

WTA Tour
Statistical Abstract
1999

Robert B. Waltz

©1999 by Robert B. Waltz and Tennis News

Reproduction and/or distribution for profit prohibited

Contents

Introduction

1999 In Review: The Top Players

The Final Top Twenty-Five
The Beginning Top Twenty
Summary of Changes, beginning to end of 1999

All the Players in the Top Ten in 1999

The Complete Top Ten Based on WTA (Best 18) Statistics
The Complete Top Ten under the 1996 Ranking System
Ranking Fluctuation
Top Players Sorted by Median Ranking

Tournament Results

Tournaments Played/Summary of Results for Top Players
Tournament Winners by Date (High-Tier Events)
Tournament Winners by Tournament Type (High-Tier Events)
Winners at Smaller Tournaments (Tier III, IVA, IVB)
Number of Tournament Wins for Each Player
Fraction of Tournaments Won
Summary: Tiers of Tournaments Played and Average Tier
Points earned week-by-week
Tournament Results (Points Earned), Sorted from Most to Least

Alternate Rankings

Total Points Ranking (1997 Ranking System)
Points Per Tournament, Minimum 14 (1996 Ranking System)
Best 14
Best 18 with Slotted Point Awards (ATP Year 2000 Award)
Total Wins
Winning Percentage

Other Alternate Rankings

Total Round Points
Total Quality Points
Round Points Per Tournament
Quality Points Per Tournament
Quality/Round Points Equalized: 2Q+R Per Tournament
Winning Percentage Adjusting for Tournament Strength
Wins Per Tournament
Percentage of Possible Points Earned

Head to Head — Results against Top Players

The Top 20 Head to Head

Wins Over Top Players
Matches Played/Won against the (Final) Top Twenty
Won/Lost Versus the Top Players (Based on Rankings at the Time of the Match)
Won/Lost Versus the Top Players (Based on Final Rankings)
Statistics/Rankings Based on Head-to-Head Numbers
Total Wins over Top Ten Players
Winning Percentage against Top Ten Players
Wins Against Top Ten Players Analysed

How They Earned Their Points

Fraction of Points Earned in Slams
Quality Versus Round Points
Percentage of Points Earned on Each Surface

Consistency

Standard Deviation of Scores by Tournament
Early-Round Losses
Frequency of Early Losses
Winning Percentage against Non-Top-20 Players
Worst Losses
Worst Losses Based on Rankings at the Time
Worst Losses Based on Year-End Rankings

Fraction of Points Earned in Biggest Win

Winning and Losing Streaks
Number of Significant Results
Points Per Quarter
First Quarter
Second Quarter
Third Quarter
Fourth Quarter

Slam Results

Surface Rankings

Hardcourts
Summary of Hardcourt Results

Winning Percentage on Hardcourts
Points Per Tournament on Hardcourts
Best and Worst Results on Hardcourts

Clay

Summary of Clay Results
Winning Percentage on Clay
Points Per Tournament on Clay
Best and Worst Results on Clay

Grass

Summary of Grass Results

Indoors

Summary of Indoor Results
Winning Percentage Indoors
Points Per Tournament Indoors
Best and Worst Results Indoors

All-Surface Players

Tournament Wins by Surface

Assorted Statistics

The Busiest Players on the Tour

Total Tour Matches Played by Top Players
Total Tour Events Played by the Top 150

The Biggest Tournaments

Tournament Strength Based on the Four Top Players Present
The Top Tournaments Based on Top Players Present

Strongest Tournament Performances

Bagels

The Dominance of the Big Four

Projections for 2000

Doubles

The Final Top 25 in Doubles
Team Doubles Titles, Sorted from Most to Least
The Top Fifteen Players/Results
Doubles Tournament Winners by Date (High-Tier Events)
Doubles Winning Percentages for the Top Fifteen
Doubles Winning Percentages for the Top Teams

Alternate Doubles Rankings

Rankings under the 1996 Ranking System (Divisor, Minimum 14)
Points Per Tournament, No Minimum Divisor

Introduction

When you see the report that so-and-so is the #1 female tennis player, what do you think? What does it mean when a player earns the “#1 ranking?” What *is* a ranking?

There are many answers, ranging from simple to complex. A simple answer is, “A ranking is a way for assessing players’ performances and seeding them in tournaments.” This is the *purpose* of the rankings.

A technical answer, for female tennis players, is, “A number, the sum of the points earned in a player’s best eighteen tournaments, where points are awarded according to a system based on the prize money the tournament offers and the quality of the opposition one faces.” This is the *method* behind the rankings.

But the usual answer is, “It’s a way to determine who is the best player.”

But “best” can mean a lot of things. The player who is best overall may not be the best on clay. Or may have moved to the top based partly on health (ability to play a full schedule). Some players are more consistent, others streaky. The best player may not have the best winning percentage (in both 1998 and 1999, for instance, the player with the best winning percentage wound up #2), or the most wins, or the most titles. In fact, the #1 ranking guarantees only one thing: That the player has done what it takes to be #1.

Thus the official tennis rankings, while they have great importance to the players (since they determine seeds and tournament admission) are actually just numbers. They do not automatically say who is the best player (whatever “best” means); they simply say who has the highest point total under the WTA rules.

To fully understand a player’s game, we need to know much more than her ranking. We need to know she did on each surface. We need to know she fared against other top players. We need to know how many tournaments she won, and how often she suffered a first round defeat. A complete statistical picture of a player will involve a vast array of statistics, and involve many types of data.

What follows is an attempt to examine some of these subjects, at least for the top players. It is a statistical exercise, based mostly on the results for the WTA Top Twenty, designed to provide more perspective than the WTA’s simple point-counting game. It also offers some miscellaneous statistics of interest.

The purpose of this document is not to assert opinions. Of course, it is impossible to entirely avoid opinions, since (ahem!) I have some. These opinions perhaps influence which statistics I include. Nonetheless, this abstract exists primarily for the sake of the numbers. If there is commentary, it is intended to explain what the numbers mean or to bring out some especially salient point. (Hence the section on “Projections.”)

Depending on the statistic, data may be offered based only on the Top Ten, the Top Twenty, or the Top Twenty-Five (usually one of the latter two). It is assumed that the Top 5 in all categories will be on this list, and usually the Top 10.

We should add a few footnotes. First, unless otherwise specified, the “Top Ten” includes Steffi Graf (making it actually a “Top Eleven”), because Graf’s final point total would have made her #5, and because she earned points and won tournaments which would otherwise have gone to other players. Therefore she must be included. Similarly, Jana Novotna, whose final point total would have made her #19, is included in references to the Top Twenty (making it actually 22). This makes comparisons to other years difficult, but there is little other choice.

Second, the decision to exclude exhibitions (Grand Slam Cup, Fed Cup) is deliberate and necessary; the WTA should not include these events in their statistics! This is because these events fill their draws by means not based on the WTA rankings. This, in turn, means that they are not valid for statistical comparison.

The data in this document has been checked several times against multiple sources. But available records (especially for doubles) are often far from complete. No responsibility is assumed by the author or by Tennis News for any errors contained in this document, or for the nature or meaning of any statistics presented.

1999 In Review: The Top Players

The Final Top Twenty-Five

For purposes of reference, here are the Final 1999 Top 25 as determined by the WTA:

Final Rank	Player Name	Best 18 Score	Number of Tournaments	Gap from Preceding	Began Year At
1	Martina Hingis	6074	19	-	#2
2	Lindsay Davenport	4841	18	1233	#1
3	Venus Williams	4378	17	463	#5
4	Serena Williams	3021	11	1357	#20
5	Mary Pierce	2658	20	363	#7
6	Monica Seles	2310	13	348	#6
7	Nathalie Tauziat	2213	25	97	#10
8	Barbara Schett	2188	23	25	#23
9	Julie Halard-Decugis	1977	24	211	#22
10	Amelie Mauresmo	1906	15	71	#29
11	Amanda Coetzer	1846	25	60	#17
12	Anna Kournikova	1641	19	205	#13
13	Sandrine Testud	1635	25	6	#14
14	Dominique Van Roost	1621	25	14	#12
15	Conchita Martinez	1564	23	57	#8
16	Anke Huber	1548	26	16	#21
17	Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario	1435	18	113	#4
18	Elena Likhovtseva	1393	29	42	#26
19	Amy Frazier	1299	21	94	#42
20	Ruxandra Dragomir	1291	23	8	#38
21	Patty Schnyder	1189	24	102	#11
22	Chanda Rubin	1188	21	1	#34
23	Jennifer Capriati	1140	16	48	>100
24	Ai Sugiyama	1122	23	18	#18
25	Nathalie Déchy (see note)	1022	23	67	#48

Note: The Number of Tournaments shown here (and elsewhere in this document) does not match the number of tournaments listed by the WTA for certain players. This is because the WTA this year counted the Grand Slam Cup (which is an exhibition, and does not award ranking points) as a “tournament” — meaning that Hingis, Davenport, Venus and Serena Williams, Pierce, Schett, Mauresmo, and Sanchez-Vicario are all listed as having played one more tournament than they actually played. Similarly, the WTA won/lost records for players include Fed Cup, meaning that one or both sides of the equation is inaccurate. This document, in order to present accurate calculations, counts only actual *tournaments* as tournaments.

Additional Note: At the conclusion of the Chase Championships, Nathalie Déchy had an actual total of 1055 points, with 24 tournaments. This included 35 points earned at a Challenger played in December, 1998. It is not yet known whether Déchy will again play this (French) Challenger. The above assumes she will not (players of her current ranking rarely play Challengers), and adjusts her point total accordingly to match her anticipated year-end total. Her WTA ranking will not be affected whether she plays or not.

