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## Introduction

Each year the National Hockey League(NHL), a North American professional ice hockey league, assigns eligible players to its 30 teams via the NHL Entry Draft. For each of seven rounds, each team has one selection though these selections or picks may be traded for other players, for other draft picks or for a combination of these two. Additional picks may be awarded by the NHL to a team for losing a restricted free agent. In this paper we analyze data related to the National Hockey League draft and de velop a value pick chart for establishing the value of a given selection. Thus, from the proposed value pick chart in this paper we can calculate the combinations of picks required to get equal value for the $1^{\text {st }}$ or $3^{\text {rd }}$ or $5^{\text {th }}$ pick in the NHL Entry Draft.

## Data

The analyses in this paper are based upon players selected in the NHL Entry Drafts from 1988 to 1997. These data were obtained from www.hockey-reference.com with additional information from www.nhl.com and www.eliteprospects.com. The choice of this ten-year period is based on a balance of two differing interests. We want to ensure that we base our metrics on career performance for players. Thus, we want players whose careers are complete or very nearly so. On the other hand, we want to construct our analyses on the most recently available information. For each of the ten years from 1988 to 1997 we have the first 215 players selected in each NHL Entry Draft. We restricted our interest to the first 215 players selected since the last five NHL drafts have had between 210 and 213 players selected. It is noteworthy that there were changes to player eligibility occurred in 1991 which is during the period of these data (NHL.com, 2008).

For each player, we have their selection number, the position they play, the NHL team that selected them, the amateur team from whom they were drafted and a variety of career performance metrics. The selection number is the place in the order of the selected players. That is, the fourth player taken in a given draft will have a value for selection of 4 ; the $137^{\text {th }}$ selection taken will have a value for selection of 137. The players position is broken into one of three categories: forward (F), defenseman (D) and goalie (G). The performance metrics that we have for forwards and defensemen include the number of career NHL games played, the career number of goals, the career number of assists, the career points which is goals plus assists, and the career plus/minus which is a measure of even strength goals scored minus goals given up when a given player is on the ice. For goalies we have the following career performance metrics: number of career NHL games, wins, losses, overtime or shootout losses, career save percentage and career goals against per game average.

[^0]In the analyses of the next section we will focus on games played as it will give us a metric that will allow for straightforward comparisons of players across positions. This is primarily because our ultimate goal in this paper is to produce an assessment of the value of each NHL draft pick. In doing this we follow Schuckers (2011) who used a similar measure for National Football League players. There have been some attempts at an NHL draft pick chart, see Anonymous (2011) and Tango (2007) but their approach is not as detailed as the one we propose here.

## Analyses

In this section we analyze and summarize the observations and the data from the first 210 selections in each of the NHL Entry Drafts from 1988 to 1997. During that time there were 696 D's, 1212 F's and 192 G's selected. A typical NHL roster will include 12 F's, 6 D's and 2 G's. Defensemen seem to be taken at a slightly proportion than rosters would indicate would be the case. Using the current 30 picks per round, Table 1 has the number of selections by position in each of the first seven rounds. From that table we can see that the distribution of positions by rounds is roughly consistent though there seems to be a tendency to take fewer D's and more F's in the second round than in other rounds.

Table 1: Distribution of Position by Round

| Round | Number of D's <br> Selected | Number of F's <br> Selected | Number of G’s <br> Selected |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 105 | 175 | 20 |
| 2 | 78 | 192 | 30 |
| 3 | 97 | 181 | 22 |
| 4 | 110 | 156 | 34 |
| 5 | 103 | 166 | 31 |
| 6 | 95 | 181 | 24 |
| 7 | 108 | 161 | 31 |

Table 2: Summary of the Distribution of Games Played by Position

|  | D | F | G |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $50^{\text {tII }}$ percentile | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 69 | 193 | 83 |
| $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 644 | 749 | 357 |
| $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 834 | 970 | 535 |
| $99^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 1148 | 1243 | 742 |
| Mean | 143 | 183 | 95 |

Table 2 has summaries of the distribution of games played for each position. The NHL regular season is 82 games. From Table 2 we see that over $50 \%$ of drafted players at each position never played one game in the NHL. By position, $40.5 \%$ of drafted D's played at least one NHL game while $49.7 \%$ of F's and $46.4 \%$ of G's play at least one game in the NHL. It is clear that the concentration of talent based upon games played for NHL players is in the top $10 \%$ of draft picks. These are the first 21 picks. The distribution of each position is heavily right skewed. The average number of games played by drafted forward exceeds that of defensemen whose average in turn exceeds that of goalies. Similarly the top $25 \%$ of drafted forwards played more than 193 games while the top $25 \%$ of defensemen and goalies played 69 and 83 games, respectively. It is worth noting that the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile for drafted D's is substantially larger than the $90^{\text {th }}$ percentile for drafted G's.

