# Professional male modern boxing: An analysis of activity profile by category Boxeo moderno masculino profesional: un análisis del perfil de actividad por categoría Vicente Puchol, Jose Antonio Sanchez Fuentes, Lluís Albesa Albiol, Toni Caparrós Pons \*University of Barcelona (Spain), \*\*University of Murcia (Spain), \*\*\*Pompeu Fabra University (Spain)

**Abstract.** The purpose of this study is to examine modern professional male boxing by analyzing world champions differences between winners and losers by categories. 322 male professional boxers (age 28.95 ± 4.10, height 175.26 ± 9.44 cm, and weight 147.82 ± 31.31 lb) were included in this observational descriptive analysis, through 320 fights separated by weight divisions [Heavy (H) (n = 24), Cruiser (C) (n = 48), Light Heavy (LH) (n = 62), Super Middle Weight (SMW) (n = 17), Middle Weight (MW) (n = 68), Light Middle Weight (LMW) (n = 42), Welter Weight (WW) (n = 49), Light Welter Weight (LWW) (n = 28), Light Welter (LW) (n = 33), Super Feather Weight (SFW) (n = 63), Feather Weight (FW) (n = 66), Super Bantam Weight (SBW) (n = 42), Bantam Weight (BW) (n = 30), Super Fly Weight (SFLW) (n = 39), Flyweight (F) (n = 29)]. Differences were found between winners and losers (U = 57804 - 90908.5; p < .001; d = 0.129 - 0.776) for all the variables analyzed. Four significant correlations were highlighted: %PL (Percentage of Punches Landed) (rho = .630); AVG PLxR (Power Punches Landed Per Round) (rho = .672) and differences were also observed between weight categories (H = 32.29 - 93.11; p < .001 - .004), except for %PL, AVG JLxR, %JL (Percentage of Jabs Landed) and %PPL. This data suggests that in order to win these events, fighters must deliver precise punches, especially power punches, and that there are differences between the categories with this type of punch (AVG PPLxR). **Keywords:** Performance, trajectory analysis, punch indicators, power punches, ecological study

**Resumen.** El propósito de este estudio es examinar el boxeo masculino profesional moderno analizando las diferencias entre campeones mundiales entre ganadores y perdedores por categorías. En este análisis descriptivo observacional se incluyeron 322 boxeadores profesionales masculinos (edad 28,95 ± 4,10, altura 175,26 ± 9,44 cm y peso 147,82 ± 31,31 lb), a través de 320 peleas separadas por divisiones de peso [Heavy (H) (n = 24), Cruiser (C) (n = 48), Semipesado (LH) (n = 62), Superpeso medio (SMW) (n = 17), Peso medio (MW) (n = 68), Peso medio ligero (LMW) (n = 42), Peso Welter (WW) (n = 49), Peso Welter ligero (LWW) (n = 28), Peso Welter ligero (LW) (n = 33), Peso súper pluma (SFW) (n = 63), Peso pluma (FW) (n = 66), Peso súper gallo (SBW) (n = 42), Peso gallo (BW) (n = 30), Peso súper mosca (SFLW) (n = 39), Peso mosca (F) (n = 29)]. Se encontraron diferencias entre ganadores y perdedores (U = 57804 - 90908,5; p < 0,001; d = 0,129 - 0,776) para todas las variables analizadas. Se destacaron cuatro correlaciones significativas: %PL (Porcentaje de golpes dados) (rho = .630); AVG PLxR (golpes dados por asalto) (rho = .594); AVG PPLxR (golpes de poder lanzados por asalto) (rho = .517); %PPL (Porcentaje de Golpes de Poder Acertados) (rho = .672) y también se observaron diferencias entre categorías de peso (H = 32.29 - 93.11; p < .001 - .004), excepto %PL, AVG JLxR, % JL (porcentaje de Jabs Land-ed) y %PPL. Estos datos sugieren que para ganar estos eventos los peleadores deben dar golpes precisos, especialmente golpes de potencia, y que existen diferencias entre las categorías con este tipo de golpe (AVG PPLxR). **Palabras clave:** Rendimiento, análisis de trayectoria, indicadores de golpe, potencia de golpe, estudio ecológico.

Fecha recepción: 19-05-23. Fecha de aceptación: 12-08-23 Toni Caparrós Pons toni.caparros@gencat.cat

#### Introduction

Boxing is an intermittent-activity sport (Franchini et al., 2019), with high intensity intervals characteristic of combat sports (Ruddock et al., 2021; Silva et al., 2011), in which two opponents from the same category (El-Ashker et al., 2018; Morton et al., 2010; Murugappan et al., 2021) exchange offensive and defensive actions to punch the adversary (Guidetti et al., 2002; Krabben et al., 2019). Depending on the competition, combats typically range from three, threeminute rounds per fight in Olympic boxing (International Boxing Association, 2021), to twelve, three-minute rounds in professional boxing, where more than one organization controls the rules in the competition (Pic, 2018). Amateur and professional boxing differ due to reasons of motivation, regulations and exposure to certain types of injury (McCrory et al., 2012), which means the technical demands could depend on the event (Thomson & Lamb, 2016).

In recent years, several studies have been carried out to analyze the different boxing activity profiles. Some of this research has provided differences between winners and losers (Davis et al., 2013; Dunn et al., 2017; El Ashker, 2011; Finlay, 2022; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020), including discriminations between weight categories (Davis et al., 2018; Thomson & Lamb, 2016) and competition level (Thomson & Lamb, 2016), with the purpose of identifying technical/tactical skills, including offensive (punch types: jab, hook, uppercut, etc.) as well as defensive (through guard, trunk, footwork, etc.), and performance parameters. These analyses provide an opportunity to understand the characteristics of the sport discipline in question (Hughes & Bartlett, 2002; O'Donoghue, 2009).

The studies used to analyze boxers are becoming more efficient to find fight patterns in the most recent events and to be able to investigate the opponents as much as possible, such as their punching characteristics, lateral dominance, punching activity profile, etc. (Schinke & Ramsay, 2009). The use of new technologies is a very precise way to facilitate improved performance (Kojman et al., 2022).

Several studies on the activity profiles that identify the types of actions that make up the rounds of this sport have reported that boxers throw an average of 63 to 82 punches per round and between 14-29% land accurately in the scoring area (Davis et al., 2015, 2018; Dunn et al., 2017; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020), with the jab being the most-used and

most-effective boxing punch with 37% accuracy (Kruszewski et al., 2016). Winners tend to have a higher average number of punches landing in the scoring zone due to their higher activity profile (El Ashker, 2011; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). Regarding defensive actions, boxers perform an average of 30 actions during the round, including defense actions with their arms, trunk, and defense with footwork (Dunn et al., 2017). Boxers spend more time during the round on footwork than even other actions such as punches thrown (Devesa & Pons, 2020), so it could be a determining factor for defensive as well as offensive actions (Davis et al., 2016).

Studies undertaken to identify boxing parameters and professional boxing profiles (Finlay, 2022; Pic, 2018; Pic & Jonsson, 2021) are scarce and only one of them aims to obtain records of the punching activity. An analysis was conducted to compare fights between winners and losers in the heavy-weight category, stating that boxers throw an average of 320.1 punches per fight, 37.6 punches per round, and land 34.6% of punches thrown. 172.4 Jabs are thrown per fight and 27.29% land, and of the 147.8 punches thrown with power, 42.4% land. Winners have a higher average number of punches thrown and greater accuracy during these events (Finlay, 2022).