The Beginning Top Twenty

The Top 20 at the beginning of 1999 was significantly different:

Rank	Name	1999 Final Ranking	Net Change
1	Davenport	#2	-1
2	Hingis	#1	+1
3	Novotna	(retired; would be #19)	(-16)
4	Sanchez-Vicario	#17	-13
5	V. Williams	#3	+2
6	Seles	#6	- 0 -
7	Pierce	#5	+2
8	Martinez	#16	-8
9	Graf	(retired; would be #5)	(+4)
10	Tauziat	#7	+3
11	Schnyder	#21	-10
12	Van Roost	#14	-2
13	Kournikova	#12	+1
14	Testud	#13	+1
15	Spirlea	#35	-20
16	Zvereva	#27	-11
17	Coetzer	#11	+6
18	Sugiyama	#25	-7
19	Farina	#26	-7
20	S. Williams	#4	+16

Summary of Changes, beginning to end of 1999

Ranking Gains:

From outside the Top 20 into the Top 20: Schett, Halard-Decugis, Mauresmo, Huber, Likhovtseva, Frazier, Dragomir

From outside the Top 20 into the Top 10: Schett, Halard-Decugis, Mauresmo

From the Top 20 into the Top 10: Serena Williams

Ranking Losses:

Dropping out of the Top 20: Schnyder, Spirlea, Zvereva, Sugiyama, Farina (plus Graf, retired)

Dropping out of the Top 10 but remaining in the Top 20: Sanchez-Vicario, Martinez (plus Novotna, retired)

Dropping from the Top 10 to below the Top 20: None

Players who were in the Top 10 at beginning and end of the year: 6 — Hingis, Davenport, Venus Williams, Pierce, Seles, Tauziat (Graf would be in the list were she still ranked; she would be #5).

Players who were in the Top 20 at the beginning and end of the year: 13 — Hingis, Davenport, Venus Williams, Serena Williams, Pierce, Seles, Tauziat, Coetzer, Kournikova, Testud, Van Roost, Martinez, Sanchez-Vicario (Graf and Novotna would be in this list were they still ranked).

Two players who were in the Top 10 starting 1999 — Graf and Novotna — retired during the year. Graf was #3 at the time she announced her retirement; Novotna #18. We might note that, although four players dropped out of the Top Ten in 1999, only one of their replacements (Serena Williams) came from players ranked #11 to #20. The other three (Schett, Halard-Decugis, Mauresmo) came from below the Top Twenty.

All the Players in the Top Ten in 1999

The Complete Top Ten Based on WTA (Best 18) Statistics

The lists below show all players who have ranked in the Top 10 in 1999, with the highest rank achieved (total of 17 players; in 1998, 15 players spent part of the year in the Top Ten).

Coetzer (7)	Mauresmo (10)	Seles (3)
Davenport (1)	Novotna (3)	Tauziat (7)
Graf (3)	Pierce (5)	Van Roost (10)
Halard-Decugis (8)	Sanchez-Vicario (4)	S. Williams (4)
Hingis (1)	Schett (7)	V. Williams (3)
Martinez (8)	Schnyder (8)	

The following list shows all the players who have occupied a given position in the Top 10:

1. Davenport, Hingis
2. Davenport, Hingis
3. Graf, Novotna, Seles, V. Williams
4. Novotna, Sanchez-Vicario, Seles, S. Williams, V. Williams
5. Graf, Novotna, Pierce, Sanchez-Vicario, Seles, V. Williams
6. Graf, Novotna, Pierce, Sanchez-Vicario, Seles, S. Williams, V. Williams
7. Coetzer, Graf, Novotna, Pierce, Sanchez-Vicario, Schett, Tauziat, V. Williams
8. Coetzer, Graf, Halard-Decugis, Martinez, Pierce, Sanchez-Vicario, Schett, Schnyder, Tauziat, S. Williams
9. Coetzer, Graf, Halard-Decugis, Martinez, Novotna, Pierce, Sanchez-Vicario, Schnyder, Tauziat, S. Williams
10. Coetzer, Graf, Halard-Decugis, Martinez, Mauresmo, Novotna, Sanchez-Vicario, Schnyder, Tauziat, Van Roost, S. Williams

The Complete Top Ten under the 1996 Ranking System

This list shows all players who would have been in the Top 10 under the 1996 ranking system (total points divided by tournaments, minimum fourteen), with the highest ranking achieved. (For the list of the *final* Top 10 under this system, see the section on Alternate Rankings.)

Coetzer (10)	Martinez (9)	Schett (8)
Davenport (1)	Mauresmo (7)	Seles (3)
Graf (2)	Novotna (4)	Tauziat (10)
Halard-Decugis (8)	Pierce (6)	S. Williams (4)
Hingis (1)	Sanchez Vicario (6)	V. Williams (2)
Kournikova (8)	Schnyder (9)	

Ranking Fluctuation

The table below shows how each of the top players ranked in the course of the year. The tennis season is divided into half-month sections, and the players' rankings listed for each of the specified days. This is followed by the mean (average), median, and standard deviation (indicating how much a player's ranking varied in the course of the year. Thus Capriati, with a standard deviation of 32.8, showed the most ranking fluctuation in the course of the year, while Hingis and Davenport, with standard deviations of 0.4, showed the least variation).

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Mean	Median	Std.															
	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	15	30	(avg)	Median	Dev.												
Capriati	*														64.3	48	32.8												
Coetzer	17	16	15	12	9	9	9	16	16	16	12	12	10	9	9	9	7	9	7	8	10	11	11	11.3	10	3.2			
Davenport	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1.8	2	0.4	
Déchy	48	42	44	42	32	33	31	30	28	28	29	29	29	25	25	27	25	27	28	28	26	27	25			30.8	28	6.6	
Dragomir	38	38	42	40	38	39	37	31	31	36	28	26	26	27	26	28	23	21	21	22	21	21	20			29.6	28	7.4	
Farina	19	21	21	20	22	22	25	25	25	25	24	24	24	23	24	25	26	26	27	26	28	29	26			24.2	25	2.5	
Frazier	42	37	33	32	33	34	33	35	30	30	27	27	28	28	28	24	24	22	20	20	20	20	19			28.1	28	6.3	
Graf	9	8	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	6	6	3	3	3	3	3	†									5.4	5.5	2.0	
Halard-Decu	22	19	20	21	20	21	21	21	21	21	19	11	18	15	15	16	11	8	9	9	9	9	9			15.9	18	5.2	
Hingis	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1.2	1	0.4	
Huber	21	18	28	29	29	29	30	29	29	29	30	30	30	30	30	26	27	20	25	21	19	17	16			25.7	29	4.9	
Kournikova	13	13	12	11	11	13	20	13	13	15	18	18	17	13	13	12	14	15	16	15	13	12	12			14.0	13	2.4	
Likhovtseva	26	25	23	23	23	23	22	22	22	22	21	22	22	20	20	21	19	17	17	16	18	19	18			20.9	22	2.6	
Martinez	8	10	16	16	17	18	18	18	19	17	22	20	20	18	18	18	17	16	14	13	15	15	16			16.5	17	3.1	
Mauresmo	29	29	17	18	15	14	14	14	14	10	17	15	15	16	16	17	16	14	12	11	11	10	10			15.4	15	4.9	
Novotna	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	6	7	7	7	10	18	18	18	17	18	§		7.8	4.5	5.8	
Pierce	7	7	8	9	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	6	5	5			6.9	7	1.2
Rubin	34	31	29	28	26	24	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	24	23	23	21	25	24	25	25	23	22			24.7	23	3.1	
Sanchez-Vica	4	5	5	5	6	5	7	7	6	7	7	7	9	8	8	8	8	11	15	17	16	16	17			8.9	7	4.2	
Schett	23	20	19	19	19	20	19	19	20	20	16	14	13	11	12	13	12	7	8	7	7	8	8			14.5	14	5.3	
Schnyder	11	9	9	8	12	12	13	10	9	12	13	19	19	19	19	19	18	24	23	24	22	22	21			16.0	18	5.5	
Seles	6	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	6	6			4.3	4	1.1
Spirlea	15	14	13	14	16	15	15	20	17	18	20	21	21	21	21	20	20	19	19	19	24	26	35			19.3	19	4.8	
Sugiyama	18	23	25	26	25	27	27	27	27	27	31	31	31	32	32	32	28	28	26	27	25	25	24			27.1	27	3.4	
Tauziat	10	11	10	10	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	9	8	10	10	10	9	10	11	10	8	7	7			9.6	10	1.2	
Testud	14	15	14	15	14	11	12	12	12	13	11	13	16	17	17	14	13	12	13	14	14	14	13			13.6	14	1.6	
Van Roost	12	12	11	13	13	17	16	15	15	14	14	16	14	14	14	15	15	13	10	12	12	13	14			13.7	14	1.7	
S. Williams	20	26	24	24	21	16	11	9	10	11	10	10	11	12	11	11	6	4	4	4	4	4	4			11.6	11	7.0	
V. Williams	5	6	6	6	5	6	6	6	7	5	5	6	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3			4.7	5	1.3	
Zvereva	16	17	18	17	18	19	17	17	18	19	15	17	12	22	22	22	22	23	22	23	23	28	27			19.7	19	3.8	

* Capriati entered the Top 100 (jumping from #113 to #53) as a result of her win at Strasbourg (immediately preceding Roland Garros). For reasons of space, her ranking prior to this time is not listed, and it has been treated as "100" for purposes of calculation.

