Position before submission? Techniques and tactics in competitive no-gi Brazilian jiu-jitsu
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Abstract
Brazilian jiu-jitsu (BJJ) is a grappling-based combat sport performed either with a traditional uniform, the gi, or without, known as no-gi. Differences between the two when it comes to gripping, pace, and ruleset can affect match characteristics, which has implications for how athletes approach competition. The present study investigated time-motion and technical-tactical characteristics in matches from official no-gi submission-only BJJ tournaments. The analysis included 26 regional and 26 international athletes from the light-feather to super-heavy weight class. Match characteristics did not differ between competition levels, style (guard or pass player), or weight (p > 0.05). The duration of positional dominance was similar between competition levels and styles (p > 0.05), but significantly different between winners and losers (p < 0.05; effect size (ES) = 0.39). Positional dominance also correlated with upper-body submissions (r = 0.50; p < 0.05). Interestingly, positional dominance appeared in consequential matches determined by lower-body submissions. In fact, athletes winning by lower-body submissions, in most cases a heel hook, exerted no positional control prior to their victory. The high- to low-intensity ratio was 1:2 for both regional and international athletes, respectively. The standing to ground time ratio was 1:2 for both groups. In addition to the novel competition characteristics of competitive no-gi BJJ, these findings indicate that there are strategical discrepancies that precede distinctly different submission holds.
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¿Posición antes de la sumisión? Técnicas y tácticas en el jiu-jitsu brasileño competitivo no-gi

Resumen
El jiu-jitsu brasileño (BJJ) es un deporte de combate basado en el agarre, que se realiza con la indumentaria tradicional, el gi, o sin ella, conocido como no-gi. Las diferencias entre ambas modalidades, en aspectos como agarre, ritmo y rendimiento, pueden afectar a las características del combate, lo cual afecta al modo en que los atletas afrontan las competiciones. Este estudio investigó el tiempo-movimiento y las características técnico-tácticas de combates de competiciones oficiales de BJJ no-gi solo por sumisión. Se analizaron 26 atletas regionales y 26 internacionales de las categorías de peso ligero a súper pesado. Las características de los combates no difirieron según nivel y estilo de competición (guardierno o pasador) o peso (p > 0.05). La duración del dominio posicional fue similar entre niveles y estilos (p > 0.05), pero existieron diferencias significativas entre ganadores y perdedores (p < 0.05; tamaño del efecto (ES) = 0.39). El dominio posicional también se correlacionó con las sumisiones de la parte superior del cuerpo (r = 0.50; p < 0.05). Curiosamente, el dominio posicional fue intrascendente en los combates finalizados con sumisiones en la parte superior del cuerpo.
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1. Introduction

Brazilian jiu-jitsu (BJJ), sometimes referred to as the game of human chess (Fischer, 2018), is a grappling-based, body mass categorized combat sport where athletes seek to control and submit their opponents through different forms of strangulation or joint locks (Gracie & Danaher, 2003). Athletes train and compete with or without the gi (training uniform), in points-based (the outcome is determined by points or submission) or submission-only (the outcome is determined by submission or referee decision) events. Matches typically last between 5 to 10 (IBJJF, 2015) and 8 to 15 minutes (Raftery & Heather, 2018), for gi and no-gi, respectively. Despite their similarities (Joel et al., 2014), no-gi matches can be more dynamic than gi matches due to the lack of gi gripping which makes it harder to manipulate and control the opponent (Coswig et al., 2018a).

Although still in its infancy, the BJJ research literature has grown substantially over the past few years across multiple domains, such as the psychosocial (Bennett & Dressler, 2020; Mickelsson, 2021; Øvretveit et al., 2018), nutritional (Verli et al., 2021; White & Kirk, 2021), anthropometric (de Paula Lima et al., 2017; Øvretveit, 2018b), physiological (Belo et al., 2020; Øvretveit, 2019), and technical-tactical (Andreato et al., 2017; Coswig et al., 2018b). Due to the paucity of research in competitive BJJ, little is known about the performance characteristics of different events, styles, and skill levels. Time-motion and technical-tactical analyses, particularly when conducted during official competition, represents valuable tools for coaches and athletes, as they may identify critical, modifiable factors that influences sport-specific demands and outcomes (Kirk et al., 2015; UFCPI, 2021).