Efficient evaluation and identification of specific aspects in combat sports is crucial to support athletes as well as coaches (Barley et al., 2019; Thomson et al., 2013) and offer the possibility of analyzing events and boxers in order to design future training plans (Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). The purpose of this work is to undertake a descriptive observational study of professional boxers from different weight categories who hold one or more world titles, where their last fights were analyzed to identify profiles and performance parameters and to identify any differences between the different modern professional boxing categories.

#### Material and methods

#### **Participants**

The actions of 322 male professional boxers (mean  $\pm$ 

Table 1.

standard deviation [SD]), age 28.95  $\pm$  4.10, height 175.26  $\pm$  9.44 cm and weight 147.82  $\pm$  31.31 lb, who held at least one of the internationally recognized titles (World Boxing Association [WBA], World Boxing Organization [WBO], World Boxing Council [WBC] and International Boxing Federation [IBF]) were analyzed during 320 fights of the following weight categories: H (n = 24), C (n = 48), LH (n = 62), SMW (n = 17), MW (n = 68), LMW (n = 42), WW (n = 49), LWW (n = 28), LW (n = 33), SFW (n = 63), FW (n = 66), SBW (n = 42), BW (n = 30), SFW (n = 39), F (n = 29). The Light Flyweight (LFW) and Minimumweight (M) categories were not included due to their scarcity in the sample.

#### Design and procedure

The official websites (*International Boxing Federation*, 2022; *World Boxing Association*, 2022; *World Boxing Organization*, 2022) were accessed to find out who the world champions were as of February 28, 2022, and from that date onward. The latest ten fights of each world champion were analyzed as the established maximum, which can be in different categories depending on their professional career. For some of the selected boxers, the maximum limit of 10 fights could not be reported, either because some of the fights did not have certain anthropometric data and/or punching activity records, or simply because of the age of the boxers, since the average age in professional boxing is usually 23.85 years (Tasiopoulos & Nikolaidis, 2022) and more experience is needed for their promotion (McCrory et al., 2012).

The boxers' characteristic records and anthropometric data were obtained from www.boxrec.com and those of the punching actions from beta.compuboxdata.com, both free access websites. Several studies have previously accessed these websites (Finlay, 2022; Pic, 2018; Pic & Jonsson, 2021).

The punching action records extracted from beta.compuboxdata.com were analyzed as variables (Table 1) on the boxing activity profile during the fight and during the round, to determine the quantity, punch types and their precision.

Description analysed variables								
VARIABLES	DESCRIPTION OF THE VARIABLES ANALYSED							
End fight (EF)	Indicates the round in which the fight ends.							
	BOXING ACTIVITY PROFILE DURING FIGHT							
Total Punches Thrown (TPT)	Number of punches thrown during the fight. Indicates the sum of Jabs and power punches thrown during the fight							
Total Punches Landed (TPL)	Number of punches landing in the valid scoring zone. Indicates the sum of Jabs and power punches landed during the fight							
Percentage Punches Landed (%PL)	Indicates the percentage of punches landing in the valid scoring zone of the total number of punches thrown during the bout							
Jabs Thrown (JT)	Number of Jabs thrown during the bout							
Jabs Landed (JL)	Number of Jabs landed during the fight Number of power punches thrown during the fight							
Power Punches Thrown (PPT)								
Power Punches Landed (PPL)	Number of power punches landed in the validated scoring zone during the bout							
Percentage Power Punches Landed (%PPL)	Percentage of power punches landing in the valid scoring zone out of the total number of power punches thrown during the bout							
Percentage Jabs Landed (%JL)	Indicates the percentage of jabs landing in the valid scoring zone out of the total number of jabs thrown during the bout							
	BOXING ACTIVITY PROFILE DURING ROUND							
Average Punches Thrown per Round (AVG PTxR)	It is the average number of punches thrown during the round							
Average punches landed per round (AVG PLxR)	Average number of jabs landing in the valid scoring zone during the round							
Jabs Thrown per Round (AVG JTxR)	Is the average number of jabs thrown during the combat							
Jabs Landed per Round (AVE JLxR)	Average number of jabs landed in the valid scoring zone							
Average Power Punches Thrown per Round (AVG PPTxR)	Average number of power punches thrown during the round							
Average Power Punches Landed per Round (AVG PPLxR)	Average number of power punches landed in the valid scoring zone per round							

#### Statistical analysis

Central tendency of Boxing activity profile during fight

and during round (Table 1) were descriptively analyzed for the entire sample (mean and standard desviation - SD -).

Next, and taking the sample's non-normality into account shown in the Shapiro-Wilk test, a statistical analysis was carried, any differences between the variables and the different categories analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis Test were assessed. Subsequently, any differences in the variables according to the result (win or lose) were assessed using the Mann Whitney test. Finally, possible relationships between the actions and winning the fight were determined using Spearman's rho test (rho). This index ranges between -1 and +1, defining the magnitude of the relationships, according to Hopkins (2002) criteria as casual: 0-.09; low: .10-.29; moderate: .30-.49; high: .50-.69; very high: .70-.89; almost perfect .90-.99; 1 perfect. The significance level for all tests is p < .05. The analysis was performed using JASP 0.16.1.0 statistical software (The Jasp Team, Amsterdam, Holland).

#### Results

#### Boxing activity profile during combat

The descriptive analysis (Table 2) shows that the boxers finished the fight in the round 8.46  $\pm$  3.65, varying between maximum values of 9.82  $\pm$  2.78 in the LW category and minimum values of 5.33  $\pm$  3.70 in BW. The activity profile during fight was 443.93  $\pm$  264.60 Total Punches Thrown (TPT), with ranges fluctuating between 652.1  $\pm$  304.97 and 240.67  $\pm$  233.45, between the SFLW and BW categories respectively. Of these TPT, the fighters obtained an average of  $117.31 \pm 73.88$  Total Punches Landed (TPL), with maximum values in the SFLW category (166.69  $\pm$ 91.46) and minimum in BW (66.80  $\pm$  74.23), which in values of %PL per fight corresponds to  $26.34 \pm 7.48$ , with maximums (28.54  $\pm$  7.67) for the MW category and minimums (24.52  $\pm$  6.81) in the H category. Boxers averaged  $195.12 \pm 133.10$  Jabs Thrown (JT) during the fight, with highs of 259.28  $\pm$  122.27 (SFLW) and lows of 116.97  $\pm$ 119.45 (BW). Of these JT,  $31.35 \pm 26.22$  correspond to Jabs Landed (JL), with maximum  $(40.23 \pm 25.18)$  and minimum (21.87  $\pm$  28.16) values that vary between the SFLW and BW categories respectively and that, in Percentage of Jabs Thrown (%JT), corresponds to  $15.96 \pm 8.61$  during the fight, with maximums of  $17.96 \pm 8.26$  in the MW category and minimums of  $13.72 \pm 7.58$  in LWW. During the fight, there were  $248.79 \pm 167.78$  Power Punches Thrown (PPT), with the SFLW category having the highest value (392.82  $\pm$  123.7) and BW the lowest value (123.7  $\pm$ 122.03), a total of 85.91  $\pm$  58.54 PPL were in the scoring zone, varying between maximums and minimums between the SFLW (125.67  $\pm$  77.93) and BW (44.93  $\pm$  48.43) categories, and which translated into the Percentage of Power Punches Landed (%PPL) corresponding to  $34.59 \pm 9.08$ , with maximum values of  $38.19 \pm 6.82$  in the SMW category and minimum values of  $32.01 \pm 7.05$  in the SFLW category.