† Graf retired and was removed from the ranking list as of this date

§ Novotna retired and was removed from the ranking list as of this date

Top Players Sorted by Median Ranking

This table lists players in order of their median ranking — that is, the ranking they spent as much of the year above as below. This indicates their typical standing in the course of the year. *It should be noted that this figure takes 1998 and 1999 results equally into account, since rankings at the beginning of the year were based entirely on 1998 results, while 1999 results were the sole influence by the end of the year.* Note that only the players who began the year in the Top Twenty, or ended it in the Top 25, are included.

Median

Rank	Player
1	Hingis
2	Davenport
4	Seles
4.5	Novotna
5	V. Williams
5.5	Graf
7	Pierce
7	Sanchez-Vicario
10	Coetzer
10	Tauziat
11	S. Williams
13	Kournikova
14	Schett
14	Testud
14	Van Roost
15	Mauresmo
17	Martinez
18	Halard-Decugis
18	Schnyder
19	Spirlea
19	Zvereva
22	Likhovtseva
23	Rubin
25	Farina
27	Sugiyama
28	Déchy
28	Dragomir
28	Frazier
29	Huber
48	Capriati

Tournament Results

Tournaments Played/Summary of Results for Top Players

The list below shows all the tournaments the top players played in 1999. The numbers in parentheses list, first, the Tier of the tournament, second, how far the player went, and third, the number of wins achieved. This is followed by a list of top players beaten en route, with the player's rank at the time. For example, the first item in the entry for Martina Hingis reads Sydney (II, F/Davenport, 3) — Van Roost (12), Schett (24). This means that Hingis's first tournament was Sydney. The II means that it was a Tier II. F/Davenport means that Hingis reached the final, where she was beaten by Davenport. The 3 indicates that she won three matches prior to that defeat. Players she defeated included Van Roost (then ranked #12) and Schett (#24). (Note: only wins over Top 30 players are listed.)

WTA Rank	Player Name	Events Played
23	Capriati	Sydney (II, lost in 2R of qualifying/Talaja, 0) — Nagyova (28) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Sanchez Lorenzo, 1) Hannover (II, 1R/Schett, 0) Lipton (I, 2R/Graf, 1) Amelia Island (II, 2R/Kournikova, 1) Berlin (I, 2R/S. Williams, 1) Strasbourg (III, Win, 5) — Tauziat (9), Likhovtseva (21) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Davenport, 3) — Farina (24) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Noorlander, 1) — Huber (30) Stanford (II, 2R/Morariu, 1) — Martinez (18) Canadian Open (R16/Schett, 2) — Tauziat (12) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/Seles, 3) — Tauziat (9) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Hingis, 1) — Spirlea (19) Zurich (I, 1R/Halard-Decugis, 0) Quebec City (III, Win, 5) — Frazier (20), Rubin (27) Philadelphia (II, 2R/Tauziat, 1)
11	Coetzer	Sydney (II, 2R/VWilliams, 1) Australian Open (Slam, R16/Hingis, 3) — Halard-Decugis (19) Pan Pacific (I, F/Hingis, 4) — Serna (22), Davenport (1), Seles (4) Oklahoma City (III, F/V. Williams, 4) — Kournikova (13) Indian Wells (I, R16/Rubin, 1) — Halard-Decugis (20) Lipton (I, QF/S. Williams, 3) — Pierce (8) Hilton Head (I, R16/Nagyova, 1) Amelia Island (II, QF/Seles, 2) Hamburg (II, QF/V. Williams, 2) Rome (I, 2R/Plischke, 1) Berlin (I, 1R/Nagyova, 0) Roland Garros (Slam, 1R/Sugiyama, 0) Eastbourne (II, SF/Zvereva, 2) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Clijsters, 2) Stanford (II, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Raymond (29), Testud (17) San Diego (II, SF/Hingis, 3) — Raymond (28), Kournikova (12), Frazier (26) Canadian Open (I, QF/Sidot, 2) New Haven (II, QF/Seles, 2) U. S. Open (Slam, 1R/Spirlea, 0) Princess Cup (II, QF/Frazier, 1) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Appelmans, 0) Zurich (I, QF/Tauziat, 1) — Schnyder (24) Quebec City (III, 2R/Snyder, 0) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Raymond, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Tauziat, 0)

2	Davenport	<p>Sydney (II, Win, 4) — Schnyder (8), Graf (10), Hingis (2) Australian Open (Slam, SF/Mauresmo, 5) — V. Williams (6) Pan Pacific (I, QF/Coetzer, 1) Indian Wells (I, 2R/S. Williams, 0) Lipton (I, QF (withdrew from match), 3) — Farina (22), Likhovtseva (23) Amelia Island (II, R16/Kournikova, 1) Madrid (III, Win, 4) — Frazier (30) Roland Garros (Slam, QF/Graf, 4) Wimbledon (Slam, Win, 7) — Schett (13), Novotna (6), Graf (3) Stanford (II, Win, 4) — Rubin (23), Frazier (28), V. Williams (4) San Diego (II, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Spirlea (20), Huber (29) Los Angeles (II, SF/Halard-Decugis, 2) — Huber (26), Martinez (18) New Haven (II, F/V. Williams, 3) — Déchy (25), Mauresmo (17), Dragomir (28) U. S. Open (Slam, SF/S. Williams, 5) — Dragomir (23), Frazier (24), Halard-Decugis (11), Pierce (5) Princess Cup (II, Win, 4) — Mauresmo (14), Frazier (22), Seles (5) Filderstadt (II, QF (withdrew from match), 1) — Farina (27) Philadelphia (II, Win, 4) — Halard-Decugis (9), V. Williams (3), Hingis (1) Chase Championships (Champ, Win, 4) — Mauresmo (10), Huber (17), Tauziat (7), Hingis (1)</p>
25	Déchy	<p>Gold Coast (III, QF/Pierce, 2) — Likhovtseva (26) Hobart (IV, QF/Frazier, 2) Australian Open (Slam, 1R/Rippner, 0) Prostejov (IV, QF/Farina, 2) Hannover (II, 1R/Tauziat, 0) Paris (II, SF/S. Williams, 3) — Testud (14), Majoli (30) Lipton (I, 3R/Novotna, 1) Hilton Head (I, R16/Zvereva, 2) — Mauresmo (14) Amelia Island (II, R16/Pierce, 2) Budapest (IV, 2R/Torrens Valero, 1) Rome (I, 2R/Hingis, 1) Strasbourg (III, QF/Fernandez, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Schwartz, 2) Birmingham (III, 2R/Arendt, 0) Eastbourne (II, QF/Kournikova, 2) — Frazier (27), Sanchez-Vicario (7) Wimbledon (Slam, R16/Novotna, 3) — Schnyder (19) Los Angeles (II, 1R/Sugiyama, 0) Canadian Open (I, 2R/Rubin, 1) New Haven (II, 2R/Davenport, 1) U. S. Open (Slam, 1R/Gersi, 0) Filderstadt (II, QF/Hingis, 2) — Van Roost (10) Zurich (I, 1R/Rubin, 0) Bratislava (IV, SF/Clijsters, 3)</p>

20	Dragomir	<p>Gold Coast (III, 2R/Serna, 1) Hobart (IV, 2R/Grande, 1) Australian Open (Slam, 3R/V. Williams, 2) Prostejov (IV, 2R/Abe, 1) Hannover (II, 2R/Novotna, 1) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Rubin, 0) Lipton (I, 3R/Huber, 2) — Spirlea (15) Hilton Head (I, 2R/Glass, 1) Amelia Island (II, F/Seles, 5) — Serna (26), Schett (19), Kournikova (16) Hamburg (II, 1R/Schett, 0) Rome (I, 2R/Morariu, 1) Berlin (I, SF/Halard-Decugis, 4) — Novotna (4), Mauresmo (10), Schnyder (12) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Hingis, 3) 's-Hertogenbosch (III, 1R/Boogert, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Gorrochategui, 1) Knokke-Heist (IV, 1R/Appelmans, 0) Los Angeles (II, 2R/Sanchez-Vicario, 1) Canadian Open (I, 2R/Pierce, 1) New Haven (II, SF/Davenport, 3) — Farina (26), Novotna (9), Testud (16) U. S. Open (Slam, 2R/Davenport, 1) Filderstadt (II, lost in 1R of qualifying/Bacheva, 0) Zurich (I, 1R/Serna, 0) Moscow (I, 2R/Huber, 1) — Likhovtseva (16)</p>
26	Farina	<p>Auckland (IV, SF/Halard-Decugis, 3) Sydney (II, 1R/Kournikova, 0) Australian Open (Slam, 1R/Glass, 0) Prostejov (IV, F/Nagyova, 4) Hannover (II, 2R/Rittner (ret), 1) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Nagyova, 1) — Kournikova (11) Lipton (I, 3R/Davenport, 1) Hilton Head (I, R16/Novotna, 2) — Ruano Pascual (29) Budapest (IV, 1R/Kuti-Kis, 1) Hamburg (II, QF/Sanchez-Vicario, 2) — Van Roost (15) Rome (I, 1R/Martinez, 0) Berlin (I, 2R/Tauziat, 1) Madrid (III, QF/Frazier, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Capriati, 2) 's-Hertogenbosch (III, 1R/Oremans, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Halard-Decugis, 1) Portschach (IV, QF/Talaja, 2) Sopot (III, 2R/Cervanova, 1) Canadian Open (I, 1R/Morariu, 0) New Haven (II, 1R/Dragomir, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 2R/Seles, 1) Luxembourg (III, QF/Krasnoroutskaya, 2) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Davenport, 1+qualifying) — Novotna (18) Zurich (I, 2R/Van Roost, 1) Moscow (I, QF/Schett, 2) — Testud (14) Linz (II, 1R/Pitkowski (ret.), 0)</p>