By round the percent of players that play at least one NHL game, appearing in the NHL, is $91.7 \%$ (Round 1), $65.0 \%, 56.7 \%, 38.0 \%, 32.3 \%, 27.3 \%$, and $21.0 \%$, respectively. For determination of value we further investigate the probability of playing more than 200 NHL games. Figure 1 has a smoothed plot (via LOESS regression) of the probability that a given draft selection will play at least 200 NHL games. To build that curve we fit and splined together two non-parametric regression curves using the loess function in R software to regress games played onto selection for each. The first line was fit with a small window for curve-fitting (span=0.2) while the second was fit with a larger window ( $\mathrm{span}=0.5$ ) to ensure monotonicity and smoothness. This was done to be sure to accurately capture the edge effects present for smaller selection numbers. We used the first LOESS curve to fit the change in probability of playing 200 games through the first 45 selections and the second LOESS curve was fit to the remaining selections through 215 though here we only plot the predicted values through selection 210. For the $1^{\text {st }}$ overall draft pick there is a very high fitted probability, approximately $98 \%$, of playing more than 200 games. That probability decreases in an steeply linear manner until approximately the $45^{\text {th }}$ pick and then drops approximately in a linear though less steep fashion through the $210^{\text {th }}$ pick which only has an $8 \%$ change of playing 200 NHL games.


Figure 1: Probability of Playing 200 NHL Games by Selection
Table 3: Summary of Probability of Playing More Than 200 NHL Games by Position

| Position | Round 1 | Round 2 | Round 3 | Round 4 | Round 5 | Round 6 | Round 7 | Total | Overall <br> Probability |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| F | 0.35 | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.08 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.03 | 306 | $25 \%$ |
| D | 0.43 | 0.12 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 145 | $21 \%$ |
| G | 0.33 | 0.25 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 36 | $19 \%$ |

Table 3 gives a breakdown of when players who played more than 200 NHL games were drafted. Note that this is not a table of probabilities of success but rather a table describing what percentage of players that appeared in more than 200 games came from each round. It does not account for the total number of each type of player selected in a given round. The overall rate of playing 200 games by position is given in the last column of Table 3. Of the F's that were selected $25 \%$ played more than 200 games, while $21 \%$ of D's and $19 \%$ of G's played more than 200 games. We note that there are differences between the positions in where players that played more than 200 games are selected. This is especially true among the first three rounds. Among the D's that played more than 200 games, $43 \%$ were selected in the $1^{\text {st }}$ round while only $35 \%$ of comparable F 's and $33 \%$ of comparable G's came from that same round. A higher percentage of the G's that played 200 games were selected in the $2^{\text {nd }}$ round, $25 \%$, than F's $(18 \%)$ or D's $(12 \%)$ taken in that same round. After the $3^{\text {rd }}$ round the portions of
each position that played more than 200 games is just under $10 \%$ and seems to be roughly the same for each position. Note that total number of players that have played more than 200 games closely matches the percentages for a typical NHL roster of 12 F's, 6 D's and 2 G's.

We next consider career games played. A graph plotting the number of games played (GP) against the selection number is given in Figure 2. As we saw in Table 2 the distribution at each selection number has long tails to the


Figure 2: Games Played versus Selection
higher values of GP. With some attention it is possible to notice that a higher density of higher values for GP are found at lower selection values. That is, lower selections, on average, have higher numbers of games played. We note that GP is an imperfect measure of comparison and that not all games played are equivalent; 500 games by a first line forward who scores 30 goals per season is not the same as 500 by a third line checking forward. For example, Ziggy Palffy a forward played 684 games and had 713 points while Kent Manderville, also a forward, played in 646 games but had only 104 points. However GP is the chosen measure since it allows for a comparison of careers across positions.