Table 2.

Descriptive analysed variables of central tendency and different categories, differentiated by win or lose.

Descriptive	anarys	U vai iai	DIES OI	Centi ai	tenden	cy and	unierei	it categ	ones, c			RIES (A		W)											
			AC			Н			С	СЛ	1200	LH		,	SMW			MW			LMW			WW	
		All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lose
VARIA- BLES	n	640	320	320	24	12	12	48	24	24	62	31	31	17	8	9	68	34	34	42	22	20	49	24	25
End	x	8.46	8.46	8.46	8.92	8.92	8.92	9.58	9.58	9.58	8.10	8.10	8.10	6.72	7.00	6.44	8.21	8.15	8.27	8.24	8.23	8.25	8.90	8.88	8.92
Round	SD	3.65	3.65	3.65		3.37	3.37		3.20	3.20	4.02	4.02	4.02		4.21	4.28	3.91	3.97	3.84	3.81	3.74	3.88	3.19	3.22	3.16
		443.	483.	404.	358.	444.	272.	476.	573.	379.	408.	469.	346.	275.	291.	258.	410.	470.	350.	400.	449.	351.	450.	486.	414.
TPT	х	93	02	84	33	42	25	65	67	63	16	39	94	08	38	78	53	18	88	51	23	80	33	58	08
IPI	SD	264.	273.	255.	196.	199.	193.	213.	245.	180.	254.	265.	242.	164.	177.	152.	241.	271.	211.	288.	331.	245.	242.	246.	239.
	3D	60	61	59	17	19	15	22	75	69	17	42	93	75	32	18	24	11	37	71	72	70	94	27	62
	x	117.	148.	86.3	90.0	120.	59.7	122.	158.	87.6	105.	145.	65.1	80.3	109.	51.2	116.	152.	79.5	104.	133.	76.0	126.	160.	92.6
TPL	л	31	22	9	4	33	5	98	33	3	13	10	6	0	38	2	24	91	6	84	68	0	61	63	0
112	SD	73.8	84.4	63.3	48.9	51.8	46.1	65.1	71.6	58.6	63.6	78.7	48.4	52.7	72.1	33.4	70.9	82.2	59.5	76.4	97.5	55.2	68.2	77.2	59.2
		8	3	3	9	0	8	7	8	6	1	9	3	8	5	2	1	4	8	2	4	9	7	6	8
	x	26.3	31.8	20.8	24.5	27.7	21.2	25.1	28.4	21.9	26.7	31.9	21.5	28.5	37.4	19.5	28.5	34.6	22.4	25.7	30.5	20.8	28.1	33.6	22.6
%PL		4	5	4	2	8	6	5	0	0	7	9	5	0	1	8	4	6	2	1	7	5	6	5	8
	SD	7.48	8.06	6.90	6.81	7.02	6.59	7.29	6.56	8.02	7.18	5.27	9.10	6.72	7.65	5.79	7.67	7.99	7.35	6.09	6.98	5.21	5.24	4.54	5.94
	x	50.8	55.9	45.6	40.1	51.9	28.3	49.6	59.6	39.6	49.4	58.5	40.3	44.1	44.1	44.2	50.2	58.3	42.2	44.6	50.5	38.8	49.6	54.5	44.7
AVG		1	5	7	4	7	0	4	8	0	9	9	8	9	4	4	8	3	2	8	1	6	1	0	2
PTxR	SD	18.5	18.6 9	18.3 9	13.9	15.0	12.9	15.6	17.9 5	13.3	15.2	15.4	15.0	12.8	10.6	14.9	18.0	20.5 5	15.5	19.8	23.5 5	16.0	16.4	16.1	1 16.6 8
		4		9	6	3	0	5 12.7	5 16.9	6	3 13.4	2 18.5	4	2	8	6	3 14.8	20.2	1	0	5 15.4	5	2 14.0	6	8
AVG	x	13.6 2	17.6 9	9.55	10.0 8	14.1	5.98	9	5	8.62	15.4	18.5	8.25	12.4	4	8.29	14.8 9	20.2	9.50	11.8	15.4	8.20	6	18.1 6	9.96
PLxR	SD	6.02	7.12	4.92	4.00	4.81	3.19	5.31	6.33	4.29	•		4.40	3.94		2.53	6.99	9.08	4.90	5.80	7.71	3.89	4.96	5.30	4.63
	50	195.	216.	173.	183.	240.	127.	225.	297.	153.	209.	237.	181.	132.	130.	134.	179.	209.	149.	167.	181.	153.	206.	236.	176.
	х	12	55	68	96	58	33	08	13	04	08	10	07	45	13	78	77	77	77	85	91	80	41	58	24
JT		133.	139.	126.	126.	135.	118.	117.	154.	79.3	164.	174.	155.	90.7		92.2	125.	146.	105.	114.	109.	120.	140.	142.	138.
	SD	10	77	42	85	18	52	05	72	8	85	37	33	0	1	8	64	01	26	64	11	17	52	55	49
	х	3.61	4.81	2.40	3.03	4.39	1.67	3.99	5.80	2.18	4.12	5.91	2.33	3.45	3.88	3.02	3.96	5.66	2.27	3.09	3.92	2.26	3.99	5.44	2.54
AVG JLxR	SD	2.38	2.99	1.77	1.76	2.12	1.41	2.47	3.25	1.70	2.49	3.34	1.64	1.69	2.29	1.10	2.60	3.38	1.82	1.78	1.89	1.67	2.45	3.12	1.79
-		22.2	24.8	19.7	20.3	28.0	12.6	23.7	30.9	16.5	24.2	27.7	20.6	21.2	19.5	22.8	21.0	24.2	17.9	19.2	21.6	16.7	22.6	26.8	18.5
AVG	х	9	0	7	5	2	8	8	9	8	2	4	9	3	8	8	7	5	0	0	3	8	9	2	7
JTxR	SD	10.7	10.5	10.8	10.6	12.1	9.12	0.00	12.7	6.02	10.8	10.8	10.8	9.58	6.02	12.2	0.61	10.7	0.40	0.00	0.11	9.69	11.1	11.1	11.1
	5D	0	6	5	3	3	9.12	9.68	4	6.62	5	5	4	9.58	6.92	5	9.61	6	8.46	8.96	8.23	9.69	5	0	9
	x	31.3	41.3	21.3	27.8	38.5	17.1	37.8	53.4	22.2	34.9	51.5	18.3	24.9	30.6	19.3	32.3	45.3	19.2	26.1	32.0	20.3	36.3	48.7	24.0
JL	х	5	7	2	3	0	7	1	2	1	2	2	2	8	3	3	1	8	4	5	0	0	8	5	0
JL	SD	26.2	32.7	19.6	20.7	23.6	17.7	25.5	30.2	20.9	32.1	47.3	16.9	24.6	34.0	15.3	27.6	33.3	21.9	17.9	18.0	17.7	29.9	38.9	20.8
	00	2	9	6	4	9	9	8	3	4	8	9	7	9	5	3	4	8	0	4	8	9	1	8	3
	x	15.9	19.4	12.4	14.9	17.2	12.7	15.9	18.1	13.7	16.9	21.0	12.8	16.7	19.1	14.3	17.9	22.7	13.1	15.2	18.2	12.2	17.5	20.3	14.7
% [L		6	3	8	8	5	1	5	5	5	4	0	7	5	1	9	6	8	4	4	2	7	1	0	2
	SD	8.61	9.82	7.41	7.28	7.75	6.81	7.86	7.02	8.70	8.94	7.64	10.2 3	6.55	7.98	5.13	8.26	8.97	7.55	8.03	8.06	8.00	6.79	7.19	6.39