19	Frazier	<p>Hobart (IV, SF/Grande, 3) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Fernandez, 1) — Sugiyama (23) Oklahoma City (III, 1R/Chi, 0) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Pierce, 1) Lipton (I, 3R/Hingis, 1) Japan Open (III, Win, 5) — Sugiyama (27) Madrid (III, SF/Davenport, 3) — Farina (25) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Kournikova, 1) Eastbourne (II, 1R/Déchy, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Stevenson, 0) Stanford (II, SF/Davenport, 3) — Huber (30), Schett (12) San Diego (II, QF/Coetzer, 2) — Schnyder (19), Graf (3) Los Angeles (II, 2R/Halard-Decugis, 1) — Tauziat (10) Canadian Open (I, 1R/Sidot, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Davenport, 2) — Zvereva (22) Princess Cup (II, SF/Davenport, 3) — Coetzer (9) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Appelmans, 1) — Martinez (14) Zurich (I, 1R/Schnyder, 0) Quebec City (III, SF/Capriati, 2) Philadelphia (II, QF/Hingis, 2)</p>
—	Graf	<p>Sydney (II, SF/Davenport, 3) — Sugiyama (21), S. Williams (22), V. Williams (5) Australian Open (Slam, QF/Seles, 4) — Schett (20) Pan Pacific (I, QF/Hingis, 2) — Likhovtseva (23) Hannover (II, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Schett (19) Indian Wells (I, F/S. Williams, 4) — Sugiyama (25), Novotna (4), Rubin (26) Lipton (I, SF/V. Williams, 3(+1 walkover)) — Nagyova (26), Zvereva (19) Berlin (I, QF/Halard-Decugis, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, Win, 7) — Kournikova (18), Davenport (2), Seles (3), Hingis (1) Wimbledon (Slam, F/Davenport, 6) — V. Williams (5) San Diego (II, 2R/Frazier (ret), 0) <i>Retired</i></p>
9	Halard-Decugis	<p>Auckland (IV, Win, 5) — Farina (19), Van Roost (12) Hobart (IV, SF (withdrew), 3) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Coetzer, 1) Pan Pacific (I, 1R/Black, 0) Paris (II, QF/S. Williams, 2) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Coetzer, 1) Lipton (I, 3R/Kournikova, 1) Bol (IVA, F/Morariu, 4) Warsaw (IV, 2R (withdrew), 1) Berlin (I, F/Hingis, 5) — Zvereva (19), Graf (6) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Seles, 3) Birmingham (III, Win, 5) — Zvereva (17), Tauziat (9) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Stevenson, 2) — Farina (24) San Diego (II, 1R/Rubin, 0) Los Angeles (II, F/S. Williams, 4) — Frazier (24), Pierce (6), Davenport (2) New Haven (II, 2R/Mauresmo, 1) — Huber (26) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/Davenport, 3) Princess Cup (II, QF/Sugiyama, 1) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Huber, 0) Zurich (I, QF/V. Williams, 2) — Capriati (29), Huber (21) Moscow (I, QF/ Van Roost, 1) Leipzig (II, 2R/Appelmans, 0) Philadelphia (II, QF/Davenport, 2) — Martinez (14) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Huber, 0)</p>

1	Hingis	<p>Sydney (II, F/Davenport, 3) — Van Roost (12), Schett (24) Australian Open (Slam, Win, 7) — Coetzer (16), Pierce (7), Seles (4), Mauresmo (29) Pan Pacific (I, Win, 4) — Sugiyama (25), Graf (7), Novotna (3), Coetzer (15) Paris (II, QF/Mauresmo, 1) Indian Wells (I, QF/Rubin, 2) — Schnyder (12) Lipton (I, SF/S. Williams, 4) — Schett (20) Hilton Head (I, Win, 5) — Martinez (18), Zvereva (17), Novotna (4), Kournikova (20) Rome (I, SF/V. Williams, 3) — Déchy (28), S. Williams (10) Berlin (I, Win, 5) — Likhovtseva (22), Schett (20), Sanchez-Vicario (7), Halard-Decugis (21) Roland Garros (Slam, F/Graf, 6) — Mauresmo (17), Dragomir (28), Sanchez-Vicario (7) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Dokic, 0) San Diego (II, Win, 4) — Rubin (23), Van Roost (15), Coetzer (9), V. Williams (4) Los Angeles (II, SF/S. Williams, 2) — Raymond (29), Schett (13) Canadian Open (I, Win, 5) — Rubin (23), Sanchez-Vicario (10), Pierce (6), Seles (5) U. S. Open (Slam, F/S. Williams, 6) — Sanchez-Vicario (8), Huber (27), V. Williams (3) Filderstadt (II, Win, 4) — Capriati (30), Déchy (28), Testud (13), Pierce (6) Zurich (I, F/V. Williams, 3) — Tauziat (10) Philadelphia (II, F/Davenport, 3) — Rubin (24), Frazier (20), Tauziat (7) Chase Championships (Champ, F/Davenport, 3) — Testud (14), Pierce (5), V. Williams (3)</p>
16	Huber	<p>Gold Coast (III, QF/Spirlea, 2) Sydney (II, 2R/Sanchez-Vicario, 1) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Plischke, 1) — Spirlea (14) Pan Pacific (I, 1R/Kournikova, 0) Hannover (II, 2R/Testud, 1) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Black, 0) Lipton (I, R16/V. Williams, 2) Estoril (IV, 2R/Kuti Kis, 1) Berlin (I, 2R/Stoyanova, 1) 's-Hertogenbosch (III, 2R/Maleeva, 1) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Capriati, 0) Portschach (IV, QF/Habsudova, 2) Stanford (II, 1R/Frazier, 0) San Diego (II, QF/Davenport, 2+ qualifying) — Tauziat (10), Schett (13) Los Angeles (II, 2R/Davenport, 1) Canadian Open (I, R16/Pierce, 2) — Spirlea (20) New Haven (II, 1R/Halard-Decugis, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, QF/Hingis, 4) — Novotna (10), Mauresmo (16) Luxembourg (III, 2R/Clijsters, 1) Filderstadt (II, SF/Pierce, 2 (+1 walkover)) — Halard-Decugis (9), Likhovtseva (17) Zurich (I, 2R/Halard-Decugis, 1) — Zvereva (23) Moscow (I, QF/Tauziat, 2) — Dragomir (24) Linz (II, 1R/Sidot, 0) Leipzig (II, SF/Tauziat, 3) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Stevenson, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, QF/Davenport, 1) — Halard-Decugis (9)</p>

12	Kournikova	<p>Sydney (II, R16/Van Roost, 1) — Farina (18) Australian Open (Slam, R16/Pierce, 3) Pan Pacific (I, QF/Seles, 2) — Huber (28) Oklahoma City (III, SF/Coetzer, 2) — Rubin (28) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Farina, 0) Lipton (I, R16/Schett, 2) — Halard-Decugis (21) Hilton Head (I, F/Hingis, 4) — Schett (19), Schnyder (13) Amelia Island (II, SF/Dragomir, 4) — Davenport (2), Schnyder (10) Rome (I, R16/V. Williams, 2) — Serna (26) Berlin (I, 1R/Fernandez, 0) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Graf, 3) — Frazier (27), Schnyder (13) Eastbourne (II, SF/Tauziat, 3) — Rubin (23), Déchy (29) Wimbledon (Slam, R16/V. Williams, 3) Stanford (II, QF/V. Williams, 2) San Diego (II, 2R/Coetzer, 1) Linz (II, 2R/Spirlea, 1) Leipzig (II, QF/Tauziat, 2) — Testud (14) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Henin, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Pierce, 0)</p>
18	Likhovtseva	<p>Gold Coast (III, 2R/Déchy, 1) Sydney (II, 1R/Habsudova, 0) Australian Open (Slam, 3R/Schett, 2) Pan Pacific (I, 2R/Graf, 1) Hannover (II, SF/Novotna, 3) — Nagyova (27), Schnyder (8) Paris (II, QF/Van Roost, 2) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Seles, 1) Lipton (I, R16/Davenport, 2) — Mauresmo (14) Hilton Head (I, QF/Schnyder, 3) — Seles (3) Hamburg (II, 1R/Tauziat, 0) Rome (I, 1R/Morariu, 0) Berlin (I, 3R/Hingis, 2) — Van Roost (14) Strasbourg (III, F/Capriati, 3) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Leon Garcia, 2) Eastbourne (II, QF/Tauziat, 2) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Van Roost, 2) Stanford (II, 1R/Schnyder, 0) San Diego (II, 1R/Sanchez-Vicario, 0) Los Angeles (II, 1R/S. Williams, 0) Canadian Open (I, R16/Seles, 2) New Haven (II, 2R/Seles, 1) — Raymond (30) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/Schett, 3) — Spirlea (20) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Huber, 1) — Sanchez-Vicario (15) Zurich (I, 1R/Panova, 0) Moscow (I, 1R/Dragomir, 0) Linz (II, 1R/Schwartz, 0) Leipzig (II, 2R/Hrdlickova, 1) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Van Roost, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Van Roost, 0)</p>