Previous analyses include both simulated (Andreato et al., 2017; Andreato et al., 2015b; Coswig et al., 2018a; Coswig et al., 2018b) and official points-based gi matches (Andreato et al., 2013; Del Vecchio et al., 2007). The effort-to-pause and the high- to low-intensity ratio ranged from 7:1 to 22:1 and 1:11 to 1:3.5 in Andreato et al. (2017) and Coswig et al. (2018b), respectively. Results obtained from simulated bouts may differ from official matches due to the use of modified rules and attenuated psycho-physiological effects (Moreira et al., 2012). Both these factors can affect strategy and pace, and consequently match characteristics. Thus, there is a need to study athletes in a more natural environment, such as in official competition. Additionally, examining the impact of skill level on both match characteristics and combat-induced responses is important, as athletes can differ in their approaches to training and competition (Silva et al., 2018), as well as in technical (Tirp et al., 2014) and psychological (Fernández et al., 2020) characteristics.

Due to their physical nature, there are several inherent challenges related to performance analysis in full-contact combat sports (Andreato et al., 2015a; Øvretveit, 2018a). Although both simulated BJJ competitions and sparring can be suitable to answer specific research questions, match data from these studies may have limited ecological validity for competitive BJJ athletes and their coaches due to factors such as the Hawthorne effect (i.e., behavioral changes when being observed, such as in a research setting), ruleset modifications, and heterogeneous skill levels. Building upon previous research on both simulated and official competition, the present study aimed to, for the first time, describe the time-motion and technical-tactical characteristics of official no-gi submission-only matches. Additionally, we explored whether these characteristics diverged between different competition levels, styles, or weight class.
2. Material and method

2.1. Participants

The study sample consisted of 52 active male BJJ competitors (16+ years old) from the light-feather (u70 kg) to super-heavy weight class (u100 kg) participating in either a regional or international BJJ event. Matches that were stopped due to an injury or with a duration exceeding 10 minutes were excluded. Both events were organized in the United Kingdom (UK). The regional event comprised local athletes from Scotland, while the international event included athletes from all over the UK. Informed consent was obtained from the event organizers and the study was approved by University of Edinburgh Ethics Committee.

2.2. Study Design

After organizational permission was given, match videos were downloaded from the events’ social media pages and imported to and analyzed in Kinovea (v. 0.8.15, open-source project). A total of 26 no-gi submission-only matches were analyzed. Matches were divided into analysis groups of 13 regional and 13 international matches. Each match was scheduled for 10 minutes, and the winner was decided either by a submission, where one of the two athletes ‘tapped out’ either verbally or by visibly tapping the floor or the opponent with the hand or foot to signalize defeat, or, in lack of a submission, by referee decision.

Matches from the highest (ultra-heavy, > 100kg) and lowest weight classes (rooster, < 58kg) were excluded because there is no upper or lower weight limit, respectively, which can lead to a substantial weight difference between the opponents and consequently misrepresentative match characteristics. The level of competition (regional vs. international), grappling style (guard vs. pass player), and match outcome (win vs. loss) were considered independent variables, while the six positional variables (standing low-intensity, standing high-intensity, ground low-intensity, ground high-intensity, pause, and dominant position) were classified as dependent variables. To assess the influence of weight on match characteristics, we also compared observations between athletes above and below the mean weight class of 85 kg. To avoid the effects of cumulative fatigue on technical-tactical outcomes following consecutive matches, we restricted our analysis to the first match of each participating athlete. This restriction was also applied to comparative data.

2.3. Procedures

The analysis methodology and positional definitions were based on the work of Del Vecchio et al. (2011). Six stopwatches were set up on the analysis screen, each corresponding to one of the dependent variables. Microsoft Excel (2002, Seattle, WA, USA) was used for data storage and calculation of total match duration (effort + pause), effort (standing time + ground time), standing time (standing low-intensity + standing high-intensity), ground time (ground low-intensity + ground high-intensity), total high-intensity (standing high-intensity + ground high-intensity), total low-intensity (standing low-intensity + ground low-intensity), standing blocks (number of rows with values filled), ground blocks (number of rows with values filled), effort blocks (pause blocks + 1), and pause blocks (number of rows with values filled).

