Running Title: Physical & technical measures in Gaelic football

Article Title: Match-play running demands and technical performance among elite Gaelic footballers: Does divisional status count?

Authors: Jason H McGahan.¹ Shane Mangan. ² Kieran Collins ²Con Burns.¹ Tim Gabbett. ^{3,4} Cian O' Neill.¹

Affiliations: ¹Department of Sport, Leisure & Childhood Studies, Cork Institute of Technology. ² Gaelic Sports Research Centre, Institute of Technology Tallaght.³ Gabbett Performance Solutions, Australia. 4 Institute for Resilient Regions, University of Southern Queensland, Australia

Correspondence to: Mr Jason McGahan Department of Sport, Leisure & Childhood Studies, Cork Institute of Technology, Rossa Avenue, Bishopstown, County Cork, Ireland Telephone: 0214326142 Email: jason.mcgahan@mycit.ie Submission Type: Original Investigation Abstract Word Count: 274

Text-Only Word Count: 2995

Number of Figures and Tables: 4 tables

1 Abstract

The aim of the current study was to compare positional differences in running demands and 2 technical performance variables among elite Gaelic football teams from separate Divisions. 3 Data were obtained from a Division 1 (26.7 \pm 2.9 years, 179.2 \pm 21.3 cm, 89.9 \pm 21.2 kg) and 4 5 a Division 3 (25.7 \pm 3.5 years, 183.0 \pm 4.7 cm, 84.4 \pm 6.5 kg) team. Match-play running 6 variables were collected using 4-Hz global positioning system (GPS) units (VX Sport, New-Zealand) (Match data sets; Division 1: n = 107, Division 3: n = 97). Selected variables 7 assessed were high speed running distance (HSR) ($\geq 17 \text{ km} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$), number of high-speed efforts 8 (HSE) (\geq 17 km·h⁻¹), relative high-speed distance (RHSD) (\geq 17 km·h⁻¹; m·min⁻¹) and 9 percentage of time at high speed (%HS). Each variable was analysed across the 5 positional 10 groups in Gaelic football (full-back, half-back, midfield, half-forward, full-forward). The 11 same 25 competitive games were analysed using GPS and the Sports Code video analysis 12 system (Sports Code Elite V9, Sportstee, NSW, Australia). Technical performance variables 13 selected for analysis were total kick/hand passes, tackles, shots and percentage of time in 14 possession. HSR running demands were differentiated between the divisions; the Division 3 15 team demonstrated significantly greater HSR, HSE, RHSD and %HS than the Division 1 16 team (p < 0.05). Positional-specific analysis found that the Division 3 fullback and midfield 17 18 positional lines had significantly greater HSR, RHSD and %HS than their Division 1 counterparts. The Division 1 team made a greater number of total tackles, with significantly 19 more tackles in the middle third (p < 0.05). The Division 3 team performed a significantly 20 21 greater number of hand passes and unsuccessful shots per game (p < 0.01). The results of the present study indicate that overall technical proficiency, rather than high-speed running 22 profiles, differentiate Division 1 and 3 Gaelic football teams. 23

24 Key words: GPS, Divisional-differences, Gaelic games, Video-analysis

25 INTRODUCTION

Gaelic football is an amateur field-based sport and is the most popular sport in 26 Ireland. (2, 9, 12) The best Gaelic footballers in each of the 32 counties in Ireland are selected 27 to represent their county team who compete in the All Ireland Championship and the National 28 League competitions.(2) The All Ireland Championship competition, the most prestigious 29 30 competition in Gaelic football, is played by all county teams in a knock out cup format. In the National Football League competition, the second most prestigious competition, the teams 31 are divided into four rank ordered divisions with 8 teams in each division.(26) Teams have 32 the possibility of being promoted or relegated from their respective divisions based on their 33 performance in the National League. In the high performance Gaelic football inter-county 34 environment, considerable time is devoted to the development of the physical running 35 demands amongst other technical and tactical performance-related variables.(24) 36

The running demands of elite Gaelic football players have been examined for over 37 twenty five years, with an initial emphasis on video and time-motion analysis. (17, 29) Given 38 the advancement in technology, global positioning systems (GPS) have been the tool of 39 choice to investigate the running demands of the modern Gaelic football player. (6, 24, 26, 40 41 31) Early research highlighted differences between the 5 positional lines (i.e. full back, half back, mid-field, half forward, full forward) with regard to the respective running demands 42 during match-play. (24) The study found significant differences among the middle 8 players 43 (half-backs, midfielders and half-forwards) covering greater distances (8700 – 9523m) than 44 the inside line players (full-back 6892m and full-forwards 7090m respectively). However, it 45 should be noted that this study only investigated the running demands of one team within one 46 division of the National Football League (NFL). A more recent paper by Mangan and 47 colleagues (27) examined changes in running demands across a playing season using 48 49 multiple teams.

