# THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SMART RING **MEASURED SLEEP VARIABLES AND IN-**GAME BASKETBALL PERFORMANCE

J. Hahn, A. Burke, K. Marsh, N. Saine, B.C. Green, A.R. Jagim, J.B. Fields, M.T. Jones



# BACKGROUND

- Sleep is critical to athlete health and has been shown to influence basketball performance, including player efficiency.
- Modern wearable devices claim improved precision and convenience in tracking sleep over traditional methods of data collection like subjective sleep journals.
- However, research regarding the accuracy of newer their relationships to methods and sports performance is limited.

# PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between night-prior sleep data recorded by a smart ring sleep tracker and next day in-game basketball performance.

## METHODS

- Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) National men's basketball athletes (n=4; age: Division I 19.8±1.3 years; height: 189.2±3.0 cm; mass: 82.5±5.0 kg;) wore smart ring sleep trackers the night before games.
- Sleep variables collected included hours (hr) of total sleep (TS), rapid eye movement sleep duration (RS), deep sleep duration (DS), and heart rate variability (HRV).
- In-game performance was evaluated using field goal percentage (FG%) and a composite stat, efficiency rating (EFF), which was calculated from NCAA offensive and defensive statistics.
- Relationships between variables were evaluated via Pearson correlation coefficients computed for the group and for individual athletes.
- Kendall's Tau was run along with Pearson's r for correlations including one or more non-parametric dataset.

# **KEY FINDINGS**

| Table 1: Correlation Table |            |                   |            |             |                   |                   |                   |             |  |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|--|
| Athlete                    | TS-EFF (r) | <b>RS-EFF (r)</b> | DS-EFF (r) | HRV-EFF (r) | <b>TS-FG% (r)</b> | <b>RS-FG%</b> (r) | <b>DS-FG% (r)</b> | HRV-FG% (r) |  |
| Group                      | 0.2        | 0.19              | 0.04       | 0.03        | 0.11              | 0.09              | 0.11              | -0.05       |  |
| 1                          | -0.1       | 0.09              | 0.02       | -0.26       | 0.07              | 0.18              | 0.27              | -0.21       |  |
| 2                          | 0.48*      | 0.51*             | 0.15       | -0.25       | 0.36              | 0.47*             | 0.15              | 0.0         |  |
| 3                          | -0.03      | -0.24             | -0.3       | 0.12        | -0.08             | -0.17             | -0.11             | -0.07       |  |
| 4                          | 0.15       | 0.26              | 0.11       | 0.19        | -0.07             | 0.07              | -0.12             | 0.24        |  |

Sleep: TS=Total Sleep Duration, RS=Rapid Eye Movement Sleep Duration, hrs=Hours, Mean±Standard Deviation Basketball Stats: FG%=Field Goal Percentage, EFF=Efficiency Rating. Correlations: TS-EFF=Total Sleep Duration with Efficiency, RS-EFF=Rapid Eye Movement Sleep Duration with Efficiency, TS-FG%=Total Sleep Duration with Field Goal Percentage, RES-FG%=Rapid Eye Movement Sleep Duration with Field Goal Percentage, r=Pearson's r Value, p<=0.05\*.

### **Table 2: Correlation Comparisons TS-EFF (r) TS-EFF** Athlete 0.2 0.07 Group 0.48\*0.28

**Sleep:** TS=Total Sleep Duration **Basketball Stats:** FG%=Field Goal Percentage, EFF=Efficiency Rating. **Correlations:** TS-EFF=Total Sleep Duration with Efficiency, TS-FG%=Total Sleep Duration with Field Goal Percentage, r=Pearson's r Value, p<= $0.05^*$ .  $\tau$ =Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient.

### Figure 1: Athlete 2 Correlation Matrix



Notes: Total=Total Sleep Duration, REM=Rapid Eye Movement Sleep Duration, Deep=Deep Sleep Duration, HRV=Heart Rate Variability, EFF=Efficiency.

The results did not show a generalizable association between smart-ring measured sleep variables and in-game performance. However, they do suggest the relationship may be highly individual-dependent.

| Γ (τ) | <b>TS-FG%</b> (r) | TS-FG% (τ) |
|-------|-------------------|------------|
| 7     | 0.11              | -0.01      |
|       | 0.36              | 0.19       |
|       |                   |            |

# Table 3: Correlation Strength

| Strength    | Pearson | Spearman | Kendall |  |
|-------------|---------|----------|---------|--|
| Negligible  | 0.00    | 0.00     | 0.00    |  |
| Weak        | 0.10    | 0.10     | 0.06    |  |
| Moderate    | 0.40    | 0.38     | 0.26    |  |
| Strong      | 0.70    | 0.68     | 0.49    |  |
| Very Strong | 0.90    | 0.89     | 0.71    |  |

# RESULTS

- The grouped analysis showed TS, RES, DS, and HRV demonstrated weak to negligible relationships with EFF and FG% (Table 1).
- When analyzed for individuals, there were no consistent relationships observed among variables (Table 1).
- The Kendall's Tau correlations were agreeable with the Pearson's r values (Table 2).
- As shown in Table 1 and Figure 1, Athlete 2 exhibited strong to moderate correlations for TS-EFF (r=0.48\*), RS-EFF (r=0.51\*), TS-FG% (r=0.36), and RS-FG% (r=0.46\*).
- Athlete 2 averaged less sleep and double the variance in sleep duration night to night.

# **CONCLUSIONS and PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

- Results suggest a lack of association between smart ring-measured sleep variables and in-game basketball performance.
- Homogeneity of the small sample size of athletes, consistency of sufficient sleep durations, and lack of sleep variations may have affected the inconsistent correlations.
- Athlete 2's data suggest that TS and RS may have a positive association with some measures of in-game performance for some athletes.
- The extent to which these variables affect individualized, performance appears to be highlighting the need for ongoing athlete monitoring to assess individual responses.