The effort variable was defined as the period between the referee’s signal to start and pause/end the match, and the pause variable as the period between the signal to pause and restart the match. High-intensity efforts were considered those in which the athlete was seen to advance, attack, or defend with clear vigor, muscle strength or power. Low-intensity efforts were those observed to be slow and/or seen to require low levels of strength, as well as when an athlete was close to or in a static position. Standing time was defined as the duration where both athletes were on their feet with the apparent intention of staying there. The latter part of the definition was implemented to avoid confusion when an athlete was on their feet for a very brief period (≤ 1 second) while they transitioned from two ground positions, e.g., passing the guard. Any time period that did not qualify as standing time was categorized as ground time. Finally, the dominant position variable included the time where an athlete was in side control, mount, back control, back mount, or north-south position for ≥ 3 seconds (Gracie & Danaher, 2003).
We defined guard players as those athletes who sat directly down on the mat when the match started or pulled their opponent into their guard (jumped from a standing position to a guard position). Pass players were classified as all athletes that did not fit the guard fighter definition. To assess intrarater reliability, intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) were calculated. All matches were analyzed twice with at least one-week interval between analyses by the first author of the study. The ICC was computed using RStudio (R version 4.0.5) for each of the six recorded variables. ICC values were defined as poor (< 0.50), moderate (≥ 0.50 and < 0.75), good (≥ 0.75 and < 0.90), and excellent (≥ 0.90) (Koo & Li, 2016). There was an excellent absolute agreement, using the two-way mixed-effects model and “single rater” unit, kappa = 0.99, p < 0.001 for all variables. To examine the interrater reliability, eight matches were randomly selected through an online random number generator (random.org) and analyzed using the same software and procedures. Absolute agreement was poor for standing high-intensity (ICC = 0.08), good for ground high-intensity (ICC = 0.88) and dominant position (ICC = 0.90), and excellent for standing low-intensity (ICC = 0.99), ground low-intensity (ICC = 0.99), and pause variables (ICC = 1.00).

2.4. Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed separately by two of the authors in a blinded and non-blinded fashion, using SPSS (v. 27, Chicago, IL, USA) and RStudio (v. 4.0.3, Boston, MA, USA), respectively. Graphics were made using GraphPad Prism (v. 9, San Diego, CA, USA). Data normality was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk's test. Groups were compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. Point-biserial correlation coefficients were calculated between continuous and dichotomous variables. Data are presented as mean (M) ± standard deviation (SD) unless otherwise stated. Effect size (ES) was calculated as \( r = \frac{Z}{\sqrt{N}} \) and interpreted as small (> 0.1), medium (> 0.3), or large (> 0.5). The alpha level was set at \( p \leq 0.05 \) for all outcomes.

3. Results

For the whole sample, the effort-to-pause, high-to-low-intensity, and standing-to-ground-time ratios were 27:1, 1:4, and 1:10, respectively. Table 1 describe the effort and Table 2 the positional characteristics of regional and international events.

| Table 1. Effort characteristics in official regional and international no-gi Brazilian jiu-jitsu matches (M±SD) |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Effort characteristic                      | Regional  | International | ES   | p      |
| Total match duration (s)                   | 245 ± 227 | 311 ± 206 | 0.19  | 0.178  |
| Total effort duration (s)                  | 236 ± 214 | 300 ± 194 | 0.17  | 0.231  |
| High-intensity actions (s)                 | 48 ± 44   | 61 ± 46   | 0.15  | 0.293  |
| Low-intensity actions (s)                  | 188 ± 184 | 239 ± 161 | 0.16  | 0.241  |
| High-to-low-intensity ratio                | 1:2       | 1:1       | 0.07  | 0.621  |
| Standing-to-ground-time ratio              | 1:2       | 1:2       | 0.26  | 0.070  |

| Table 2. Positional characteristics in official regional and international no-gi Brazilian jiu-jitsu matches (M±SD) |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Positional characteristic                   | Regional  | International | ES   | p      |
| Total stand-up time (s)                     | 28 ± 34   | 21 ± 33    | 0.20  | 0.144  |
| High-intensity stand-up (s)                 | 3 ± 5     | 2 ± 3      | 0.01  | 0.932  |
| Low-intensity stand-up (s)                  | 25 ± 32   | 20 ± 32    | 0.21  | 0.126  |
| Stand-up blocks (n)                         | 1 ± 1     | 1 ± 1      | 0.26  | 0.061  |
| Total ground time (s)                       | 208 ± 202 | 279 ± 189  | 0.23  | 0.094  |
| High-intensity on ground (s)                | 45 ± 43   | 60 ± 48    | 0.16  | 0.249  |
| Low-intensity on ground (s)                 | 162 ± 174 | 219 ± 154  | 0.24  | 0.080  |
| Ground blocks (n)                           | 2 ± 2     | 2 ± 1      | 0.26  | 0.070  |

Positional control did not differ between levels of competition (\( p = 1.000 \)) or style (\( p = 0.731 \)) but was significantly different between winners and losers (figure 1a). Furthermore, it correlated with upper-body submissions (\( r = 0.50; p < 0.001 \)), but not lower-body submissions (\( r = -0.21; p = 0.145 \)). Interestingly, those winning by lower-body submission spent no time in a dominant position prior to securing the victory (figure 1b).
No differences in match characteristics nor outcome were found between guard and pass players \( (p > 0.05) \). Similarly, there were no differences between heavy \( (\geq 85 \text{ kg}) \) and light \( (< 85 \text{ kg}) \) athletes \( (p > 0.05) \). The distribution of upper-body and lower-body submission holds was almost identical between events (figure 2). Pass players tended to have more upper-body submissions than guard players (pass players: 9 vs. guard players: 2, \( p = 0.09, \text{ES} = 0.369 \)).