15	Martinez	<p>Sydney (II, 2R/Schett, 1) Australian Open (Slam, 3R/Loit, 2) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Rubin, 1) Lipton (I, 3R/Seles, 1) Hilton Head (I, R16/Hingis, 2) Amelia Island (II, SF/Seles, 3) — Rubin (24), Pierce (8) Hamburg (II, QF/Pierce, 2) Rome (I, R16/Pierce, 2) — Farina (25) Berlin (I, R16/Sanchez-Vicario, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, QF/Seles, 4) — Pierce (8) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Raymond, 2) Sopot (III, Win, 5) — Testud (17) Stanford (II, 1R/Capriati, 0) San Diego (II, 1R/Schett, 0) Los Angeles (II, QF/Davenport, 2) — Plischke (30) Canadian Open (I, R16/Sanchez-Vicario, 2) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/S. Williams, 3) — Rubin (21) Princess Cup (II, QF/Seles, 2) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Frazier, 0) Moscow (I, 1R/Petrova, 0) Leipzig (II, QF/Pierce, 2) — Spirlea (24) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Halard-Decugis, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/V. Williams, 0)</p>
10	Mauresmo	<p>Sydney (II, 1R/Schett, 0 — 3 wins in qualifying) Australian Open (Slam, F/Hingis, 6) — Schnyder (9), Van Roost (12), Davenport (1) Paris (II, F/S. Williams, 4) — Hingis (1), Van Roost (11) Lipton (I, 3R/Likhovtseva, 1) Hilton Head (I, 2R/Déchy, 0) Rome (I, SF/Pierce, 4) — Schnyder (12) Berlin (I, R16/Dragomir, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Hingis, 1) San Diego (II, 1R/Testud, 0) New Haven (II, QF/Davenport, 2) — Halard-Decugis (10) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/Huber, 3) Princess Cup (II, QF/Davenport, 2) Bratislava (IV, Win, 4 (+1 walkover)) Linz (II, SF/Pierce, 2) — Schnyder (22) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Davenport, 0)</p>
—	Novotna	<p>Australian Open (Slam, 3R/Sanchez Lorenzo, 2) — Nagyova (28) Pan Pacific (I, SF/Hingis, 2) — Zvereva (17) Hannover (II, Win, 4) — Testud (15), Likhovtseva (23), V. Williams (6) Indian Wells (I, QF/Graf, 2) Lipton (I, QF/V. Williams, 3) — Schnyder (12) Hilton Head (I, SF/Hingis, 3) — Farina (25), Nagyova (26) Budapest (IV, 1R/Cervanova, 0) Hamburg (II, QF/Schett, 1) Berlin (I, 2R/Dragomir, 0) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Plischke, 3) Wimbledon (Slam, QF/Davenport, 4) — Plischke (27) Canadian Open (I, 2R/Sugiyama, 0) New Haven (II, 2R/Dragomir, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Huber, 2) Luxembourg (III, 1R/Maleeva, 0) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Farina, 0) <i>Retired</i></p>

5	Pierce	<p>Gold Coast (III, F/Schnyder, 3) — Spirlea (15) Australian Open (Slam, QF/Hingis, 4) — Kournikova (13) Indian Wells (I, QF/S. Williams, 2) Lipton (I, R16/Coetzer (ret), 2) — Ruano Pascual (30) Amelia Island (II, QF/Martinez, 2) — Déchy (29) Cairo (III, QF/Spirlea, 1) Hamburg (II, F/V. Williams, 3) — Martinez (19), Schett (20) Rome (I, F/V. Williams, 4) — Martinez (18), Testud (11), Mauresmo (16) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Martinez, 1) Wimbledon (Slam, R16/Dokic, 3) San Diego (II, 1R/Sugiyama, 0) Los Angeles (II, QF/Halard-Decugis, 1) Canadian Open (I, SF/Hingis, 3) — Dragomir (28), Huber (26), Testud (14) U. S. Open (Slam, QF/Davenport, 4) Filderstadt (II, F/Hingis, 3) — Zvereva (22), Schett (8), Huber (25) Zurich (I, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Rubin (25), Van Roost (12) Moscow (I, 2R/Sugiyama, 0) Linz (II, Win, 4) — Plischke (30), Spirlea (26), Mauresmo (12), Testud (19) Leipzig (II, SF/Hrdlickova, 2) — Martinez (15) Chase Championships (Champ, QF/Hingis, 1) — Kournikova (12)</p>
22	Rubin	<p>Auckland (IV, QF/Farina, 2) Hobart (IV, Win, 4 (+1 walkover)) Australian Open (Slam, R16/V. Williams, 3) — Zvereva (17) Oklahoma City (III, QF/Kournikova, 2) Indian Wells (I, SF/Graf, 4) — Martinez (17), Coetzer (9), Hingis (1) Lipton (I, 3R/Weingartner, 1) Amelia Island (II, 3R/Martinez, 2) Berlin (I, 1R/Raymond, 0) Madrid (III, SF/Suarez, 3) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Talaja, 1) Eastbourne (II, 1R/Kournikova, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Boogert, 0) Stanford (II, 2R/Davenport, 1) — Spirlea (21) San Diego (II, 2R/Hingis, 1) — Halard-Decugis (16) Canadian Open (I, 3R/Hingis, 2) — Déchy (27) U. S. Open (Slam, 1R/Martinez, 0) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Testud, 0) Zurich (I, 2R/Pierce, 1) — Déchy (28) Moscow (I, 1R/Myskina, 0) Quebec City (III, F/Capriati, 4) Philadelphia (II, 2R/Hingis, 1)</p>

17	Sanchez-Vicario	<p>Sydney (II, QF/Schett, 1) — Huber (19) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Schett, 1) Lipton (I, 2R/Kremer, 0) Hilton Head (I, 2R/Leon Garcia, 0) Cairo (III, Win, 4) — Spirlea (20) Hamburg (II, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Farina (25) Rome (I, R16/Plischke, 1) Berlin (I, SF/Hingis, 3) — Martinez (17), S. Williams (11) Roland Garros (Slam, SF/Hingis, 4 (+1 walkover)) — Spirlea (20) Eastbourne (II, 2R/Déchy, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Raymond, 1) Sopot (III, 2R/Weingartner, 0) San Diego (II, 2R/Testud, 1) — Likhovtseva (21) Los Angeles (II, QF/S. Williams, 1) — Dragomir (28) Canadian Open (I, QF/Hingis, 2) — Martinez (18) U. S. Open (Slam, R16/Hingis, 3) — Schnyder (18) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Likhovtseva, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Schett, 0)</p>
8	Schett	<p>Auckland (IV, SF/Van Roost, 3) — Raymond (27) Sydney (II, SF/Hingis, 3) — Mauresmo (29), Martinez (9), Sanchez-Vicario (4) Australian Open (Slam, R16/Graf, 3) — Sanchez-Vicario (5), Likhovtseva (25) Hannover (II, QF/Graf, 2) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Osterloh, 0) Lipton (I, QF/Hingis, 3) — Kournikova (13) Hilton Head (I, R16/Kournikova, 2) Amelia Island (II, R16/Dragomir, 1) Hamburg (II, SF/Pierce, 3) — Tauziat (11), Novotna (4) Warsaw (IV, 2R/Barabanschikova, 1) Berlin (I, QF/Hingis, 3) — Tauziat (9) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Plischke, 2) — Nagyova (25) Wimbledon (Slam, R16/Davenport, 3) Stanford (II, 2R/Frazier, 0) San Diego (II, 2R/Huber, 1) — Martinez (18) Los Angeles (II, QF/Hingis, 2) — Zvereva (22) Canadian Open (I, QF/Seles, 3) U. S. Open (Slam, QF/V. Williams, 4) — Likhovtseva (20) Filderstadt (II, QF/Pierce, 2) — Tauziat (11) Zurich (I, 2R/Morariu, 1) Moscow (I, F/Tauziat, 3) — Farina (25), Van Roost (12) Linz (II, 2R/Chladkova, 0) Chase Championships (Champ, QF/V. Williams, 1) — Sanchez-Vicario (16)</p>

21	Schnyder	<p>Gold Coast (III, Win, 4) — Serna (24), Sugiyama (18), Pierce (7) Sydney (II, QF/Davenport, 2) — Testud (15) Australian Open (Slam, 2R/Mauresmo, 1) Hannover (II, 2R/Likhovtseva, 0) Indian Wells (I, R16/Hingis, 2) Lipton (I, R16/Novotna, 2) Hilton Head (I, SF/Kournikova, 3) — Raymond (28), Likhovtseva (22) Amelia Island (II, QF/Kournikova, 2) Cairo (III, QF/Drake, 2) Rome (I, R16/Mauresmo, 1) Berlin (I, QF/Dragomir, 2) Madrid (III, 2R/Suarez, 0) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Kournikova, 2) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Déchy, 0) Portschach (IV, 1R/Nemeckova, 0) Stanford (II, 2R/Testud, 1) — Likhovtseva (20) San Diego (II, 1R/Frazier, 0) Los Angeles (II, 2R/S. Williams, 1) Canadian Open (I, 1R/Lucic, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Sanchez-Vicario, 2) — Raymond (29) Zurich (I, 2R/Coetzer, 1) — Frazier (20) Moscow (I, 1R/Van Roost, 0) Linz (II, 2R/Mauresmo, 1) Leipzig (II, 1R/Testud, 0)</p>
6	Seles	<p>Australian Open (Slam, SF/Hingis, 5) — Testud (15), Graf (8) Pan Pacific (I, SF/Coetzer, 2) — Kournikova (12) Indian Wells (I, R16/Nagyova, 1) — Likhovtseva (23) Lipton (I, R16/S. Williams, 2) — Martinez (18) Hilton Head (I, R16/Likhovtseva, 1) Amelia Island (II, Win, 5) — Coetzer (13), Martinez (17) Roland Garros (Slam, SF/Graf, 5) — Halard-Decugis (19), Martinez (22) Eastbourne (II, 2R/Kremer, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Lucic, 2) Canadian Open (I, F/Hingis, 4) — Likhovtseva (21), Schett (16) New Haven (II, SF/V. Williams, 2) — Likhovtseva (20), Coetzer (7) U. S. Open (Slam, QF/S. Williams, 4) — Farina (26), Sugiyama (28) Princess Cup (II, F/Davenport, 3) — Martinez (16), Sugiyama (28)</p>