It was found that teams who progressed to the latter part of the All Ireland Championship were found to increase their running demands, with these running demands closely related to the score-line of the match (27).

Despite the growth of research investigating the running demands in elite Gaelic 53 football, presently there is a lack of published literature across technical performance 54 variables. More recently Carroll (4) investigated specific technical elements of performance 55 from teams of different standards, concluding that differences in technical performance 56 between teams vary as a result of opposition characteristics. The study also found that attack 57 efficiency and total number of shots were higher for the higher ranked teams when compared 58 to lower ranked teams. Similar findings have been reported within soccer (21, 30) and 59 Australian Rules Football (AF) (11) where total shots, shots on target, passes and number of 60 61 tackles separate the top and bottom ranked teams.

Currently within Gaelic football there is dearth of research comparing the high-speed 62 running demands across standards of play. (26) Although numerous studies have examined 63 the positional demands, (24, 31) none have differentiated teams by success rates or divisional 64 status. Studies in AF, (1, 3) rugby league (10) and soccer (28) have reported that elite players 65 66 record greater running demands when compared to their counterparts playing at the sub-elite level. However, in contrast to these studies, it has been reported that soccer and rugby league 67 teams competing in higher divisions of competition cover less total distance and less high-68 69 speed running distance than teams competing in lower divisions. (8, 13) It has been hypothesized that this is due to their increased technical abilities. Furthermore, Di Salvo et al. 70 (7) found that the bottom 5 teams in the English Premier League covered greater high-speed 71 72 running distance than the teams in the top 5 positions. However, it is unclear whether similar patterns exist within elite Gaelic football match-play. 73

To date, there is no published literature that has investigated the differences in highspeed running and technical performance variables between different divisional teams in elite Gaelic football. Analysis of such differences would serve to assist coaches in identifying the key characteristics of performance and could help to increase prospects of promotion to higher divisions. Therefore, the purpose of the current study was to investigate the matchplay high-speed running demands and technical performance variables of Division 1 and Division 3 players in elite Gaelic football.

81 METHODS

82 Experimental Approach to the Problem

Data were collected across a full Division 1 and Division 3 season (9 months, Jan-83 Sept) which consisted of 25 competitive games in total (Division 1: n = 13; Division 3: n =84 12). Data included League games (Division 1: n = 7; Division 3: n = 8) and Championship 85 games (Division 1: n = 6; Division 3: n = 4). Post-season ranking placed both teams in the top 86 3 of their respective divisions. Only full individual match data sets (i.e. players who 87 completed the full match 75-80min) were selected for analysis (Division 1: n = 107; Division 88 3: n = 97). Notably, an initial analysis revealed no significant difference between the running 89 and technical demands of each team across their respective league and championship 90 competitions, therefore all matches, irrespective of phase of season, were analysed together. 91 Players were sub-categorized via the five positional lines in Gaelic football, full-back 92 (Division 1: n = 29; Division 3: n = 23), half-back (Division 1: n = 30; Division 3: n = 22), 93 midfield (Division 1: n = 13; Division 3: n = 19), half-forward (Division 1: n = 15; Division 94 95 3: n = 16) and full-forward (Division 1: n = 20; Division 3: n = 17).