3. Discussion

The present study addressed some of the current gaps in the grappling sports’ literature by investigating the time-motion and technical-tactical characteristics of official no-gi submission-only competition matches. We found that high-intensity efforts constitute a relatively large fraction of the total match time, highlighting the taxing nature of this style and format. Even though no points are awarded for establishing a dominant position in submission-only bouts, the latter appears to be an important factor for the outcome of the match. However, the most common submission in our sample, the heel hook, was performed exclusively with no prior positional control, suggesting that submission preference affects match strategy. This novel finding adds nuance to the concept of “position before submission” in BJJ and may also have implications for what should be considered positional dominance in certain competition rulesets.

We found no differences in match characteristics between winners and losers, which is consistent with the findings of others (Franchini & da Silva, 2019). Similarly, we found no differences
in match characteristics between regional and international matches. Although it is not uncommon for advanced athletes to present superior physical characteristics compared to non-advance athletes (Corrêa da Silva et al., 2014; da Silva et al., 2012; da Silva Junior et al., 2019; Diaz Lara et al., 2014), this was not reflected in the match pace characteristics in our sample. A likely reason is that each athlete was matched with an opponent of similar skill and experience level, which may negate any major differences in athletic ability. Additionally, BJJ training alone appears to lead to limited exercise-induced adaptations (Øvretveit, 2019; Øvretveit & Tøien, 2018), and major performance determinants such as cardiorespiratory fitness appears to be largely independent of rank and experience level (Andreato et al., 2017; Øvretveit, 2018b). There may also be other factors not available for analysis in the present study at play, such as psychological differences. Although we analyzed two ostensibly distinct competition levels, the lack of a single governing body in BJJ events makes the boundaries between the two vague. Moreover, as both events were based in the UK, the brackets may have been populated by athletes from local academies who were learning similar strategies and tactics and/or athletes attending similar local seminars and preparation camps, consequently reducing sample heterogeneity.

High-intensity efforts comprised 20% of total match time in our sample, which is almost three times more than what has been reported from competition gi matches (table 3). Interestingly, this was still substantially lower than a sample of simulated no-gi matches (Coswig et al., 2018a), but the differences in high-intensity efforts between styles under the same conditions (i.e., simulation or competition), appear to be similar. Maintaining a dominant position for ≥ 3 seconds in gi competition matches results in points for the dominant athlete (IBJJF, 2015). Thus, since the athlete must firmly establish the new position before continuing to advance in order to score, it is reasonable to assume that the number and duration of low-intensity blocks under this ruleset would be greater than those in submission-only matches. However, we found that low-intensity characteristics from competitive points-based gi matches were almost identical to those in our sample, and similar to simulated gi matches. The high-intensity differences observed between our study and research on simulated matches may thus partly be explained by the fact that official matches can induce more severe psycho-physiological effects, such as amplifying the stress hormone response (Moreira et al., 2012), which could affect performance and potentially increase the intensity. We also observed relative differences in positional characteristics between no-gi and gi (table 4), with the former spending less time standing, possibly related to submission preference.

<p>| Table 3. Comparison of pooled effort characteristics between competition formats |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
<th>-----------------------------</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total match duration (s)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort fraction (%)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pause fraction (%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-intensity fraction (%)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-intensity fraction (%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comp., competition; Sim., simulation. a Data from Andreato et al. (2013); b data from Coswig et al. (2018a); c data from Andreato et al. (2017); d data from Andreato et al. (2015b).

| Table 4. Comparison of pooled positional characteristics between competition formats |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Total match duration (s)    | 278         | 184       | 574     |
| Standing time (%)           | 9           | 14        | 15      |
| Ground time (%)             | 87          | 79        | 85      |

Comp., competition; Sim., simulation. a data from Del Vecchio et al. (2007); b data from Coswig et al. (2018b).

