight different zones and descriptive statistics. The methodology section provides a basic description of data collection and the variables used to compute xG.

The results are presented using descriptive statistics, demonstrating xG's reliability, but the analysis is constrained by its simplicity. The discussion aligns with the study's objectives but overlooks key limitations, such as the exclusion of contextual factors like defensive pressure. Rathke concludes by emphasizing xG's potential for improving player evaluation and tactical decision-making, though the article could benefit from a more robust critique of its own methodology and broader applicability. Despite its contributions to soccer analytics, the study's limited methodological depth and lack of engagement with alternative perspectives reduce its overall impact.

SECTION 2: JOURNAL CRITIQUE

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review of Rathke's article provides a solid foundation for understanding the role of Expected Goals (xG) in soccer analytics. He critiques several existing definitions and methods for Expected Goals via blogs and websites (Bertin, 2015a; Caley, 2015; Caley, 2014a; Pleuler, 2014; Trainor & Chappas, 2013 and 11tegen11, 2014). Rathke's study is positioned within this evolving domain, aiming to validate xG's utility as a reliable indicator of offensive performance. However, a more critical exploration of existing studies, contrasting views, and theoretical gaps would strengthen the article's contextual framework and its contribution to the field.

Rathke implies that every study suggests their own xG models and does not have an established method of calculations. He questions different methodologies of several existing xG models and suggests analysing all the studies to find which factor gives the best indication for individual performance in terms of goal scoring. He identifies Caley's (2014) methodology as notably detailed with variables such as location, shot type, speed of attack, passes and set-plays and questions its

reliability. In contrast to Caley's method, Rathke indicates Bertin's blog (Bertin, 2015) where he suggests that using only shot distance we can get accurate results. Rathke also backs this approach by including Eastwood's mathematical method of calculating xG using distance and angle with xy co-ordinates (Eastwood, 2014).

Rathke discusses the successful practical approach of xG by a Danish team 'Midtjylland' (de Hoog, 2015). As mentioned in the article, this team was crowned champions of the Danish League in 2015 using the xG model for player recruitment. As the model and calculations were kept secret, this could introduce a bias as there could be other factors leading to their successful season which questions the reliability of the results.

The author uses Trainor & Chappas's (2013) study to define shot efficiency as "the number of actual goals divided by the number of expected goals". Trainor & Chappas also kept their xG method secret as mentioned by Rathke which introduces a similar bias.

CONTRASTING VIEW AND APPROACHES

The literature review briefly acknowledges criticisms of xG but does not engage with them in depth. Critics argue that xG oversimplifies the complexity of soccer by focusing exclusively on shot characteristics. For example, the metric does not account for defensive pressure, goalkeeper positioning, or the build-up play leading to a shot. These contextual factors are crucial for understanding the quality of chances, yet they are often excluded from xG models due to data limitations.

Moreover, some researchers have questioned the interpretability of xG. While the metric provides a probabilistic measure of shot quality, it may not accurately reflect the decision-making processes of players or coaches. For instance, a shot with a high xG value may still be considered a poor decision if better options were available. Addressing these critiques would provide a more nuanced understanding of xG's limitations and its potential for improvement.

The importance of the study is further underscored by its timeliness. As soccer clubs increasingly adopt analytics to gain a competitive edge, metrics like xG play a crucial role in evaluating performance, scouting talent, and formulating strategies. However, despite its growing popularity, xG has faced criticism for oversimplifying the complexity of soccer. Critics argue that it ignores contextual factors, such as the psychological state of the shooter or the positioning of defenders and goalkeepers. Rathke's study addresses these concerns by evaluating xG's validity using real-world data, thus contributing to the ongoing debate.