Table 4: Summary of Distribution of Games Played by Selection Round

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1^{\text {st }} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2^{\text {nd }} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3^{\mathrm{ra}} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\mathrm{th}} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5^{\mathrm{th}} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6^{\mathrm{th}} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7^{\mathrm{th}} \\ & \text { Round } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 436 | 22 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $75^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 878 | 281 | 208 | 32 | 22 | 3 | 0 |
| $90^{\text {LI }}$ percentile | 1071 | 736 | 691 | 293 | 381 | 393 | 80 |
| $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 1200 | 859 | 892 | 594 | 580 | 628 | 372 |
| $99^{\text {th }}$ percentile | 1363 | 1135 | 1175 | 901 | 989 | 1032 | 903 |
| Mean | 482 | 192 | 182 | 84 | 86 | 87 | 50 |



Figure 3: Fitted LOESS line for Predicting Games Played from Selection

Table 5 further breaks down GP by position and round. The mean is given for each combination followed by the standard deviation in ()'s. Forwards in a given round average more games played than D's or G's but they also have similarly large standard deviations through the first six rounds. The general trend that we saw for the mean GP of all players in Table 4 is present here for F's and D's. That is, there is a steep drop-off in performance through the middle of the $2^{\text {nd }}$ round which is then followed by a bit of a leveling which is then followed by a gradual decrease in games played. Goalies do not follow this trend. There is a sharp drop-off in performance in the early rounds but there does not seem to be a gradual descent in performance after the $2^{\text {nd }}$ round. Rather performance seems to be level for goalies for rounds 3 through 7 .

Table 5: Mean (and Standard Deviation) of Games Played by Position and Round

| Position | Round 1 | Round 2 | Round 3 | Round 4 | Round 5 | Round 6 | Round 7 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| F | $530(457)$ | $210(316)$ | $207(330)$ | $104(223)$ | $110(227)$ | $93(233)$ | $31(119)$ |
| D | $435(398)$ | $163(306)$ | $167(307)$ | $64(172)$ | $57(186)$ | $89(228)$ | $72(218)$ |
| G | $320(305)$ | $148(218)$ | $42(83)$ | $59(140)$ | $45(120)$ | $36(101)$ | $68(174)$ |

## NHL Draft Value Pick Chart

Having summarized the NHL draft data in the previous section, we now propose a value pick chart for the NHL draft based upon player performance. The goal of a pick chart is to allow teams to have a single currency for the trading of draft selections, cf Schuckers (2011). To build the NHL Pick Value Draft Chart that we give below we fit and splined together two non-parametric regression curves using the loess function in R software to regress games played onto selection. We take the same basic approach for the relationship between games played and selection as we did for predicting the probability of playing at least 200 games. We used the first loess curve to fit the change in games played through the first 45 selections and the second loess curve was fit to the remaining selections through 215 though here we only report the predicted values through selection 210 . This type of model was fit to players selected before and after the change in eligibility of players for the 1992 draft and found that the
differences between these two models was not substantial. Figure 3 plots our combined curve through the observed values of games played and selection.

The NHL Draft Value Pick Chart that we propose here is based upon the curve given in Figure 3. The complete details of this chart are given in the Appendix to this paper. The maximal value given to the first selection is 917 while the smallest value is 51 given to the $210^{\text {th }}$ selection. This chart assigns value to each pick based upon the predicted number of games that a given player will play in their career. Consequently, based upon this chart the first pick is about 18 times more valuable that the last pick. The chart like the curve in Figure 3 has large changes in value for early draft picks, i.e. those from lower selections, and smaller changes in value for later draft picks. Thus, the values assigned to the for the $10^{\text {th }}, 50^{\text {th }}, 100^{\text {th }}$ and $200^{\text {th }}$ picks are $565,185,107$ and 57 , respectively which represent the predicted number of games that we expect those picks will play in the NHL.

## Discussion

In this paper we have proposed a new draft value pick chart for the National Hockey League. This chart is based upon the observed performance of players selected in the 1988 to 1997 NHL Entry Draft. Utilizing nonparametric regression we smoothed the games played for each of the first 210 selections in the NHL Entry Draft. This chart provides a common currency for teams to evaluate the value of the draft selections for trading those selections or for trading those selections for players. For example, if a team would like to trade for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ overall draft selection, another team might offer the $8^{\text {th }}$ overall selection and the $32^{\text {st }}$ overall selection to gives a total value of $629+246=875$ which is close to the value for the $2^{\text {nd }}$ overall pick of 871 . Or a team might offer the $14^{\text {th }}$, $44^{\text {th }}, 104^{\text {th }}$ and $164^{\text {th }}$ selections with a total value of $456+196+101+75=828$ for the $3^{\text {rd }}$ overall selection which has approximately the same value of 826 . We recognize that predicted performance is not the only criterion for the value of a draft selection. Team needs, financial constraints and other considerations might suggest adjustments to the values for this chart. We have based our valuation of selections purely on games played, a metric that is common and consistent for all positions. One significant advantage to using this metric is that we can evaluate trades including current players and determine if the number of predicted games played is the same for each team involved in the trade.
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APPENDIX