96

Subjects 97

Forty seven Gaelic football players from two elite teams volunteered to participate in 98 the study; 23 from a Division 1 team (26.7 \pm 2.9 years, 179.2 \pm 21.3 cm, 89.9 \pm 21.2 kg) and 99 100 24 from a Division 3 team (25.7 \pm 3.5 years, 183.0 \pm 4.7 cm, 84.4 \pm 6.5 kg). This study received ethical approval from the local institution's Human Research Ethics Committee. 101 Players were provided with a detailed explanation and completed a consent form prior to 102 commencement of data collection. 103

Procedure 104

Running Demands 105

The running-based movement demands were assessed using VX Sport 4 Hz GPS units 106 (VX Sport; Visuallex Sport, Lower Hutt, New Zealand, Firmware: V1.60 28). The unit was 107 worn on the upper back between the shoulder blades; players wore the same unit across all 108 competitive matches. All devices were activated by the side of the pitch, satellite locked and 109 established for a minimum of 30 minutes before the commencement of each match.(22, 24) 110 Following each match, running performance data was downloaded using the VX software 111 suite (VX Sport View, New Zealand V1.60 28). Each file was trimmed to ensure that only 112 data recorded when the player was in competition (excluding warm-up, half-time and cool-113 down) was included for analysis. 114

The VX Sport GPS unit has been found to be a valid and reliable tool for the 115 measurement of intermittent activity in field sports.(23) The typical error (TE \pm 95% 116 117 confidence interval [CI]) was 0.75 ± 0.26 for maximum speed, and 0.55 ± 0.19 for average speed (23). The coefficient of variation (CV% \pm 95% CI) was 4.2 \pm 1.5 for maximum speed, 118 and 4.4 ± 1.5 for average speed.(23) The running variables assessed were high speed running 119 distance (HSR) ($\geq 17 \text{ km} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$), number of speed efforts (HSE) ($\geq 17 \text{ km} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$), relative high 120

speed distance (RHSD) per min (m·min⁻¹) and percentage of time spent at high speed (% HS). Acceleration were defined as a change in speed by 2 km·h⁻¹ within 1 second. The change was triggered over a minimum time of 2 seconds. The acceleration stopped when the player decelerated to <75% of maximum speed reached in the forgoing sprint effort.(24) These variables were analyzed for all 5 out-field positional groups. Selected thresholds and metrics used in the current study have been used previously in the GAA literature.(6, 24, 25)

127 Video Analysis

Sports code video analysis (Sports Code Elite V9, Sportstec, Warriewood, New South 128 Wales, Australia) was used to determine the technical performance of Gaelic football match-129 play on an iMac (version OS X 10.9.4). A specific coding template was developed to best 130 understand the technical variables within match-play. Each technical variable analyzed was 131 assigned an operational definition to determine what was deemed to be a successful or 132 unsuccessful outcome (Table 1). For the purpose of this research, the Gaelic football pitch 133 was divided into 3 distinct sections (Table 1). Two games were chosen at random to perform 134 test-retest reliability on the coding of technical actions. This involved re-coding the 2 games 135 7-10 days after the original coding. Test-retest reliability was conducted for each of the 136 137 variables using paired sample t-tests. There was a very low percentage error for all variables (< 2%). 138

139

Insert Table 1 About Here

140 Statistical Analysis

141 All data are reported as mean \pm standard deviation unless stated. Preliminary 142 assumption testing was conducted to check for normality (Shapiro Wilk test), while Levene's 143 test was used to test the homogeneity of variances. Independent sample *t*-tests were used to 144 compare the mean performance scores (independent of position) of both teams for all GPS and technical performance variables. The statistical significance was set at p < 0.05. Further position-specific independent sample *t*-tests were used to compare GPS variables between players in the same positional lines on both teams. Eta squared effect size (95% CI) was used to determine the magnitude of any statistical difference (Trivial effect $\eta^2 < 0.01$; Small effect: $0.01 \le \eta^2 < 0.06$; Medium effect: $0.06 \le \eta^2 < 0.14$; Large effect: $\eta^2 \ge 0.14$). (5) All data was analyzed using IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Studies), Version 22.

151

152 **RESULTS**

There were significant differences across all the GPS variables HSR (p = .001, $\eta^2 = .054$, ES = small), HSE (p = .024, $\eta^2 = .025$, ES = small), RHSD (p = .002, $\eta^2 = .047$, ES = small) and % HS (p = .002, $\eta^2 = .049$, ES = small) with the Division 3 team consistently demonstrating significantly higher scores than their Division 1 counterparts (Table 2).