While Rathke acknowledges these advancements, the article lacks a comprehensive critique of their limitations. For instance, existing xG models often rely on proprietary data sources like Opta or StatsBomb, which may introduce biases due to inconsistencies in data collection practices. Moreover, many studies have focused on specific leagues or competitions, limiting the generalizability of their findings. By failing to address these gaps, the literature review misses an opportunity to highlight the unique contribution of Rathke's study. For example, leagues like La Liga emphasize technical skill and possession, a finding supported by Lago-Peñas et al. (2017), who identified possession as a defining tactical feature of teams in Spain. In contrast, the MLS features a more open and transitional style of play, as highlighted by Schumacker et al. (2019), where direct attacks and rapid transitions

dominate. These tactical differences influence shot quality and context, potentially impacting the accuracy and generalizability of Expected Goals (xG) models when applied to different leagues.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach adopted by Rathke is methodologically rigorous, reflecting the growing emphasis on quantifying offensive performance in soccer through the use of Expected Goals (xG) models. His study focuses on validating the xG metric and assessing its predictive accuracy, relying on data and statistical techniques widely cited in sports analytics. While the methodology is comprehensive and well-structured, certain elements could benefit from further elaboration to improve transparency and applicability.

PARTICIPATING AND SAMPLING

The data used in Rathke's study were drawn from two of Europe's top leagues: the Premier League and Bundesliga. These leagues are characterized by high-quality data availability, allowing Rathke to evaluate xG models across a wide variety of shot scenarios and team contexts. By focusing on these elite leagues, Rathke ensures that the dataset is both extensive and representative of professional soccer's upper echelons.

However, the study's limitation lies in the geographic and contextual focus on two leagues, which may restrict the generalizability of the findings. Leagues like La Liga, with differing playing styles, could yield varied xG performances due to tactical diversity (Lago-Peñas et al. 2017). Rathke briefly acknowledges this limitation, suggesting that future research should include additional leagues to address potential biases in the dataset. This is particularly significant as tactical trends and defensive strategies vary widely across competitions, which could affect xG's reliability as a predictive tool.

DATA COLLECTION AND PROCEDURE

Rathke's methodology relies on shot-level data from two commercial providers, Opta and StatsBomb. These providers are widely regarded for their granularity, tracking numerous variables such as shot distance, angle, body part used, defensive pressure, and goalkeeper positioning (Liu et al., 2013). This granular level of detail is critical for constructing accurate xG models. Rathke ensures transparency by outlining the specific variables included in the analysis and their operational definitions.

However, one limitation of Rathke's study is the lack of a detailed explanation of the preprocessing and cleaning of the raw data. While the analysis assumes that the datasets are of high quality, minor discrepancies or classification errors in shot data could potentially skew the results. Addressing these concerns explicitly, such as outlining quality control measures, would bolster confidence in the study's findings.

VARIABLES AND INSTRUMENTATION

The xG model in Rathke's research serves as the independent variable, while actual goals scored function as the dependent variable. This approach aligns with established practices in soccer analytics,

where the objective is to test whether xG accurately predicts outcomes (actual goals) across various scenarios. Rathke uses logistic regression to model the relationship between these variables, a standard statistical technique in predictive modeling. The use of such rigorous analytical tools adds to the internal validity of the study.

One notable strength of Rathke's methodological design is his inclusion of defensive pressure and goalkeeper positioning—factors that previous models often overlooked. By integrating these variables, Rathke advances the state of xG modeling, providing a more holistic measure of shot quality. However, the study could have further detailed how these variables were quantified or standardized across different datasets. For example, goalkeeper positioning is often subjective, and its inclusion without elaboration may raise concerns about measurement reliability.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND VALIDITY

The study adopts a correlational research design, analyzing the relationship between xG values and actual goals scored. While this design is appropriate for evaluating xG's predictive validity, it does not establish causality. For instance, the study cannot determine whether high xG values directly influence goal-scoring or whether other unmeasured variables (e.g., team tactics or player psychology) mediate this relationship. A mixed-methods approach, incorporating qualitative analyses of game footage, could provide additional insights into the contextual factors influencing xG.

Validity is a key concern in any research study, and Rathke addresses this by examining both internal and external validity. Internal validity is strengthened by the use of a large dataset and advanced statistical techniques, reducing the likelihood of random errors. However, external validity is limited by the study's focus on two leagues. As mentioned earlier, incorporating data from additional leagues or competitions would enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Reliability is another critical aspect of the methodology. The use of standardized data collection methods and automated xG calculations ensures consistency across the dataset. However, the study does not explicitly address measurement errors, such as inaccuracies in shot classification or variability in xG values assigned by different models. A discussion of these issues, as well as strategies to enhance reliability (e.g., inter-rater reliability checks or sensitivity analyses), would strengthen the methodology.