AVG	x	10.0	12.8	7.14	6.80	9 2 2	4.28	8.79	11.1	6.44	9.28	12.6	5.91	8.99	12.6	5.29	10.9	14.6	7.24	8.73	11.5	5.95	10.0	12.7	7.4
PPLxR		0	6						5			6 5.12			9		3	2			1		7	2	
	SD	5.16 85.9	6.14	4.18 64.9	3.06	3.77 81.8	2.34 42.5	4.01 85.1	4.55	3.47 65.4	4.51 70.1	93.5	3.91 46.7	3.98 55.3	5.32 78.7	2.64	5.99 83.9	8.03	3.94 60.3	5.09 78.6	7.45	2.73 55.7	3.95 90.2	4.34	3. 68
PPL	х	1	84	7	1	3	8	7	92	2	6	8	4	2	5	9	3	53	2	9	68	0	4	88	(
	SD	58.5 4	65.5 8	51.5 0	33.6 5	34.0 4	33.2 6	51.4 7	56.6 8	46.2 5	43.4 9	48.2 3	38.7 6	30.9 6	41.2 1	20.7 2	50.6 1	56.0 3	45.1 9	64.9 8	88.7 7	41.1 9	50.8 6	56.9 9	44
	x	28.5	31.1	25.9	19.4	23.4	15.3	25.8	28.7	23.0	25.2	30.8	19.6	22.9	24.5	21.3	29.2	34.0	24.3	25.4	28.9	22.0	26.9	27.6	26
AVG PTxR		2 13.3	4 14.1	0 12.5	2	8	6	5	0	0 10.0	7 11.0	5 12.5	9	5	5	4 11.8	0 13.7	8 17.0	3 10.4	9 14.4	0 19.5	9	1	8	1
	SD	3	4	2	6.24	5.96	6.52	9.37	8.67	8	5	0	9.59	9.77	7.69	4	5	2	8	7	5	9.39	8.79	8.80	8.
	x	248. 79	266. 38	231. 19	173. 46	202. 00	144. 92	251. 56	276. 54	226. 58	199. 08	232. 29	165. 87	142. 63	161. 25	124. 00	230. 77	260. 41	201. 12	232. 80	267. 59	198. 00	243. 92	250. 00	23
PPT	SD	167.	172.	163.	92.8	87.3	98.3	125.	122.	128.	128.	131.	125.	86.3	98.5	74.0	139.	151.	127.	196.	247.	146.	130.	131.	12
	0.0	78 34.5	37 42.0	20	2 34.6	0 41.5	5 27.7	87 33.2	75 38.5	99 27.9	47 35.6	35 41.9	58 29.3	0 38.1	7	3	77 36.5	93 43.3	61 29.6	72 34.5	19 42.0	24 27.1	05	22 46.2	27
%PPP	x	9 9	9	0	5	9	27.7	4	1	8	5	5	29.3 5	9	8	0	1	+3.3 8	29.0 5	9 9	1	7	2	6	2,
/0111	SD	9.08	9.50	8.65	10.0	11.1	8.96	9.09	9.35	8.84	8.28	7.25	9.30	6.82	8.97	4.68	9.10	9.01	9.20	10.6 7	12.1	9.18	8.15	9.37	6.
					4	2				CAT	EGOR	IES (LV	WW to	FLW)						/	6				
		A 11	LWW		A 11	LW	Laaa	A 11	SFW	Lass	A 11	FW	Lana	A 11	SBW	I	A 11	BW	Lasa		SFLW	I	A 11	FLW	L
VARIA-	_	All	Win	Lose	All	Win	Lo																		
BLES	n	28	14	14	33	17	16	63	31	32	66	33	33	42	21	21	30	15	15	39	20	19	29	14	1
Finaliza Asalto	x SD	8.29 3.93	8.29 3.93	8.29 3.93	9.82 2.78	9.77 2.75	9.88 2.80	7.76 3.82	7.68 3.82	7.84 3.83	9.53 2.94	9.61 2.94	9.46 2.94	7.91 4.00	7.91 4.00	7.91 4.00	5.33 3.70	5.33 3.70	5.33 3.70	9.79 3.08	9.80 3.04	9.79 3.12	8.14 3.56	8.07 3.61	8. 3.
	x	375.	372.	377.	447.	437.	457.	406.	409.	403.	579.	625.	533.	475.	519.	430.	240.	259.	221.	652.	673.	631.	484.	484.	48
TPT		07 241.	64 204.	50 278.	47 158.	12 159.	81 156.	69 238.	84 229.	53 247.	42 285.	18 297.	67 274.	07 291.	71 305.	43 276.	67 233.	80 231.	53 234.	10 304.	20 287.	00 322.	91 269.	14 271.	6 26
	SD	05	06	03	06	14	98	55	41	69	70	31	08	02	86	17	45	93	97	97	23	72	53	93	1
	x	98.9 3	117. 71	80.1 4	114. 29	138. 71	89.8 8	103. 59	119. 48	87.6 9	148. 30	184. 36	112. 24	136. 45	171. 05	101. 86	66.8 0	88.6 7	44.9 3	166. 69	196. 75	136. 63	121. 59	154. 79	88
TPL	SD	69.8	65.8	73.8	44.0	47.7	40.3	64.2	67.1	61.4	78.7	94.3	63.0	90.1	98.8	81.5	74.2	104.	44.2	91.4	88.0	94.8	70.8	91.0	50
	3D	3	5	0	3	4	3 19.9	9 25.2	0 30.1	7 20.2	0	3 30.2	7 20.4	7	0	3	3 27.3	19	7	6	5	7	6 25.6	9	10
0/ DI	x	24.4 5	30.8 9	18.0 2	26.1 8	32.3 9	19.9 7	25.2	50.1 6	20.2 8	25.3 4	30.2	20.4 6	27.9 3	33.4 2	22.4 4	27.3 7	36.0 5	18.6 8	25.0 5	30.0 8	20.0 3	25.6 6	33.3 2	18
%PL SI	SD	8.08	6.96	9.21	5.46	5.08	5.84	7.12	6.99	7.25	6.30	7.49	5.10	6.23	6.02	6.44	14.5	20.5	8.45	5.57	5.54	5.59	6.62	9.08	4.
		42.1	42.5	41.6	45.8	45.2	46.4	50.5	53.2	47.8	59.3	63.5	55.1	58.6	64.5	52.8	1 39.3	7 42.8	35.9	64.2	67.6	60.9	57.7	58.1	57
AVG	х	1	3	9	4	2	6	8	7	9	4	5	4	9	9	0	6	0	1	9	2	6	4	3	ļ