There were considerable differences in positional dominance between winners and losers, but not between regional and international level matches, nor guard and pass players. Since pass players typically seek top positions early, it could be expected that these are more likely to attain dominant positions compared to guard players. However, the literature investigating the characteristics of each style is equivocal. Pass players have been found to have more muscle mass than guard players (Báez et al., 2014), which might translate to greater strength (Ikegawa et al., 2008) and consequently competition success. Yet, others have found no differences between styles.
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(de Paula Lima et al., 2017; Sousa et al., 2020). Also, guard players are often sweep specialists, which is why the bottom position is often preferred in competition as it allows them to sweep their opponent. Since positional dominance can both lead to points, under certain rule sets, and submissions independent of style preference and starting point, establishing and maintaining a superior position can presumably influence match outcome. This is supported by our finding that the majority of athletes who were able to positionally dominate their opponent won the match via an upper body submission, while the remaining dominant athletes won via referee decision. Notably, however, was that all athletes who won via a lower body submission spent no time in dominant positions, suggesting that this submission category may require less set-up and less control over the opponent in the traditional sense, but rather be both more limb specific as well as executable from what is perceived as neutral or inferior positions.

Since there are no points awarded for positional control in submission-only matches, the athletes are likely more willing to take positional risks, give up a positional advantage in favor of limb control, or attempt a submission without establishing a position first. Indeed, this was evident in our sample, as the submission with the highest frequency in both regional and international matches was the heel hook – a direct attack on the lower limbs, usually starting from the bottom position. Athletes that are aware of and seeks decisive finishing moves like heel hooks, which in our sample appeared to be a high percentage submission, may be more careful in their attempts to pass the guard to gain a positional advantage. Advancing might not be worth the risk as no points will be gained and it might involve exposing a lower limb to dangerous attacks. Indeed, athletes that are skilled at performing heel hooks are likely actively pursuing this submission and thus disincentivized to go after dominant top positions, resulting in less positional dominance, but ultimately a match victory.

Consistent with the existing literature (Coswig et al., 2018b; Del Vecchio et al., 2011; Miarka et al., 2011; Miarka et al., 2012), we found excellent levels of intrarater reliability for all analytic variables. In an attempt to improve upon previously established methods, we revised the definition of high-intensity to include both “attacking” and “defending” in addition to “advancing”, and the definition of low-intensity to include when the athlete was in a static position, or close to it. However, effort characterizations performed by external observers have intrinsic challenges that are hard to overcome not matter how well-defined the specific actions are. For instance, an athlete gripping and holding the opponent’s wrist with maximal effort can be perceived as a low-intensity effort yet in reality be severely fatiguing and more appropriately classified as high-intensity. In a sport that involves repeated extended isometric contractions such as BJJ, this may lead to misclassifications of effort. Additionally, physical qualities like flexibility can influence whether a position is comfortable or a significant struggle bordering on a submission hold, a nuance that can easily be missed by an outside observer. One way of addressing these limitations may be a more athlete-involved method where the evaluator adheres to strictly defined criteria when performing the observational analysis, followed by the observed athlete assigning the perceived intensity for each objectively identified effort block. Indeed, combining objective tools and subjective performance analysis has previously been done with success for different outcomes in a comparable combat sport (Gernigon et al., 2004). Moreover, devices such as heart rate monitors and lactate analyzers have the potential to provide additional context that can improve the interpretation and validity of performance analyses. Yet, these are challenging, if not impossible, to deploy in official competition, which is why simulated matches remain valuable study settings in BJJ.

Similar to the issues related to effort classifications, the complex and often unpredictable nature of BJJ combat lends itself to the notion that positional definitions that relies on assumptions of the athlete’s intention may be prone to some uncertainty. The fact that feints and deception is integral to the sport makes it particularly challenging for external observers to make valid interpretations of certain aspects of the sport. Indeed, we found marked reliability differences between positions, with excellent and poor levels of interrater reliability for the standing low- and high-intensity variable, respectively. We propose that one way to improve reliability is to define ground time, which had moderate to excellent ICC values, as “one or both athletes with any other part of the body, than their feet, in contact with the ground” and base the definition of standing time on the ground time variable, i.e., “any time period that does not qualify as ground time”. This would eliminate the subjective part from the positional definitions entirely and thus potentially improve ICC.
6. Conclusions

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first formal performance analysis of official no-gi submission-only matches from multiple tournaments that comprised a diverse athlete population. Positional control was associated with upper-body submissions such as the rear naked choke and armbar, whereas athletes winning by lower-body submissions, primarily heel hook, did not record a single second in a dominant position. This indicates that the path to victory differs between athletes depending on submission strategy. Accordingly, what are traditionally viewed as ‘dominant positions’ may not always reflect the athlete’s true proximity to danger, indicating that points-based competitions that allow heel hooks and similar lower-body submissions may require a revised ruleset to keep up with the technical development of the sport. Based on comparable past and present analyses from this field, we propose novel, sport-specific definitions of common positions, which may aid future research with similar approach and objectives.
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