157 Insert Table 2 About Here

Position-specific analyses (5 positional lines) comparing running demands between 158 Division 1 and Division 3 players is illustrated in Table 2. The Division 3 full-backs had 159 higher HSR (p = .002, $\eta^2 = .177$, ES = large), RHSD (p = .002, $\eta^2 = .174$, ES = large) and % 160 HS (p = .001, $\eta^2 = .208$, ES=large) than their Division 1 counterparts. Division 3 midfielders 161 also performed significantly more HSR (p = .001, $\eta^2 = .520$, ES=large), RHSD (p = .001, $\eta^2 = .001$, η^2 162 .508, ES=large), %HS (p = .001, $\eta^2 = .431$, ES = large) and additionally more HSE (p < 0.01, 163 η^2 = 0.301; ES = large) than their Division 1 counterparts (Figure 1). There were no 164 significant differences between half-backs, half-forwards and full-forwards for any of the 165 GPS variables. 166

Insert Figure 1 About Here

167

The technical performance data of the Division 1 and Division 3 teams are presented 168 in Table 3. The Division 3 team demonstrated a significantly greater number of total hand 169 passes (p=.007, η^2 = .278, ES = large) and missed shots per game (p=.007, η^2 = .279, ES = 170 large) than the Division 1 team. There were no significant differences between the teams for 171 total kick passes (p=.102, $\eta^2 = .112$, ES = medium), shots scored from play (p=.606, $\eta^2 =$ 172 .012, ES = small) and percentage of time in possession (p=.539, $\eta^2 = .017$, ES = small). The 173 Division 1 team made a greater number of total tackles than the Division 3 team, with 174 significantly more tackles in the middle third (p=.044, $\eta^2 = .072$, ES = medium). 175

176

Insert Table 3 About Here

177

178 **DISCUSSION**

The current study is one of the first to investigate the high-speed running demands 179 and technical performance variables in Gaelic football match-play between two elite teams 180 with differing Divisional status. One major finding within this study was that the Division 3 181 Gaelic football team covered greater HSR, RHSD, performed more HSE and had a higher % 182 HS running performance when contrasted to the Division 1 team. These differences were 183 most pronounced in the full-back and midfield positional lines. Second unique finding, there 184 were a greater number of tackles, particularly in the middle third, executed by the Division 1 185 team. Finally, the Division 1 team's attacking efficiency and accuracy in scoring attempts 186 was higher when compared to the Division 3 team, with the latter found to have a greater 187 number of hand passes completed than their Division 1 counterparts. 188

189 Consistent with previous Gaelic football studies, (24, 25) the middle 8 positions (half-190 backs, midfielders and half-forwards) covered more high-speed running when compared to 191 the other two positional lines (full-back and full-forwards). These differences in running demands might be explained by the typical interchangeable and roving tactical role the middle 8 players have within Gaelic football (winning possession and transitioning from defense to attack). Additionally, with the previous literature (24,25), the Division 3 midfielders recorded the greatest high speed running values in comparison to the other four positional lines. However in contrast, the findings within the current study, found the Division 1 team's half-forward line covered the greatest high speed running distances. This difference may be due to a tactical ploy among the Division 1 team.

A novel finding within the present study was that the Division 3 full-back and 199 200 midfield lines had the increased running demands (i.e. HSD, RHSD, HSE and %HS) when compared to their Division 1 counterparts. There are several possible explanations for this 201 finding. Firstly, the lack of tackles by Division 3 teams in the middle third may result in an 202 increase in match-play involvements for the full-back line, therefore these lines will have 203 increased running demands placed upon them,. This is in direct contrast to the increased 204 tackle count noted within Division 1 teams who had lower running demands but a higher 205 tackle count in the middle third. Notably, the Division 3 team completed a significantly 206 greater number of hand passes; this finding is not surprising as anecdotal evidence suggests 207 208 that Division 3 teams will engage in a style of play that is hand pass oriented with the aim of keeping possession and working the ball up the pitch (4), which in turn would increase these 209 teams' running demands. In contrast to Division 3 teams, the Division 1 team had a greater 210 211 number of kick passes than their Division 3 counterparts; this may directly explain the lower high-speed running observed for these players as the ball is consistently traveling a greater 212 distance thus lowering the running demands on these players. 213

The present findings are in agreement with other research (7, 8, 13, 26, 30) that increased high-speed running does not necessarily ensure success. These studies indicate that there are technical and tactical variables at play that more accurately determine success than high-speed running. Similar to Hulin et al. (13) within rugby league, the present study found
no significant difference between the two teams with regard to the percentage of time in
possession of the ball. Previous research has found that the team with less time in possession
completes greater amounts of high-speed running defending and chasing (10, 11) this was not
the case in the present study with both teams having possession of the ball for approximately
50% of the time.