PTxR	SD	15.7 1	12.2 5	19.1 7	10.9 4	10.0 7	11.8 0	15.1 7	14.0 8	16.2 5	21.6 8	21.6 1	21.7 5	18.4 9	17.7 2	19.2 5	18.5 7	18.6 9	18.4 6	20.2 7	19.7 4	20.8 1	16.1 3	14.2 2	18
AVG	x	10.5	13.3	7.81	11.8	14.5	9.06	13.1	16.1	10.1	15.4	19.3	11.5	16.6	21.6	11.6	10.7	14.3	7.17	16.4	20.0	12.7	14.6	19.0	10
PLxR	SD	6 5.37	1 4.94	5.81	2 3.43	9 4.00	2.86	7 5.46	7 6.03	6 4.88	2 7.23	0 9.04	3 5.43	4 6.15	1 6.93	6 5.37	7 6.82	6 9.41	4.22	2 6.48	7 6.00	6 6.96	7 4.78	2 6.05	3.
	x	167.	171.	164.	203.	197.	209.	176.	181.	171.	248.	282.	213.	169.	196.	143.	116.	114.	119.	259.	244.	274.	187.	189.	18
JT		82 110.	29 91.8	36 129.	28 88.5	18 73.1	38 103.	22 112.	10 112.	34 112.	15 154.	70 166.	61 141.	81 112.	38 129.	24 95.9	97 119.	47 106.	47 132.	28 122.	20 103.	37 140.	63 142.	86 139.	4 14
	SD	64	9	40	4	2	97	51	112.	88	00	66	35	61	26	5	45	06	85	27	92	62	01	06	9
AVG JLxR	x	2.68	3.26	2.10	3.74	4.66	2.83	3.06	3.68	2.44	3.79	5.02	2.56	3.31	4.71	1.91	3.21	3.77	2.65	4.27	5.29	3.24	3.16	4.18	2.
	SD	2.03	2.22 20.4	1.84	2.43	3.03	1.83	1.76	1.71 23.0	1.81 19.9	2.74	3.21 28.3	2.26	2.12	2.87	1.38	2.92	4.09	1.74 19.0	2.37	2.92	1.81	2.27	2.76	1.
AVG	х	7	5	9	1	1	1	9	7	2	5	2	9	8	1	6	8	9	8	8	4	2	2	7	
JTxR	SD	8.03	6.15	9.90	8.71	6.13	11.3 0	8.46	6.76	10.1 7	13.0	12.6 6	13.4	9.50	8.26	10.7	10.3 6	9.97	10.7 5	11.1 3	12.4	9.82	12.2 9	9.78	14
	x	23.9	27.0	20.7	33.8	41.8	25.8	24.5	27.6	21.4	37.0	49.4	24.6	26.5	37.4	15.5	21.8	28.2	15.5	40.2	47.3	33.1	27.4	35.7	19
JL		3 21.5	7 19.8	9 23.2	2 20.5	2 23.5	1 17.5	4 18.8	8 18.9	1 18.6	8 29.8	9 36.6	7 23.0	0 20.3	3 27.5	7 13.1	7 28.1	0 41.8	3 14.4	3 25.1	0 27.0	6 23.3	9 26.5	1 32.5	20
	SD	2	0	5	0	0	1	2	9	5	4	7	2	9	9	9	6	7	4	8	7	0	0	3	8
	x	13.7 2	15.4 4	12.0	17.2 0	21.3 7	13.0 3	13.8 3	16.2 5	11.4 2	14.3 1	17.7 0	10.9 1	15.6 7	19.2 7	12.0 6	17.7 9	21.9 8	13.5 9	16.2 5	20.5 2	11.9 8	15.1 3	21.1 2	9.
% JL	SD	7.58															17.3			7.32		5.46		10.4	5.
	00	7.50	10.0	7.10	0.55	2.12	7.10		12.5			14.2			16.9	7.07	1	8 10.5	0.55	12.0	14.7	5.10	11.5	4	5.
AVG PPLxR	x	7.86	0	5.72	8.10	9.95	6.24	1	0	7.73	4	8	8.99	4	2	9.75	7.55	9	4.51	8	7	9.40	2	5	8.
TTLAK	SD	3.91		4.35			2.42					7.24			6.92	-			-	5.69	5.77	5.61	3.78 94.1	4.64	2.
DDI	x	74.9 3	90.5 0	59.3 6	80.4 7	96.8 8	64.0 6	79.0 4	91.8 1	66.2 8	111. 23	134. 88	87.5 8	109. 95	133. 62	86.2 9	44.9 3	60.4 7	29.4 0	125. 67	149. 45	101. 90	94.1 0	119. 07	65
PPL	SD			53.9	35.9	37.9	-	-	56.9		63.1		54.4		-		48.4		30.9	77.9	80.8	74.9	53.3	68.1	
		7 22.5	3 22.0	23.0	3 24.4	8 24.4	24.5	6 29.0	5 30.2	6 27.9	8 33.9	0 35.2	7 32.7	4 37.6	0 40.7	7 34.4	3 20.6	3 24.5	4 16.8	3 37.5	9 41.2	6 33.7	7 35.4	7 36.3	34
AVE	х	4	8	0	8	3	3	9	0	8	8	1	6	0	7	2	8	2	5	2	9	5	2	6	,
PTxR	SD	9.90	8.15	11.6 5	6.87	5.82	7.91	12.6 0	12.2 7	12.9 3	13.7 6	14.3 8	13.1 3	16.1 7	16.3 1	16.0 3	11.1 3	12.5 7	9.70	16.6 7	18.1 5	15.2 0	11.1 9	10.4 8	11
	x	207.	201.	213.	244.	239.	249.	230.	228.	232.	331.	342.	320.	305.	323.	287.	123.	145.	102.	392.	429.	356.	297.	294.	30
PPT		25 141.	36 121.	14 161.	50 106.	94 95.9	06 117.	47 156.	74 136.	19 175.	12 178.	18 181.	06 175.	24 216	29 218.	19 214.	70 122.	33 140.	07 104.	82 233.	00 250.	63 216.	28 163.	29 157.	2 16
	SD	75	55	96	74	1	57	05	45	65	90	98	82	55	58	51	03	06	00	61	82	41	44	30	5
	x		45.9 4	22.7	33.2 9	40.9 0	25.6	33.8 7	41.1 2	26.6	33.3	40.1	26.4	34.9	41.7	28.1	35.1 0	45.8 9	24.3	32.0	37.1	26.8	32.6	41.3 3	24
%PPP		6		7 11.5			9			2 10.1	1	6	6	2	3	1		9 18.9	0 12.8	1	7	6	8		6
	SD	9.33	7.08	0	6.31	6.02	6.60	8.90	7.61	8	7.45	7.86	7.03	6.50	6.52	6.48	0	6	3	7.05	6.95	7.15	8.05	9.67	6.