35	Spirlea	<p>Gold Coast (III, SF/Pierce, 3) — Huber (21) Sydney (II, 1R/Van Roost, 0) Australian Open (Slam, 1R/Huber, 0) Paris (II, 2R/Cocheteux, 0) Indian Wells (I, 2R/Black, 1) Lipton (I, 2R/Dragomir, 0) Hilton Head (I, 2R/Majoli, 1) Cairo (III, F/Sanchez-Vicario, 4) — Pierce (8) Hamburg (II, 1R/Sidot, 0) Rome (I, R16/S. Williams, 2) Berlin (I, 1R/Black (ret), 0) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Sanchez-Vicario, 2) Eastbourne (II, 2R/De Swardt, 1) Wimbledon (Slam, 1R/Rippner, 0) Stanford (II, 1R/Rubin, 0) San Diego (II, 2R/Davenport, 1) — Plischke (30) Los Angeles (II, 1R/Zvereva, 0) Canadian Open (I, 1R/Huber, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Likhovtseva, 2) — Coetzer (7) Luxembourg (III, 1R/Appelmans, 0) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Capriati, 0) Zurich (I, 2R/V. Williams, 1) Linz (II, QF/Pierce, 2) — Kournikova (13) Leipzig (II, 1R/Martinez, 0) Philadelphia (II, 1R/Vento, 0)</p>
24	Sugiyama	<p>Gold Coast (III, SF/Schnyder, 3) Sydney (II, 1R/Graf, 0) Australian Open (Slam, 1R/Frazier, 0) Pan Pacific (I, 2R/Hingis, 1) Hannover (II, 2R/V. Williams, 1) — Majoli (30) Paris (II, 1R/Ruano Pascual, 0) Indian Wells (I, R16/Graf, 2) — Raymond (28) Japan Open (III, F/Frazier, 4) Rome (I, 1R/Appelmans, 0) Berlin (I, 1R/Leon Garcia, 0) Strasbourg (III, QF/Chladkova, 1) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Farina, 1) — Coetzer (12) Eastbourne (II, 2R/Likhovtseva, 1) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Likhovtseva, 1) San Diego (II, 2R/Van Roost, 1) — Pierce (6) Los Angeles (II, 2R/Pierce, 1) — Déchy (27) Canadian Open (I, R16/Sidot, 2) — Novotna (7) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Seles, 2) Princess Cup (II, SF/Seles, 3) — Halard-Decugis (8) Zurich (I, 1R/Van Roost, 0) Moscow (I, QF/Raymond, 2) — Pierce (6) Linz (II, 1R/Hopmans, 0) Leipzig (II, 1R/Talaja, 0)</p>

7	Tauziat	<p>Prostejov (IV, 1R/Cocheteux, 0) Hannover (II, 2R/Oremans, 1) Paris (II, 2R/S. Williams, 0) Indian Wells (I, R16/Testud, 1) Lipton (I, 3R/Zvereva, 1) Hamburg (II, 2R/Schett, 1) — Likhovtseva (22) Rome (I, R16/Van Roost, 1) Berlin (I, R16/Schett, 1) — Farina (25) Strasbourg (III, QF/Capriati, 1) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/Leon Garcia, 1) Birmingham (III, F/Halard-Decugis, 4) Eastbourne (II, F/Zvereva, 3) — Likhovtseva (22), Kournikova (18) Wimbledon (Slam, QF/Lucic, 4) — Van Roost (14) San Diego (II, 1R/Huber, 0) Los Angeles (II, 1R/Frazier, 0) Canadian Open (I, 2R/Capriati, 0) New Haven (II, 1R/Nagyova, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Capriati, 2) Filderstadt (II, 1R/Schett, 0) Zurich (I, SF/Hingis, 3) — Testud (14), Coetzer (8) Moscow (I, Win, 4) — Huber (19), Schett (8) Linz (II, QF/Testud, 1) Leipzig (II, Win, 4) — Kournikova (13), Huber (19) Philadelphia (II, SF/Hingis, 2) — Capriati (26), Raymond (30) Chase Championships (Champ, SF/Davenport. 2) — Coetzer (11), Van Roost (13)</p>
13	Testud	<p>Sydney (II, 1R/Schnyder, 0) Australian Open (Slam, R16/Seles, 3) — S. Williams (26) Hannover (II, QF/Novotna, 2) — Huber (29) Paris (II, 1R/Déchy, 0) Indian Wells (I, SF/S. Williams, 4) — Tauziat (10), Nagyova (27) Lipton (I, 2R/Weingartner, 0) Rome (I, QF/Pierce, 2) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/De Swardt, 1) Birmingham (III, 2R/Pratt, 0) 's-Hertogenbosch (III, 2R/Gagliardi, 0) Wimbledon (Slam, 3R/Tanasugarn, 2) Sopot (III, SF/Martinez, 2) Stanford (II, QF/Coetzer, 2) — Schnyder (19) San Diego (II, QF/V. Williams, 2) — Mauresmo (17), Sanchez-Vicario (8) Los Angeles (II, 1R/Morariu, 0) Canadian Open (I, QF/Pierce, 3) New Haven (II, QF/Dragomir, 2) U. S. Open (Slam, 2R/Serna, 1) Filderstadt (II, SF/Hingis, 3) — Rubin (24), S. Williams (4) Zurich (I, 1R/Tauziat, 0) Moscow (I, 1R/Farina, 0) Linz (II, F/Pierce, 4) — Tauziat (7) Leipzig (II, 2R/Kournikova, 1) — Schnyder (22) Philadelphia (II, QF/V. Williams, 2) — Van Roost (13) Chase Championships (Champ, 1R/Hingis, 0)</p>

14	Van Roost	Auckland (IV, F/Halard-Decugis, 4) — Schett (23) Sydney (II, QF/Hingis, 2) — Spirlea (14), Kournikova (13) Australian Open (Slam, QF/Mauresmo, 4) Prostejov (IV, 2R/Hopmans (ret), 1) Paris (II, SF/Mauresmo, 2) — Likhovtseva (22) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Rittner, 0) Lipton (I, 2R/Lucic, 0) Hamburg (II, 2R/Farina, 1) Rome (I, QF/V. Williams, 3) — Tauziat (9) Berlin (I, 2R/Likhovtseva, 1) Roland Garros (Slam, 1R/Schwartz, 0) Birmingham (III, 2R/Stevenson, 0) 's-Hertogenbosch (III, QF/Brandi, 1) Wimbledon (Slam, R16/Tauziat, 3) — Likhovtseva (22) Stanford (II, 1R/Kremer (ret), 0) San Diego (II, QF/Hingis, 2) New Haven (II, 1R/Sanchez Lorenzo, 0) U. S. Open (Slam, 3R/Fernandez, 2) Luxembourg (III, F/Clijsters, 3) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Déchy, 1) Zurich (I, QF/Pierce, 2) — Sugiyama (27), Farina (26) Moscow (I, SF/Schett, 3) — Schnyder (22), Halard-Decugis (9) Leipzig (II, 2R/Sidot, 0) Philadelphia (II, 2R/Testud, 1) — Likhovtseva (19) Chase Championships (Champ, QF/Tauziat, 1) — Likhovtseva (19)
4	Williams, S.	Sydney (II, 2R/Graf, 1) Australian Open (Slam, 3R/Testud, 2) — Serna (22) Paris (II, Win, 5) — Tauziat (9), Halard-Decugis (21), Mauresmo (18) Indian Wells (I, Win, 6) — Davenport (2), Pierce (8), Testud (14), Graf (7) Lipton (I, F/V. Williams, 5) — Serna (25), Seles (3), Coetzer (9), Hingis (1) Rome (I, QF/Hingis, 2) — Spirlea (17) Berlin (I, QF/Sanchez-Vicario (ret.), 2) Roland Garros (Slam, 3R/Fernandez, 2) Los Angeles (II, Win, 5) — Likhovtseva (21), Schnyder (19), Sanchez-Vicario (8), Hingis (1), Halard-Decugis (16) U. S. Open (Slam, Win, 7) — Martinez (17), Seles (4), Davenport (2), Hingis (1) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Testud, 0)
3	Williams, V.	Sydney (II, QF/Graf, 1) — Coetzer (17) Australian Open (Slam, QF/Davenport, 4) — Rubin (30) Hannover (II, F/Novotna, 3) — Sugiyama (26), Graf (7) Oklahoma City (III, Win, 4) — Coetzer (10) Lipton (I, Win, 6) — Huber (29), Novotna (4), Graf (7), S. Williams (16) Amelia Island (II, 2R/Jeyaseelan, 0) Hamburg (II, Win, 4) — Serna (26), Coetzer (16), Sanchez-Vicario (6), Pierce (8) Rome (I, Win, 5) — Kournikova (13), Van Roost (15), Hingis (1), Pierce (8) Roland Garros (Slam, R16/Schwartz, 3) — Zvereva (15) Wimbledon (Slam, QF/Graf, 4) — Kournikova (17) Stanford (II, F/Davenport, 3) — Kournikova (13), Coetzer (9) San Diego (II, F/Hingis, 3) — Zvereva (22), Testud (14), Davenport (1) New Haven (II, Win, 4) — Seles (5), Davenport (2) U. S. Open (Slam, SF/Hingis, 4 (+ 1 walkover)) — Schett (12) Zurich (I, Win, 4) — Spirlea (19), Halard-Decugis (9), Pierce (6), Hingis (1) Philadelphia (II, SF/Davenport, 2) — Testud (15) Chase Championships (Champ, SF/Hingis, 2) — Martinez (15), Schett (8)