Another unique finding within the present study was the Division 1 team's execution 223 of a greater number of total tackles. Similar findings were found in rugby league (13) with 224 225 successful teams making greater number of collisions than unsuccessful teams. A potential explanation for the greater amount of tackles associated with the Division 1 team is the 226 tactical approach selected. Currently, within Gaelic football, there is an increase in teams 227 adopting a high press of kick outs and direct opposition within the half forward and full 228 forward lines with the aim of dispossessing opponent lines (half back and full back) in the 229 middle third. This may have impacted a number of findings within the current study, such as 230 the Division 1 team completing a greater number of tackles in the middle third, resulting in 231 the team winning possession higher up the pitch, which in turn reduced the need for the 232 233 midfield line to complete high-speed running in their defensive third. Finally if possession is re-gained through this high-press tactic, it will result in the exclusion of the defensive lines 234 from completing high-speed running during the ensuing phases of play. 235

The Division 1 team demonstrated a higher score rate than the Division 3 team. The 'shots missed' category was greater in the Division 3 team, which may suggest the presence of better decision-making and technical proficiency in front of goal in higher level teams. This finding is consistent with Carroll (4) who found this to be a major difference between higher and lower ranked Gaelic football teams. 241

242

The efficiency, rather than the quantity of shots, has also been shown to differentiate top and bottom teams in previous soccer studies. (18-21, 32)

The findings from the current study must be viewed in context with the limitations 243 within the investigation. The use of a 4-Hz GPS system to accurately track high-speed 244 movements must be considered. In addition, the absence of a tri-axial accelerometer and 245 gyroscope, which provides information on physical contact such as a tackle, could have 246 provided additional information related to match-play demands. Future research should aim 247 to apply recent technological advances in this field to evaluate other physiological demands 248 such as contact force (i.e. tackles), change of direction and associated heart rate variability. 249 Furthermore, this study did not examine positional differences in technical performance. 250 Future research should aim to examine the technical performance by position, by team and 251 how these potentially fluctuate across the season. While this study examines differences in 252 movement demands and technical performance variables across divisions, it does not 253 examine differences within teams competing in the same division. Similar to Carrol's (4) 254 findings, a team's style of play and prevalence of technical skill may vary depending on the 255 opponent. Future research in Gaelic football should examine differences in the 256 257 aforementioned variables from multiple teams within the same division to gather a more overview and representation of performance measures. Finally, future studies in Gaelic 258 football must look at the match to match variation in running performance with a team across 259 multiple divisions taking into account the quality of opposition, styles of play, styles of 260 coaching and the margins that are associated with winning and losing, so we can better 261 understand the contextual factors that impact running and technical demands across divisions. 262

263

264 PRACTICAL APPLICATION

Findings from the current research suggest that greater amounts of high-speed running 265 are not necessarily related to team ranking in elite Gaelic football. Scoring accuracy, in 266 addition to a higher frequency of tackles, particularly in the middle third, were characteristics 267 more associated with the higher ranked team. It is beneficial for coaches to be aware of the 268 relevant running and technical performance measures associated with higher divisional status. 269 Greater knowledge in this regard would facilitate coaches to structure their training to 270 optimize performance. Currently within Gaelic football, there is an increased emphasis on the 271 physical development of athletes. However these findings highlight the importance of 272 technical competence in differentiating between higher and lower-ranked teams. It is 273 recommended that coaches at all levels place these elements as a central tenet of their 274 coaching philosophy to maximize the development of the key performance skills required 275 during match-play. Finally, this study highlights the importance of technical skill proficiency, 276 rather than running performance capability, in distinguishing between higher and lower 277 ranked teams within elite Gaelic football. 278

279 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No external sources of funding were provided during this research. The authors would like to thank the players who took part in this study and the management and coaches for their support.