2023, Retos, 50, 987-994 © Copyright: Federación Española de Asociaciones de Docentes de Educación Física (FEADEF) ISSN: Edición impresa: 1579-1726. Edición Web: 1988-2041 (https://recyt.fecyt.es/index.php/retos/index)

o 6 6 3 Notes: All: is the sum of the Win (win the match) and lose (lose the match) samples. Mean (x) and standard desviation (SD) of 320 events analysed (n), differentiated by win and lose of; All categories (AC), Heavy (H), Cruiser (C), Light Heavy (LH), Super Middle Weight (SMW), Middle Weight (MW), Light Middle Weight (LMW), Welter Weight (WW), Light Welter Weight (LWW), Light Weight (LW), Super Feather Weight (SFW), Feather Weight (FW), Super Bantam Weight (SBW), Bantam Weight (BW), Super Fly Weight (SFLW), Fly Weight (FW)

#### Boxing activity profile during the round

The boxers had an Average Punches Thrown per Round (AVG PTxR) of 50.81  $\pm$  18.54 with maximum and minimum values that varied between the SFLW (64.29  $\pm$ 20.27) and BW (39.36  $\pm$  18.57) categories, respectively (Table 2). A total of  $13.62 \pm 6.02$  corresponds to Average Punches Landed per Round (AVG PLxR), with the maximum value belonging to the SFLW category ( $16.42 \pm 6.48$ ) and minimum for H (10.08  $\pm$  4.00). An Average Jabs Thrown per round (AVG [TxR) of  $22.29 \pm 10.70$  was obtained with respect to the fighters' central tendency, with ranges that vary between  $26.78 \pm 11.13$  (SFLW) and 18.6810.36 (BW). A total of  $3.61 \pm 2.38$  belongs to Average Jabs Landed per Round (AVG JLxR), with a maximum of 4.27  $\pm$  2.37 in SFLW and a minimum of 2.68  $\pm$  2.03 in LWW. The fighters obtained values of  $28.52 \pm 13.33$  of Average Power Punches Thrown per round (AVG PPTxR), data that fluctuates between the SBW category (37.6  $\pm$  16.7) and H  $(19.42 \pm 6.24)$  and obtained  $10.00 \pm 5.16$  of Average Power Punches Landed per Round (AVG PPLxR), varying between the maximum values of the SBW category (13.34  $\pm$  6.17) and minimum H (6.80  $\pm$  3.06).

The Kruskal-Wallis Test reported significant differences between the variables analyzed and the different categories (H = 32.29 - 93.11; p <.01 - .004), except for %PL, AVG JLxR, %JL and %PPL.

Significant differences were observed between "winner and loser" (Table 3) for the variables TPT, TPL, %PL, AVG PTxR, AVG PLxR, JT, AVG JLxR, AVG JTxR, JL, %JL, PPT, PPL, AVG PPTxR, AVG PPLxR, %PPL. (U = 57804 – 90908.5; p <.01; d = 0.12 – 0.77)

Finally, significant relationships were observed between the winner and the different variables analyzed, of which high relationships with %PL (Punches Landed) stood out (rho = .63; p <.01); AVG PLxR (rho = .59; p <.01); AVG PPLxR (rho = .51; p <.01); %PPL (rho = .67; p <.01) and moderate for TPL (rho = .38; p <.01); AVG JLxR (rho = .45; p <.01); JL (rho = .35; p <.01); %JL (rho = .39; p <.01); PPL (rho = .34; p <.01).

#### Discussion

This is the first descriptive observational study to analyze activity profiles within modern professional boxing in different categories to analyze possible indicators of victory as well as differences in activity between different weight classes. The most important findings of this study are that the types of power punches are a determining factor to be victorious in these events, since they have greater validity in the event of judging decisions, unlike amateur boxing, where the jab is considered a more frequent and precise punch (Kruszewski et al., 2016). These discrepancies could be attributed to conditioning factors of the event in question (McCrory et al., 2012). It is also observed that the winning fighters develop a greater activity profile in the actions carried out and that they also have greater precision in their punches.

The boxers threw an average of 443.93 TPT and conceded a total of 26.34% PL during the fight, with PPT being the most-used punches (248.79) and more accurate to land in the valid scoring zone (34.95% PPL) compared to the jabs (195.12 JT and 15.96% JL). These values are somewhat heterogeneous (Finlay, 2022), with 320.1 TPT, 34.6% PL, who agrees with other studies on amateur boxing (Kruszewski et al., 2016) in which it is stated that the punches most used by boxers are the jabs, with a total of 53.8% of the punches thrown, but which is in agreement with our work that power punches are more accurate compared with jabs with averages of 42.4% PPL and 27.9% JL respectively. These differences might be caused by the fact that the cited study was carried out only with the heavyweight category, since these works were not homogeneous with respect to the categories analyzed (Thomson, 2015). In addition, Table 2 indicates that the fights usually end in the 8.46 round, so this could be another reason why the results differ, since fights in professional boxing can range from 1 to 12 rounds, depending on how they end (Bianco et al., 2013).

Descriptively, the fighters throw an average of 50.81 AVG PTxR, of which a total of 13.62 AVG PLxR land in the scoring zone, with AVG PPTxR being the most-used punches (28.52) and those that land the most in the valid zone (10.00 AVG PPLxR) compared to jabs (22.29 AVG JTxR and 3.61 AVG JLxR). These are somewhat unequal results compared to the only study of these characteristics with professional boxers and in which no differences stood out between Jabs and Power Punches during the rounds, with 37.6 AVG PTxR and 13.3 AVG PLxR (Finlay, 2022), and with studies in amateur boxing with figures ranging between 63 and 82 punches thrown and 10 and 23.6 PLxR (Davis et al., 2015, 2018; Dunn et al., 2017; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). These differences could be attributed to the diversity of categories analyzed (Puchol & Caparrós, 2020) and activity strategies with varied performance objectives common in amateur boxing (Dunn et al., 2017; Halperin et al., 2019).

# Differences between categories

Regarding the possible discrepancies between categories, significant differences are observed in many of the variables studied apart from: %PL, %JL, %PPL and AVG JLxR. This suggests that in all categories, the accuracy percentage in the types of punches is similar to the punches that are thrown during the fight and the average number of Jabs landed during the round is also similar, since they are punches used to set the rhythm of fight, not so forceful and of a preparatory nature for other punches (Pic & Jonsson, 2021). On the contrary, the same does not occur with AVG PPLxR, since the impact force that is produced is not identical for the different weight categories (Pierce et al., 2006).

Although the boxers in the LW category didn't turn out to be the ones with the highest activity records regarding the variables analyzed, they were the ones who completed the most rounds during the fight (9.82). When comparing their numbers with BW, the category that fought fewer rounds (5.33), their low records can be justified with respect to the average magnitudes in many of these variables during the fight (TPT, TPL, AVG PTxR, JT, JL, PPL, PPT), although also in round (AVG PTxR and AVG JTxR). The SFLW category is also the one with the most activity in some of the variables, apart from: %PL, %JL, %PPL, AVG PPTxR and AVG PPLxR, and the second in number of rounds completed (9.79).

Differences between weight categories are common in combat sports, in other disciplines such as Judo (Batista et al., 2022), Taekwondo (Bridge et al., 2011) Muay Thai (Podhurskyi & Pavlenko, 2021) or Mixed Martial Arts (Kirk, 2018) technical and strategic differences have been demonstrated. In this sense, it could be intuited that one of the criteria upon which it is coherent to base the training prescription could be weight category (Thomson & Lamb, 2016), although not before considering situational roles (Hristovski et al., 2006), precompetitive pressures (García Pazmiño et al., 2018) and other relevant factors such as general physical conditioning and, especially, lower body work (Lenetsky et al., 2020), which requires more than half of the round through so-called footwork (Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). This shows that boxing is a multi-factorial sport, like many other sports disciplines (Hughes & Bartlett, 2002).