27	Zvereva	<p> Sydney (II, 1R/Molik, 0) Australian Open (Slam, 3R/Rubin, 2) Pan Pacific (I, QF/Novotna (ret), 2) — Raymond (27) Indian Wells (I, 1R/Raymond, 0) Lipton (I, R16/Graf, 2) — Tauziat (I) Hilton Head (I, QF/Hingis, 3) — Déchy (31) Cairo (III, 1R/Gagliardi, 0) Rome (I, 1R/Smashnova, 0) Berlin (I, 2R.Halard-Decugis, 1) Roland Garros (Slam, 2R/V. Williams, 1) Birmingham (III, QF/Halard-Decugis, 2) Eastbourne (II, Win, 5) — Coetzer (11), Tauziat (9) Wimbledon (Slam, 2R/Panova, 1) Sopot (III, 2R/Torrens-Valero, 1) San Diego (II, 2R/V. Williams, 1) Los Angeles (II, 2R/Schett (ret.), 1) — Spirlea (20) U. S. Open (Slam, 2R/Frazier, 1) Filderstadt (II, 2R/Pierce, 1) Zurich (I, 1R/Huber, 0) Moscow (I, 1R/Pitkowski, 0) </p>
----	---------	---

Tournament Winners by Date (High-Tier Events)

The following list shows the winner of all important (Tier II or higher) tournaments, ordered first by date then by type:

Tournament	Tier	Winner
Sydney	II	Davenport
Australian Open	Slam	Hingis
Tokyo (Pan Pacific)	I	Hingis
Hannover	II	Novotna
Paris	II	S. Williams
Indian Wells	I	S. Williams
Lipton (Key Biscayne)	I	V. Williams
Hilton Head	I	Hingis
Amelia Island	II	Seles
Hamburg	II	V. Williams
Rome	I	V. Williams
Berlin	I	Hingis
Roland Garros	Slam	Graf
Eastbourne	II	Zvereva
Wimbledon	Slam	Davenport
Stanford	II	Davenport
San Diego	II	Hingis
Los Angeles	II	S. Williams
Canadian Open	I	Hingis
New Haven	II	V. Williams
U.S. Open	Slam	S. Williams
Tokyo (Princess Cup)	II	Davenport
Filderstadt	II	Hingis
Zurich	I	V. Williams
Moscow	I	Tauziat
Linz	II	Pierce
Leipzig	II	Tauziat
Philadelphia	II	Davenport
Chase Championships	Champ	Davenport

It is perhaps worth noting that, among the Tier I events, Moscow was by far the weakest. (See the section on strength of tournaments.) Among Tier II events, Sydney, San Diego, Filderstadt, and Philadelphia were the strongest this year (and have been for several years past); all four featured fields stronger than most of the Tier I events with the exception of the Lipton.

Tournament Winners by Tournament Type (High-Tier Events)

SLAMS	
<i>Event</i>	<i>Winner</i>
Australian Open	Hingis
Roland Garros	Graf
Wimbledon	Davenport
U.S. Open	S. Williams
YEAR-END CHAMPIONSHIP	
<i>Event</i>	<i>Winner</i>
Chase Championships	Davenport
TIER I	
<i>Event</i>	<i>Winner</i>
Pan Pacific (Tokyo)	Hingis
Indian Wells	S. Williams
Lipton (Key Biscayne)	V. Williams
Hilton Head	Hingis
Italian Open (Rome)	V. Williams
German Open (Berlin)	Hingis
Canadian Open	Hingis
Zurich	V. Williams
Moscow	Tauziat
TIER II	
<i>Event</i>	<i>Winner</i>
Sydney	Davenport
Hannover	Novotna
Paris	S. Williams
Amelia Island	Seles
Hamburg	V. Williams
Eastbourne	Zvereva
Stanford	Davenport
San Diego	Hingis
Los Angeles	S. Williams
New Haven	V. Williams
Princess Cup (Tokyo)	Davenport
Filderstadt	Hingis
Linz	Pierce
Leipzig	Tauziat
Philadelphia	Davenport

Winners at Smaller Tournaments (Tier III, IVA, IVB)

Tournament	Winner	Tier	Same Week As
Gold Coast	Schnyder	III	Auckland (IV)
Auckland	Halard-Decugis	IVB	Gold Coast (III)
Hobart	Rubin	IVB	Sydney (II)
Prostejov	Nagyova	IVB	
Bogota	Zuluaga	IVA	Hannover (II)
Oklahoma City	V. Williams	III	Paris (II)
Estoril	Srebotnik	IVA	Amelia Island (II)
Japan Open	Frazier	III	
Cairo	Sanchez-Vicario	III	Budapest (IV)
Budapest	Pitkowski	IVA	Cairo (III)
Bol	Morariu	IVA	Hamburg (II)
Warsaw	Torrens Valero	IVB	Rome (I)
Antwerp	Henin	IVB	Berlin (I)
Madrid	Davenport	III	Strasbourg (III); week before Roland Garros
Strasbourg	Capriati	III	Madrid (III); week before Roland Garros
Birmingham	Halard-Decugis	III	Tashkent (IV); week after Roland Garros
Tashkent	Smashnova	IVB	Birmingham (III); week after Roland Garros
's-Hertogenbosh	Brandi	III	Eastbourne (II); week before Wimbledon
Portschach	Habsudova	IVB	week after Wimbledon
Palermo	Myskina (Q)	IVA	Sopot (III); week before Stanford
Knokke-Heist	Sanchez Lorenzo	IVB	San Diego (II)
Luxembourg	Clijsters (Q)	III	Princess Cup (II)
Sao Paulo	Zuluaga	IVA	Filderstadt (II)
Quebec City	Capriati	III	Leipzig (II); week before Philadelphia; two before Chase
Kuala Lumpur	Carlsson	III	Philadelphia (II); week before Chase Champ.
Pattaya City	Maleeva (Q)	IVB	Chase Championships

Number of Tournament Wins for Each Player

The following table shows tournament wins by the Top 25. Tournaments are categorized as major (Tier II or higher) or minor (Tier III or lower). The tournaments are listed, with their level, on the next line.

Rank	Name	Major Wins	Minor Wins	Total Wins
23	Capriati Strasbourg (III), Quebec City (III)		2	2
2	Davenport Sydney (II), Madrid (III), Wimbledon (Slam), Stanford (II), Princess Cup (II), Philadelphia (II), Chase (Champ)	6	1	7
19	Frazier Japan Open (III)		1	1
—	Graf Roland Garros (Slam)	1		1
9	Halard-Decugis Auckland (IV), Birmingham (III)		2	2
1	Hingis Australian Open (Slam), Pan Pacific (I), Hilton Head (I), Berlin (I), San Diego (II), Canadian Open (I), Filderstadt (II)	7		7
15	Martinez Sopot (III)		1	1
10	Mauresmo Bratislava (IV)		1	1
—	Novotna Hannover (II)	1		1
5	Pierce Linz (II)	1		1
22	Rubin Hobart (IV)		1	1
17	Sanchez-Vicario Cairo (III)		1	1
21	Schnyder Gold Coast (III)		1	1
6	Seles Amelia Island (II)	1		1
7	Tauziat Moscow (I), Leipzig (II)	2		2
4	S. Williams Paris (II), Indian Wells (I), Los Angeles (II), U. S. Open (Slam)	4		4
3	V. Williams Oklahoma City (III), Lipton (I), Hamburg (II), Rome (I), New Haven (II), Zurich (I)	5	1	6

The following Top 25 players did not win any tournaments in 1999: Schett, Coetzer, Kournikova, Testud, Van Roost, Huber, Likhovtseva, Dragomir, Sugiyama, Déchy. The following Top 25 players won at least one tournament, but did not win any important (Tier II or higher) events: Halard-Decugis, Mauresmo, Martinez, Sanchez-Vicario, Frazier, Schnyder, Rubin, Capriati. The only player to win a Tier II or higher tournament to finish outside the Top 20 is Zvereva (winner of Eastbourne/II), who ends the year at #27.

Fraction of Tournaments Won

Sorted in descending order of fraction won.