283 **REFERENCES**

- Aughey RJ. Widening margin in activity profile between elite and sub-elite Australian
 football: a case study. *J Sci Med Sport* 16: 382-386, 2013.
- Bradley JM. The Gaelic athletic association and the Irish diaspora in Scotland, 1897–
 1947. *Int J His Sport* 16: 135-146, 2007.

- Brewer C, Dawson B, Heasman J, Stewart G, Cormack S. Movement pattern
 comparisons in elite (AFL) and sub-elite (WAFL) Australian football games using
 GPS. J Sci Med Sport 13: 618-623, 2010.
- Carroll R. Team Performance Indicators in Gaelic Football and Opposition Effects.
 Int J Perform Anal Sport 13: 703-715, 2013
- 293 5. Cohen JW. *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ:
 294 Lawerence Erlbaum Associates, 1988.
- 295 6. Collins DK, Solan B, and Doran DA. A preliminary investigation into high-intensity
 296 activity during elite Gaelic football. *J Sports Therapy* 6: 10, 2013.
- 297 7. Di Salvo V, Gregson W, Atkinson G, Tordoff P, and Drust B. Analysis of high
 298 intensity activity in Premier League soccer. *Int J Sports Med* 30: 205-212, 2009.
- Di Salvo V, Pigozzi F, González-Haro C, Laughlin MS, De Witt JK. Match
 performance comparison in top English soccer leagues. *Int J Sports Med* 34: 526-532,
 2013.
- 302 9. ESRI. The Social Significance of Sport. *Econ Social Res Inst* Report: 10-21, 2008.
- 303 10. Gabbett T. Influence of the opposing team on the physical demands of elite rugby
 304 league match play. *J Strength Con Res* 27: 1629-1635, 2013.
- Gabbett TJ, Polly C, Dwyer DB, Kearney S, Corvo A. Influence of field position and
 phase of play on the physical demands of match-play in professional rugby league
 forwards. *J Sci Med Sport* 17: 556–561, 2014.
- Hassan D. Governance and the Gaelic Athletic Association: time to move beyond the
 amateur ideal? *Soccer & Society* 11: 414-427, 2010.
- Hulin BT, Gabbett TJ, Kearney S, Corvo A. Physical demands of match play in
 successful and less-successful elite rugby league teams. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform*10: 703–710, 2014.

- 313 14. Johnston R, Gabbett, TJ, Jenkins, DG. Influence of number of contact efforts on
 running performance during game-based activities. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 10:
 740-745, 2015
- Johnston R, Gabbett, TJ, Seibold, AJ, and Jenkins, DG. Influence of physical contact
 on pacing strategies during game-based activities. *Int J Sports Physiol Perform* 9:
- **318 811–816**, 2014.
- 319 16. Johnston RD, Gabbett TJ, Seibold AJ, Jenkins, DG. Influence of physical contact on
 320 neuromuscular fatigue and markers of muscle damage following small-sided games. J
 321 Sci Med Sport 17: 535-540, 2014.
- 322 17. Keane S, Reilly T, and Hughes M. Analysis of workrates in Gaelic Football. *Aus J Sci*323 *Med Sport* 25: 100- 102, 1993.
- 18. Lago-Peñas C, Lago-Ballesteros, J., Dellal, A., & Gómez, M. Gamerelated statistics
 that discriminated winning, drawing and losing teams from the Spanish Soccer
 League. J Sports Sci Med 9: 288–293, 2010.
- Liu H, Gómez, M. A., Lago-Peñas, C., & Sampaio, J. Match statistics related to
 winning in the group stage of 2014 Brazil FIFA World Cup. *J Sports Sci* 33: 1205–
 1213, 2015.
- Liu H, Hopkins, W. G., & Gomez, M.A. Modelling relationships between match
 events and match outcome in elite football. *Eur J Sport Sci* 16: 1-10, 2015.
- Liu H, Miguel-Angel, G., Gonçalves, B., & Sampaio, J. Technical performance and
 match-to-match variation in elite football teams. *J Sports Sci* 34: 509–518., 2015.
- Maddison. R. and Ni Mhurchu. C. Global positioning system: A new opportunity in
 physical activity measurement. *Int J Behav Nutr and Phys Act* 6: 73, 2009.
- 336 23. Malone S, Collins DK, McRobert AP, Morton J, and Doran DA. Accuracy and
- 337 reliability of VXsport global positioning system in intermittent activity. In:

- Proceedings of the 19th Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science,
 Amsterdam, 2-5th July, 2014.
- 340 24. Malone S, Solan B, Collins K, and Doran D. The positional match running
 341 performance in elite Gaelic football. *J Strength Con Res* 30: 2292 2298, 2015.
- 342 25. Malone S, Solan B, Collins K, and Doran D. The metabolic power and energetic
 343 demands of Elite Gaelic football match play. *J Sports Med Phys fit* 55: 543 549,
- 344 2016.
- Mangan S, Malone S, Ryan M, McGahan J, O'neill C, Burns C, Warne J, Martin D,
 and Collins K. The influence of match outcome on running performance in elite
 Gaelic football. *Sci Med Football* 1: 272 279, 2017.
- 348 27. Mangan, S. Ryan, M. Shovlin, A. Mc Gahan, J. Malone, S. O'Neill, C. Burns, C.
 349 Collins, K. Seasonal changes in Gaelic football match-play running performance. J
 350 *Strength Con Res* epub ahead of print, 2017.
- 351 28. Mohr M, Krustrup P, Bangsbo J. Match performance of high-standard soccer players
 352 with special reference to development of fatigue. *J Sports Sci* 21: 519-528, 2003.
- 353 29. O'Donoghue P, Donnelly O, Hughes L, and McManus S. Time-motion analysis of
 354 Gaelic games. *J Sports Sci* 22: 255-256, 2004.
- 30. Rampinini E, Impellizzeri FM, Castagna C, Coutts AJ, and Wisloff U. Technical
 performance during soccer matches of the Italian Serie A league: effect of fatigue and
 competitive level. *J Sci Med Sport* 12: 227-233, 2009.
- 358 31. Reilly B, Akubat I, Lyons M, and Collins DK. Match-play Demands of Elite Youth
 359 Gaelic Football Using Global Positioning System Tracking. *J Strength Con Res* 29:
 360 989 996, 2014.
- 361 32. Yue ZY, Broich, H., & Mester, J. Statistical analysis for the soccer matches of the
 362 first Bundesliga. *Int J Sports Sci Coaching* 9: 553–560, 2014.

LEGEND OF TABLE AND FIGURES

Table 1. The technical variables quantified and there specific definitions.

Table 2. Position specific mean $(\pm SD)$ high-speed running demands within elite Gaelic football competition with respect to Division 1 and Division 3 players.

Table 3. Mean (±SD) technical demands within elite Gaelic football competition with respect to Division 1 and Division 3 teams.

Figure 1. Position specific mean (±SD) in high-speed running (m) demands of Division 1 and Division 3 players.

Variable	Definition		
Total kick passes	The number of attempts made to transfer the ball by foot to a teammate. Successful and unsuccessful.		
Total hand passes	The number of attempts made to transfer the ball by hand to a teammate. Successful and unsuccessful.		
Tackle	The number of situations where the defending player made physical contact with an opponent player while contesting the ball.		
Shots from play	The number of attempts to score, over or above the cross bar from play. Successful and unsuccessful.		
Percentage of possession	The overall percentage of time a team had in possession of the ball whilst it was in play.		
Gaelic football 3 distinct section	The defensive section was from the defending team's end-line to their 45m line.		
	The area between the two 45m lines was categorized as the middle section (50-60m).		
	The area from the opposition's 45m line to the opposition's end-line was categorized as the attacking section.		