#### Differences between winners and losers

The significant differences between winners and losers (Table 3) enables the assessment that in most of the boxing actions carried out by the winners, their average is higher in relation to the losers. Winners have a higher activity profile of punching actions during the fight and during the round. These results coincide with most of the previously analyzed studies, in which the total number of punches thrown during the fight and during the round was higher in winners than in losers (Finlay, 2022). Winners also tend to have a higher average number of punches landed in the scoring zone due to their higher activity profile, as indicated in amateur boxing studies (El Ashker, 2011; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020) and other striking sports with similar results (Ouergui et al., 2013). To win in boxing competitions, the ability to maintain a high number of punches during the fight is required (El Ashker, 2011).

Finally, possible relationships between certain variables that could define the profiles of world champions and victory are observed. Four variables stand out from the others: %PL (rho = .63), AVG PLxR (rho = .59), AVG PPLxR (rho = .51) and %PPL (rho = .67), and would reinforce the idea that the higher the proportions, the greater the boxer's performance and the more likely he is to win a fight. It is observed that the winners have a better punching accuracy average during fight (31.84% PL) than the losers (20.84% PL), obtain greater precision in relation to Power Punches, 106.84% PPL and 64.97 PPL% respectively, and achieve also better activity results during the round. At the same time, the winners take more punches during the round (13.31 AVG PLxR) than the losers (7.81 AVG PLxR) and also obtain better results when it comes to Power Punches Landed, with 10.00 AVG PPLxR and 5.72 AVG PPLxR respectively, confirming the importance of precision during these events (El Ashker, 2011; Puchol & Caparrós, 2020) and that possibly these results are due to a more precise physical preparation (Santos-Junior & Franchini, 2021).

Table	3.

Tuble 5.
U Mann Whitney Test for analysed variables. Difference between winners and losers.

				95% CI for Rank- Biserial Correlation				
	W	р	Rank-Biserial Correlation	Lower	Upper			
TPT	59729.5	< .01	.16	.07	.25			
TPL	74220	< .01	.45	.37	.51			
%PL	88426	< .01	.72	.68	.76			
AVG PTxR	67599	< .01	.32	.23	.39			
AVG PLxR	86345	< .01	.68	.63	.73			
JT	60839.5	< .01	.18	.1	.27			
AVG JL.ROUND	77871.5	< .01	.52	.45	.58			
AVG JTxR	66215	< .01	.29	.2	.37			
JL	72043	< .01	.4	.33	.47			
% JL	74375.5	< .01	.45	.37	.52			
AVG PPLxR	81782.5	< .01	.59	.53	.65			
PPL	71856	< .01	.4	.32	.47			
AVG PTxR	63007.5	< .01	.23	.14	.31			
PPT	57804	<01	.12	.04	.21			
%PPP	90908.5	< .01	.77	.73	.8			

Despite the consistency of the results obtained in this study, it has some limitations. The punching numbers scarcely distinguished between offensive actions without considering the defensive actions, as in previous amateur boxing studies (Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). They only differentiated between the types of jab and power punches, and did not include others such as hooks and/or uppercuts (Finlay, 2022), for example. Nor was it possible to obtain results of temporary parameters during the round (Slimani et al., 2017), such as footwork time, among others (Puchol & Caparrós, 2020). Although the results show world champion profiles, this is not a guarantee of success since in combat sports, fighters are continually adapting to the opponent's behavior and demands (Krabben et al., 2019). Finally, a larger sample would be needed in other categories to reinforce the study. It should be noted that there are profiles in which less data was considered, since boxers in certain categories may be too young for professional boxing (Tasiopoulos & Nikolaidis, 2022), so they offer a limited registry base.

#### Conclusions

Successful fighters in modern boxing have a high activity profile and good punching accuracy, with %PL, AVG PLxR, AVG PPLxR and %PPL standing out for their relationship to victory. The fighters of the different weight classes have a homogeneous average precision of punches thrown, with the exception of power punches in the round, which could suggest that the impact force produced may be a determining factor in the different weights. These results would provide some indicators that would help to adopt performance strategies for these categories in question.

## **Practical applications**

The definition of boxing profiles would indicate the rhythms of punching activity with respect to offensive actions during the fight as well as during each round. Through observational ecological analysis, specific aspects of boxing events and boxers can be distinguished and identified with the aim of supporting coaches as well as fighters in terms of improving sports performance.

## **Compliance with ethical standards**

This article did not receive any sources of financial support. This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

# Acknowledgments

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

- Barley, O. R., Chapman, D. W., Guppy, S. N., & Abbiss, C. R. (2019). Considerations when assessing endurance in combat sport athletes. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 10(MAR), 1– 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2019.00205
- Batista, M. A. S., Sequeira, D., Gancho, H., & Fernandes, J. (2022). Predominance of techniques analysis used in the final rounds of judo international competitions scoring for the Olympic ranking: A biomechanical approach. *Retos*, 46, 833–842.

https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v46.94 538

- Bianco, M., Loosemore, M., Daniele, G., Palmieri, V., Faina, M., & Zeppilli, P. (2013). Amateur boxing in the last 59 years. Impact of rules changes on the type of verdicts recorded and implications on boxers' health. *British Journal* of Sports Medicine, 47(7), 452–457. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2012-091771
- Bridge, C. A., Jones, M. A., & Drust, B. (2011). The activity profile in international taekwondo competition is modulated by weight category. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 6(3), 344–357. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.6.3.344
- Davis, P., Benson, P. R., Pitty, J. D., Connorton, A. J., & Waldock, R. (2015). The Activity Profile of Elite Male Amateur Boxing. International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 10(1), 53–57. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2013-0474
- Davis, P., Benson, P. R., Waldock, R., & Connorton, A. J. (2016). Performance analysis of elite female amateur boxers and comparison with their male counterparts. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 11(1), 55–60. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.2014-0133
- Davis, P., Connorton, A. J., Driver, S., Anderson, S., & Waldock, R. (2018). The activity profile of elite male amateur boxing after the 2013 rule changes. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 32(12), 3441–3446.

https://doi.org/10.1519/jsc.00000000001864

- Davis, P., Wittekind, A., & Beneke, R. (2013). Amateur boxing: Activity profile of winners and losers. *International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance*, 8(1), 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijspp.8.1.84
- Dunn, E. C., Humberstone, C. E., Fiona Iredale, K., Martin,
  D. T., & Blazevich, A. J. (2017). Human behaviours associated with dominance in elite amateur boxing bouts: A comparison of winners and losers under the Ten Point Must System. *PLoS ONE*, *12*(12), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0188675
- El-Ashker, S., Chaabene, H., Negra, Y., Prieske, O., & Granacher, U. (2018). Cardio-respiratory endurance responses following a simulated 3 × 3 minutes amateur boxing contest in elite level boxers. *Sports*, *6*(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/sports6040119
- El Ashker, S. (2011). Technical and tactical aspects that differentiate winning and losing performances in boxing. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*, 11(2), 356–364.