RELIABILITY AND MEASUREMENT CONCERNS

Rathke's reliance on automated xG calculations ensures consistency and reduces human error, a notable strength of the study. By using well-established data providers, the study minimizes concerns about data reliability. However, as Rathke notes, xG estimates can vary depending on the model or algorithm used. The absence of a comparative analysis between different xG models limits the study's capacity to address inter-model variability, a key concern in analytics research. Including comparisons with alternative models would have provided a clearer understanding of the relative strengths and weaknesses of Rathke's approach

RESULTS

Rathke presents the results using descriptive statistics and tables, demonstrating xG's reliability as a metric for evaluating shot quality. The findings indicate that xG correlates strongly with actual goals scored, supporting the validity of the hypothesis. However, the critique identifies several limitations in the presentation and analysis of results.

The results in Fig 2 are not supplemented with visualizations such as graphs or heatmaps, which could provide a clearer understanding of the data. While the descriptive analysis is sufficient for initial validation, the absence of inferential statistics limits the depth of the conclusions. Also, a debatable difference of '%G from SoT' in Zone 7 is not mentioned in the statistical results analysis.

Overall, the results demonstrate xG's potential but are constrained by limited statistical depth and poor visualization.

SECTION 3: DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The discussion section of Rathke's study provides a clear evaluation of the utility of the Expected Goals (xG) metric in soccer analytics. While the results demonstrate xG's correlation with actual goals scored, the discussion falls short in critically addressing the broader implications, methodological limitations, and future research directions. Expanding this critique helps illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the study, as well as its potential applications.

ALIGNMENT WITH RESULTS

Rathke's discussion emphasizes the reliability of xG as a measure of shot quality, corroborating its strong correlation with actual scoring outcomes. This validation is significant, as it supports xG's role in providing a more nuanced evaluation of offensive performance compared to traditional metrics like goals scored. However, the discussion does not fully explore the nuances of the results, such as their variability across teams, game contexts, or specific situations. For example, xG may perform differently for high-pressing teams versus defensive-minded teams. Including subgroup analyses in the discussion would help contextualize the findings and demonstrate whether xG's reliability holds across different playing styles.

Additionally, the absence of inferential statistics in the results limits the discussion's depth. Rathke could have explored whether the correlation between xG and goals scored varies significantly across seasons or leagues. Without this insight, the findings, while promising, remain surface-level. Future research could enhance this area by employing advanced statistical techniques like regression analysis or hypothesis testing to identify factors that influence xG's accuracy.

RELEVANCE TO INTRODUCTION AND STUDY AIM

The discussion aligns with the introduction's emphasis on the importance of soccer analytics and the need for metrics like xG. Rathke reiterates that xG offers a more refined understanding of offensive performance, addressing the limitations of traditional metrics that fail to account for shot quality. However, the discussion does not fully connect the findings to the broader research questions or aims stated in the introduction. Specifically, the article lacks an exploration of how xG compares to alternative metrics, such as Goals Added (GA), or whether it can predict future performance better than existing models.

Furthermore, the study's introduction highlights the growing role of analytics in decision-making by soccer clubs, yet the discussion does not address how xG can be practically implemented. For instance, how can teams integrate xG into their scouting systems or tactical planning? Including practical examples—such as case studies of clubs that successfully use xG—would strengthen the discussion's relevance and impact. Without these connections, the discussion feels somewhat disconnected from the introduction's broader claims.

CRITIQUE OF METHODOLOGY

One of the most notable omissions in the discussion is a critical evaluation of the study's methodology. The methodological weaknesses highlighted earlier, such as the lack of contextual variables like defensive pressure and goalkeeper positioning, are not acknowledged in the discussion. These omissions limit xG's predictive power and raise questions about the internal validity of the findings. For example, a shot from a favorable position may have a high xG value, but its actual likelihood of success depends on whether the shooter is under pressure from defenders. Ignoring such factors reduces xG's ability to accurately reflect the complexity of real-world soccer scenarios.

Additionally, the discussion does not address the external validity of the findings. While the use of data from two prominent leagues—the Premier League and Bundesliga—provides a solid foundation, the study's generalizability to other contexts remains unexamined. Soccer styles vary significantly across leagues, with differences in defensive intensity, pace, and tactical systems. It is unclear whether xG would perform as reliably in leagues with distinct styles, such as La Liga or the MLS. Future research should explore xG's applicability across diverse competitions to establish its universal validity.