TABLE 1

Variable by Position	Division 1 ($n = 107$)	Division 3 $(n = 97)$	Effect Size	Difference 95% CI
All Positions				
HSR (m)	1145 ± 436	1358 ± 462 ‡	Small	-336.973 to -89.030
HSE (no.)	64 ± 21	$71 \pm 24^{*}$	Small	-13.539 to982
RHSD (m/min)	14.9 ± 5.7	$17.6 \pm 6.1 \ddagger$	Small	-4.1923 to9750
HS (%)	11.2 ± 2.8	$12.5 \pm 3.1 \ddagger$	Small	-2.1340 to5103
Full Back				
HSR (m)	796 ± 255	$1072 \pm 340^{*}$	Large	-451.987 to -106.909
HSE (no.)	47 ± 16	55 ± 14	Small	-14.434 to 2.167
RHSD (m/min)	10.4 ± 3.3	$13.9 \pm 4.5^*$	Large	-5.6780 to -1.3408
HS (%)	9.2 ± 1.8	11.9 ± 3.2 ‡	Large	-4.2117 to -1.1823
Half Back				
HSR (m)	1339 ± 433	1339 ± 289	Trivial	-201.209 to 201.639
HSE (no.)	75 ± 23	73 ± 17	Trivial	-8.898 to 13.976
RHSD (m/min)	17.5 ± 5.6	17.3 ± 3.7	Trivial	-2.5434 to 2.9731
HS (%)	12.1 ± 3.0	12.7 ± 2.0	Trivial	-2.0389 to .9601
Midfielders				
HSR (m)	1221 ± 216	$1767 \pm 295 \ddagger$	Large	-742.122 to -350.599
HSE (no.)	75 ± 10	93 ± 15 ‡	Large	-27.542 to -7.575
RHSD (m/min)	15.9 ± 2.7	22.9 ± 3.9 ‡	Large	-9.5415 to -4.4172
HS (%)	10.7 ± 1.7	$13.9 \pm 1.9 \ddagger$	Large	-4.5626 to -1.8245
Half Forwards				
HSR (m)	1500 ± 548	1659 ± 254	Small	-482.951 to 165.476
HSE (no.)	75 ± 21	86 ± 10	Medium	-24.073 to 1.473
RHSD (m/min)	19.6 ± 7.2	21.4 ± 3.3	Small	-5.9757 to 2.5440
HS (%)	13.1 ± 3.4	14.0 ± 1.5	Small	-2.8838 to 1.0804
Full Forwards				
HSR (m)	1051 ± 250	1030 ± 578	Trivial	-293.825 to 333.748
HSE (no.)	57 ± 12	56 ± 32	Trivial	-16.649 to 17.560
RHSD (m/min)	13.8 ± 3.1	13.4 ± 7.5	Trivial	-3.6813 to 4.4742
HS (%)	11.4 + 23	10.0 ± 4.2	Small	- 9682 to 3 7529

TABLE 2

HS (%)11.4 ± 2310.0 ± 4.2Small-.9682 to 3.7529Difference mean value in high speed running (HSR), number of high speed efforts (HSE), relative high speed distance(RHSD) and percentage of time at high speed (HS %); Trivial effect $\eta^2 < 0.01$; Small effect: $0.01 < \eta^2 < 0.06$; Moderateeffect $0.06 < \eta^2 < 0.14$; Large effect: $\eta^2 > 0.14$. CI, confidence interval. ‡ Significant difference (p < 0.01) from division 1team.*Significant difference (p < 0.05) from division 1 team.

- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

	Division 1	Division 3		
Variable	Total $(n = 13 \text{ games})$	Total $(n = 12 \text{ games})$	Effect Size	Difference 95% CI
Total Hand passes	131 ± 23	$167 \pm 36^{*}$	Large	-60.44 to -10.87
Total Kick passes	71 ± 11	62 ± 17	Medium	-2.07 to 21.53
Shots Missed from Play	9 ± 3	13 ± 3*	Large	-6.28 to -1.50
Shots Scored from Play	10 ± 4.1	11 ± 3	Small	-3.84 to 2.29
Percentage of Possession	49 ± 3	50 ± 4	Small	-4.09 to 2.19
Tackles in Defensive Third	56 ± 34	34 ± 10	Large	0.41 to 42.64
Tackles in Middle Third	54 ± 44	$36 \pm 11^{*}$	Medium	-9.51 to 44.09
Tackles in Attacking Third	12 ± 8	10 ± 4	Small	-3.30 to 7.32
Total Tackles	121 ± 71	80 ± 17	Large	-2.65 to 84.29

TABLE 3

Difference mean value; Small effect: $0.01 < \eta^2 < 0.06$; Moderate effect $0.06 < \eta^2 < 0.14$; Large effect: $\eta^2 > 0.14$. CI, confidence interval. *Significant difference (p<0.05) from Division 1 team



Difference means values significant difference set at 0.05. \ddagger Significantly different (p<0.01) from Division 1 team. *Significant difference (p<0.05) from Division 1 team.