https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.2011.11868555

- Finlay, M. J. (2022). World Heavyweight Championship boxing: The past 30+ years of the male division. *PLoS ONE*, *17*(1 January), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263038
- Franchini, E., Cormark, S., & Takito, M. Y. (2019). Effects of High-Intensity Interval Training on Olympic Combat Sports Athletes' Performance and Physiological Adaptation A Systematic Review. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 33(1), 242–252. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.000000000002957
- García Pazmiño, M. A., García Ucha, F., Arévalo García, N. A., & García Pazmiño, S. T. (2018). Presiones Deportivas y Disposición Óptima Combativa (Sports Pressures and Optimal Combative Disposition). *Retos*, 2041(35), 335–340. https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i35.61911
- Guidetti, L., Musulin, A., & Baldari, C. (2002). Physiological factors in middleweight boxing performance. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*, 42(3), 309–314. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12094121/
- Halperin, I., Chapman, D. W., Thompson, K. G., & Abbiss, C. (2019). False-performance feedback does not affect punching forces and pacing of elite boxers. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 37(1), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2018.1482526
- Hopkins, W. G. (2002). A Scale of Magnitudes for Effect Statics. Internet Society for Sports Science. http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/index.html
- Hristovski, R., Davids, K., Araújo, D., & Button, C. (2006). How Boxers Decide to Punch a Target: Emergent Behaviour in Nonlinear Dynamical Movement Systems. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine*, 5(CSSI), 60–73. http://www.jssm.org
- Hughes, M. D., & Bartlett, R. M. (2002). The use of performance indicators in performance analysis. *Journal of Sports* Sciences, 20(10), 739–754. https://doi.org/10.1080/026404102320675602
- IBA. (2021). IBA Technical & Competition Rules. https://www.iba.sport/wpcontent/uploads/2022/02/IBA-Technical-and-Competition-Rules\_20.09.21\_Updated\_.pdf

International Boxing Federation. (2022). https://www.ibf-usbaboxing.com/index.php/ratings/ibf-ratings

- Kirk, C. (2018). Does anthropometry influence technical factors in competitive mixed martial arts? *Human Movement*, 19(2), 46–59. https://doi.org/10.5114/hm.2018.74059
- Kojman, Y., Beeching, K., Gomez, M. A., Parmar, N., & Nicholls, S. B. (2022). The role of debriefing in enhancing learning and development in professional boxing. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*, 22(2), 250–260.

https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.2022.2042640

- Krabben, K., Orth, D., & van der Kamp, J. (2019). Combat as an Interpersonal Synergy: An Ecological Dynamics Approach to Combat Sports. *Sports Medicine*, 49(12), 1825– 1836. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-019-01173-y
- Kruszewski, M., Kruszewski, A., Kuźmicki, S., Sklepiński, Ł., Kępa, G., & Landowski, K. (2016). Boxing techniques based on the analysis of boxing tournament finals during Olympic Games in London in 2012. *Journal of Combat Sports* and Martial Arts, 7(2), 61–66. https://doi.org/10.5604/20815735.1224961
- Lenetsky, S., Brughelli, M., Nates, R. J., Neville, J. G., Cross, M. R., & Lormier, A. V. (2020). Defining the Phases of Boxing Punches: A Mixed-Method Approach. *Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research*, 34(4), 1040–1051. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.00000000002895
- McCrory, P., Falvey, É., & Turner, M. (2012). Returning to the golden age of boxing. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 46(7), 459–460. https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2012-091276
- Morton, J. P., Robertson, C., Sutton, L., & MacLaren, D. P.
  M. (2010). Making the weight: A case study from professional boxing. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism*, 20(1), 80–85. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsnem.20.1.80
- Murugappan, K. R., Reale, R., Baribeau, V., O'Gara, B. P., Mueller, A., & Sarge, T. (2021). Rapid weight gain following weight cutting in male professional boxers. *Physician and Sportsmedicine*, 00(00), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913847.2021.1960780
- O'Donoghue, P. (2009). Research methods for sports performance analysis. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203878309
- Ouergui, I., Hssin, N., Franchini, E., Gmada, N., & Bouhlel, E. (2013). Technical and tactical analysis of high level kickboxing matches. *International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport*, 13(2), 294–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.2013.11868649
- Pic, M. (2018). Quality, height, age and home advantage in boxing. *RICYDE: Revista Internacional de Ciencias Del Deporte*, 14(52), 174–187. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5232/ricyde2018.05 207 RICYDE.
- Pic, M., & Jonsson, G. K. (2021). Professional boxing analysis with T-Patterns. *Physiology and Behavior*, 232(January). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2021.113329
- Pierce, J. D., Reinbold, K. A., Lyngard, B. C., Goldman, R. J., & Pastore, C. M. (2006). Direct Measurement of Punch Force During Six Professional Boxing Matches. *Journal of*

uantitative Analysis in Sports, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.2202/1559-0410.1004

- Podhurskyi, S. E., & Pavlenko, I. A. (2021). Differentiated approach to the development of speed-strength capabilities of qualified Muay-Thai athletes, taking into account weight categories. *Retos*, 40, 365–374. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v0i40.8 3499
- Puchol, V., & Caparrós, T. (2020). Methodological analysis of boxing activity profile by category. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport*, 20(3), 2052–2060. https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2020.s3277
- Ruddock, A., James, L., French, D., Rogerson, D., Driller, M., & Hembrough, D. (2021). High-intensity conditioning for combat athletes: Practical recommendations. *Applied Sciences* (*Switzerland*), 11(22). https://doi.org/10.3390/app112210658
- Santos-Junior, R., & Franchini, E. (2021). Developing strengthendurance for combat sports athletes. *Revista de Artes Marciales Asiáticas*, *16*(1s), 174. https://doi.org/10.18002/rama.v16i1s.7004
- Schinke, R. J., & Ramsay, M. (2009). World title boxing: From early beginnings to the first bell. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 8(CSSI-3), 1–4.
- Silva, J. J., Del Vecchio, F., Picanço, L., Takito, M. Y., & Franchini, E. (2011). Time-Motion analysis in Muay-Thai and Kick-Boxing amateur matches. *Journal of Human Sport & Exercise*, 6(3), 490–496. https://doi.org/10.4100/jbse.2011.63.02
- Slimani, M., Chaabène, H., Davis, P., Franchini, E., Cheour, F., & Chamari, K. (2017). Performance Aspects and Physiological Responses in Male Amateur Boxing Competitions: A Brief Review. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research, 31(4), 1132–1141. https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.000000000001643
- Tasiopoulos, I., & Nikolaidis, P. T. (2022). Analysis of Olympic and World boxing medalists from 1904 to 2019: The role of age, height, weight categories and nationality. *Biomedical Human Kinetics*, 14(1), 159–168. https://doi.org/10.2478/bhk-2022-0020
- Thomson, E. (2015). The development of an amateur boxing simulation protocol. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Chester]. University of Chester Digital Repository.
- Thomson, E., & Lamb, K. (2016). The technical demands of amateur boxing: Effect of contest outcome, weight and ability. International Journal of Performance Analysis in Sport, 16(1), 203–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.2016.11868881
- Thomson, E., Lamb, K., & Nicholas, C. (2013). The development of a reliable amateur boxing performance analysis template. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *31*(5), 516–528. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/24748668.200 7.11868388
- World Boxing Association. (2022). https://www.wbaboxing.com/wba-ranking
- World Boxing Council. (2022). https://wbcboxing.com/wbceng/ratings
- World Boxing Organization. (2022). https://wboboxing.com/rankings/