The study's reliance on Opta data is another area that warrants critical reflection. Although Opta is a trusted source, differences in data collection practices across leagues could introduce inconsistencies. The discussion could benefit from addressing these potential biases and recommending strategies to standardize data collection and improve the reliability of xG models.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF LIMITATIONS

The discussion does not adequately address the study's limitations, which undermines its credibility. The exclusion of contextual variables, limited data diversity, and reliance on descriptive statistics are significant shortcomings that should be acknowledged. Additionally, the discussion should have addressed potential challenges in applying xG, such as the metric's susceptibility to bias if not properly calibrated for different leagues or player roles.

Acknowledging these limitations would not only enhance the article's transparency but also provide a roadmap for future research. For instance, researchers could focus on incorporating additional variables, such as defensive pressure or game state, to improve xG's accuracy. Similarly, expanding the dataset to include lower-tier leagues or international competitions could enhance the metric's generalizability.

CONCLUSION

Rathke's article makes a valuable contribution to soccer analytics by validating the Expected Goals metric. The study demonstrates xG's reliability as a tool for evaluating shot quality and predicting performance, offering practical applications for clubs and analysts. However, its impact is limited by methodological weaknesses, including insufficient detail on sampling, the exclusion of contextual factors, and a lack of advanced statistical analysis.

The article's practical applications are clear, particularly in player evaluation and tactical decision-making. However, its reliance on data from only two leagues restricts its generalizability. Expanding the dataset and incorporating additional variables, such as defensive pressure, would enhance the model's accuracy and applicability.

Overall, while Rathke's study provides a solid foundation for further research, its limitations highlight the need for more comprehensive validation of xG. Future studies should address these gaps to fully realize the metric's potential in soccer analytics.

REFERENCES

Bertin, M. (2015a). Why Soccer's Most Popular Advanced Stat Kind Of Sucks. Regression. Retrieved from http://regression.deadspin.com/why-soccers-most-popular-advanced-stat-kind-of-sucks 1685563075

Caley, M. (2014a). Premier League projections, from the winners to the relegated clubs. Cartilage Free Captain. Retrieved from http://cartilagefreecaptain.sbnation.com/2014/9/11/6131661/premier league-projections-2014#methodology

Caley, M. (2015). Let's talk about expected goals. Cartilage Free Captain. Retrieved from http://cartilagefreecaptain.sbnation.com/2015/4/10/8381071/football-statistics-expected-goals michael-caley-deadspin

De Hoog, M. (2015). How data, not people, call the shots in Denmark. The Correspondent. Retrieved 24 September 2015, from https://decorrespondent.nl/2607/How-data-not-humans-run-this-Danish

football-club/517995289284-77644562

Lago-Peñas, C., Gómez-Ruano, M., & Yang, G. (2017). "Tactical analysis of team success in soccer: Possession vs. direct play." *Journal of Sports Sciences,* 35(24), 2280-2287.

Liu, Hongyou & Hopkins, Will & Ruano, Miguel & Molinuevo, Javier. (2013). Inter-operator reliability of live football match statistics from OPTA Sportsdata. International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport. 13. 803-821. 10.1080/24748668.2013.11868690.

Pleuler, D. (2014). On the topic of Expected Goals and the repeatability of finishing skill. OptaPro Blog. Retrieved from http://www.optasportspro.com/about/optapro-blog/posts/2014/on-the-topic-of expected-goals-and-the-repeatibility-of-finishing-skill.aspx

Rathke, A. (2017). An examination of expected goals and shot efficiency in soccer. *Journal of Human Sport and Exercise*, *12*(2), 514-529.

Schumacker, R., Clemente, F. M., & Silva, P. (2019). "Characteristics of high-intensity play in the MLS: A comparison with European leagues." *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport,* 19(4), 512-528.

Trainor, C. & Chappas, C. (2013). Goal Expectation and Efficiency. StatsBomb. Retrieved from http://statsbomb.com/2013/08/08/goal-expectation-and-efficiency/

11tegen11. (2015). The best predictor for future performance is Expected Goals, 11tegen11. Retrieved from expected-goals/