## Proposed NHL Draft Value Pick Chart

Round 1 Value Round 2 Value Round 3 Value Round 4 Value Round 5 Value Round 6 Value Round 7 Value

| 1 | 917 | 31 | 255 | 61 | 175 | 91 | 128 | 121 | 88 | 151 | 79 | 181 | 67 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 871 | 32 | 246 | 62 | 176 | 92 | 125 | 122 | 88 | 152 | 79 | 182 | 66 |
| 3 | 826 | 33 | 237 | 63 | 176 | 93 | 122 | 123 | 87 | 153 | 79 | 183 | 66 |
| 4 | 783 | 34 | 228 | 64 | 177 | 94 | 119 | 124 | 87 | 154 | 78 | 184 | 65 |
| 5 | 741 | 35 | 222 | 65 | 177 | 95 | 117 | 125 | 86 | 155 | 78 | 185 | 65 |
| 6 | 702 | 36 | 217 | 66 | 177 | 96 | 114 | 126 | 86 | 156 | 78 | 186 | 64 |
| 7 | 665 | 37 | 213 | 67 | 176 | 97 | 113 | 127 | 85 | 157 | 77 | 187 | 64 |
| 8 | 629 | 38 | 211 | 68 | 176 | 98 | 111 | 128 | 85 | 158 | 77 | 188 | 63 |
| 9 | 596 | 39 | 209 | 69 | 174 | 99 | 109 | 129 | 85 | 159 | 77 | 189 | 63 |
| 10 | 565 | 40 | 208 | 70 | 173 | 100 | 107 | 130 | 85 | 160 | 77 | 190 | 62 |
| 11 | 535 | 41 | 206 | 71 | 171 | 101 | 106 | 131 | 84 | 161 | 76 | 191 | 62 |
| 12 | 507 | 42 | 203 | 72 | 169 | 102 | 104 | 132 | 84 | 162 | 76 | 192 | 61 |
| 13 | 481 | 43 | 199 | 73 | 167 | 103 | 103 | 133 | 84 | 163 | 76 | 193 | 60 |
| 14 | 456 | 44 | 196 | 74 | 165 | 104 | 101 | 134 | 84 | 164 | 75 | 194 | 60 |
| 15 | 433 | 45 | 192 | 75 | 164 | 105 | 99 | 135 | 84 | 165 | 75 | 195 | 59 |
| 16 | 413 | 46 | 189 | 76 | 162 | 106 | 98 | 136 | 84 | 166 | 75 | 196 | 59 |
| 17 | 395 | 47 | 188 | 77 | 160 | 107 | 97 | 137 | 83 | 167 | 74 | 197 | 58 |
| 18 | 379 | 48 | 186 | 78 | 158 | 108 | 95 | 138 | 83 | 168 | 74 | 198 | 58 |
| 19 | 364 | 49 | 186 | 79 | 156 | 109 | 94 | 139 | 83 | 169 | 73 | 199 | 57 |
| 20 | 350 | 50 | 185 | 80 | 155 | 110 | 93 | 140 | 83 | 170 | 73 | 200 | 57 |
| 21 | 336 | 51 | 185 | 81 | 153 | 111 | 92 | 141 | 82 | 171 | 72 | 201 | 56 |
| 22 | 324 | 52 | 184 | 82 | 151 | 112 | 91 | 142 | 82 | 172 | 72 | 202 | 55 |
| 23 | 315 | 53 | 183 | 83 | 149 | 113 | 90 | 143 | 82 | 173 | 71 | 203 | 55 |
| 24 | 308 | 54 | 182 | 84 | 147 | 114 | 89 | 144 | 82 | 174 | 70 | 204 | 54 |
| 25 | 302 | 55 | 180 | 85 | 145 | 115 | 89 | 145 | 81 | 175 | 70 | 205 | 54 |
| 26 | 297 | 56 | 178 | 86 | 142 | 116 | 89 | 146 | 81 | 176 | 69 | 206 | 53 |
| 27 | 291 | 57 | 176 | 87 | 140 | 117 | 89 | 147 | 81 | 177 | 69 | 207 | 53 |
| 28 | 283 | 58 | 176 | 88 | 137 | 118 | 88 | 148 | 80 | 178 | 68 | 208 | 52 |
| 29 | 275 | 59 | 175 | 89 | 134 | 119 | 88 | 149 | 80 | 179 | 68 | 209 | 52 |
| 30 | 265 | 60 | 175 | 90 | 131 | 120 | 88 | 150 | 80 | 180 | 67 | 210 | 51 |
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