WTA Rank	Player	Tournaments Won	Tournaments Played	Percent Won
2	Davenport	7	18	38.9%
1	Hingis	7	19	36.8%
4	S. Williams	4	11	36.4%
3	V. Williams	6	17	35.3%
23	Capriati	2	16	12.5%
(5)	Graf	1	10	10%
9	Halard-Decugis	2	24	8.3%
7	Tauziat	2	25	8%
6	Seles	1	13	7.7%
10	Mauresmo	1	15	6.7%
(19)	Novotna	1	16	6%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	1	18	5.6%
5	Pierce	1	20	5%
19	Frazier	1	20	5%
22	Rubin	1	21	4.8%
15	Martinez	1	23	4.3%
21	Schnyder	1	24	4.2%
8	Schett	0	23	0%
11	Coetzer	0	25	0%
12	Kournikova	0	19	0%
13	Testud	0	25	0%
14	Van Roost	0	25	0%
16	Huber	0	26	0%
18	Likhovtseva	0	29	0%
20	Dragomir	0	23	0%
24	Sugiyama	0	23	0%
25	Déchy	0	23	0%

Summary: Tiers of Tournaments Played and Average Tier

(Note: Certain players, including Capriati and Dragomir, played qualifying matches *and lost*. These count toward their official WTA tournament count, but are not included here. Note: The Slams and the Chase are treated mathematically as “Tier 0.” The *lower* the mean and median strength, the tougher one’s schedule.)

	Slams Played	Chase Played	Tier I Played	Tier II Played	Tier III Played	Tier IV Played	Total Played	Mean Strength	Median Strength
Capriati	4		4	5*	2		15	1.33	I
Coetzer	4	1	8	10	2		25	1.36	I
Davenport	4	1	3	9	1		18	1.33	II
Déchy	4		5	7	3	4	23	2.04	II
Dragomir	4		8	5†	2	3	22	1.64	I
Frazier	4		4	7	4	1	20	1.7	II
Graf	3		4	3			10	1.0	I
Halard-Decugis	4	1	6	8	1	4	24	1.71	II
Hingis	4	1	8	6			19	1.05	I
Huber	3	1	7	10	3	2	26	1.58	II
Kournikova	3	1	6	8	1		19	1.21	I
Likhovtseva	4	1	9	13	2		29	1.41	II
Martinez	4	1	7	10	1		23	1.30	I
Mauresmo	3	1	4	6		1	15	1.33	I
Novotna	4		6	4	1	1	16	1.31	I
Pierce	4	1	6	7	2		20	1.30	I
Rubin	4		6	6	3	2	21	1.52	II
Sanchez-Vicario	4	1	5	6	2		18	1.28	I
Schett	4	1	7	9		2	23	1.43	I
Schnyder	4		8	8	3	1	24	1.29	I/II
Seles	4		5	4			13	1.0	I
Sugiyama	4		7	9	3		23	1.48	II
Tauziat	3	1	7	11	2	1	25	1.56	II
Testud	4	1	6	11	3		25	1.48	II
Van Roost	4	1	6	9	3	2	25	1.64	II
S. Williams	3		4	4			11	1.09	I
V. Williams	4	1	3	8	1		17	1.41	II

* Capriati also played — and lost — in the qualifying for Sydney; this result is not included here.

† Dragomir also played — and lost — in the qualifying for Filderstadt; this result is not included here.

Thus the strongest (highest average tier) schedules on the tour were played by Graf and Seles, followed by Hingis and Serena Williams; the weakest schedule was played by Nathalie Déchy, followed by Julie Halard-Decugis, Amy Frazier, Ruxandra Dragomir, and Dominique Van Roost.

Points earned week-by-week

The following table shows the week-by-week point totals earned by the Top Twenty. *Note: Weeks in which no Tour events were played are not shown. Results due to winning events are italicised.*

week of	C O E T Z E R	D A V E N P O	D R A G O M I	F R A Z I E R	G R A F	H A L A R D	H I N G I S	H U B E R	K O U R N I K	L I K H O V T	M A R T I N E	M A R U R E S M	N O V O T N A	P I E R C E	S A N C H E Z	S C H E T	S E L E S	T A U Z I A T	T E S T U D	V A N R O	S W I L L I A	V W I L L I A	
1/10			28			<i>162</i>		53		22				144		59					95		
1/17	36	365	18	58	186	60	200	30	49	1	28	19			73	203			1	120	28	73	
1/31	126	380	60	72	204	30	828	96	100	82	68	766	90	232	46	226	430		140	166	98	196	
2/7	364	73			92	1	427	1	90	46			150				167						
2/14			18															1		12			
2/21			36		121			36		156			311			69		36	73			206	
2/28	151			1		66	52		86	56		285						1	1	128	<i>303</i>	<i>197</i>	
3/14	59	1	1	32	283	32	102	1	1	30	26		79	88		1	59	40	187	1	468		
3/28	126	115	65	32	159	23	167	50	67	79	23	32	125	59	1	112	67	32	1	1	418	426	
4/4	38		30				<i>394</i>		258	151	54	1	163		1	54	40						
4/11	73	27	223					18	216		166			73		30	286					1	
4/18				<i>171</i>																			
4/25													1	39	<i>170</i>								
5/2	73		1			95				1	60		60	196	123	195		49		36		336	
5/9	24		23			14	185		59	1	74	172		283	44	12		40	85	112	96	483	
5/16	1		254		84	268	382	30	1	73	50	42	1		190	120		59		24	79		
5/23		<i>179</i>		104						127								39					
6/5	2	186	132	46	<i>1064</i>	112	546		180	68	286	46	100	34	330	106	358	42	34	2	60	158	
6/14						<i>234</i>												132	1	1			
6/21	108		1	1				22	138	75					1		1	201	1	39			
7/4	68	840	42	2	520	98	2	2	108	82	68		226	116	34	116	68	216	68	134		228	
7/11								30															
7/18											<i>191</i>				1				71				
8/1	128	303		155				1	75	1	1					1			81	1		226	
8/8	155	128	1	139	1	1	<i>356</i>	149	30	1	1	1		1	49	49		1	116	73		298	
8/15		128	41	69		285	140	36		1	75			65	65	81		1	1		<i>424</i>		
8/22	77		24	1			<i>429</i>	69		54	56		1	182	98	87	258	1	93				
8/29	62	201	183			41		1		41		97	1				156	1	66	1		<i>345</i>	
9/13	2	516	42	90		112	662	346		130	134	104	56	190	154	196	226	84	42	80	<i>1046</i>	358	
9/26	60	<i>318</i>		137		58		26			68	54	1				194				117		
10/11	1	65	1	61		1	<i>308</i>	156		61	1		1	229	1	93		1	178	36	1		
10/18	88		1	1		103	243	59		1					175		46	210	1	95		<i>469</i>	
10/25			71			80		90		1	1	<i>110</i>			1		244	<i>344</i>	1	185			
11/1								1	34	1		123		288		1		54	210				
11/9	1			69		1		130	95	28	83				133			270	49	1			
11/16	1	<i>417</i>		60		87	229	1	1	1	1							120	87	49		125	
11/22	54	<i>599</i>				54	424	140	54	54	54	54		132	54	132		245	54	120		253	
Total	1878	4841	1296	1301	2714	2018	6076	1574	1642	1425	1569	1906	1366	2660	1435	2233	2310	2220	1642	1629	3021	4378	
Trns	25	18	23	20	10	24	19	26	19	29	23	15	16	20	18	23	13	25	25	25	11	17	

Alternate Rankings

There are, of course, many ways of reshaping the above ranking data. A typical way would be to use some of the WTA's earlier ranking systems.

Total Points Ranking (1997 Ranking System)

This ranking simply adds up the total points from *all* the tournaments a player played, whether that number of tournaments be 10 (for Graf) or 29 (for Likhovtseva). It is essentially the system used by the WTA in 1997 (except that there were minor differences in the way points were awarded at events)

Total Points Rank	WTA (Best 18) Rank	Player	Total Points
1	1	Hingis	6076
2	2	Davenport	4841
3	3	V. Williams	4378
4	4	S. Williams	3021
(5)	—	Graf	2714
5	5	Pierce	2660
6	6	Seles	2310
7	8	Schett	2233
8	7	Tauziat	2220
9	9	Halard-Decugis	2018
10	10	Mauresmo	1906
11	11	Coetzer	1878
12	12	Kournikova	1642
12	13	Testud	1642
14	14	Van Roost	1629
15	16	Huber	1574
16	15	Martinez	1569
17	17	Sanchez-Vicario	1435
18	18	Likhovtseva	1425
(19)	—	Novotna	1366
19	19	Frazier	1301
20	20	Dragomir	1296
21	21	Schnyder	1195
22	22	Rubin	1191
23	23	Capriati	1140
24	24	Sugiyama	1127
25	25	Déchy	1028

Best 18 does not differ much from Total Points. (This is because almost no one earns very much in tournaments 19 through whatever.) We observe only three changes between this list and the Best 18 list: Schett and Tauziat have swapped the #7 and #8 rankings, Huber and Martinez have exchanged #15 and #16, and Kournikova and Testud have the same number of points (Kournikova, however, would have been ranked as #12 and Testud #13, because Kournikova has more quality points.)

But if Best 18 and Total Score rankings are almost identical, the same is not true when these systems are compared with the WTA's 1996 ranking system, Points per Tournament (minimum 14). Here the rankings are completely different. Scores are rounded to the nearest tenth of a point.

Points Per Tournament, Minimum 14 (1996 Ranking System)

1996 Ranking	WTA Rank	Name	Score
1	1	Hingis	319.8
2	2	Davenport	268.9
3	3	V. Williams	257.5
4	4	S. Williams	215.8
(5)	—	Graf	193.9
5	6	Seles	165.0
6	5	Pierce	133.0
7	10	Mauresmo	127.1
8	8	Schett	97.1
9	7	Tauziat	88.8
10	12	Kournikova	86.4
11	9	Halard-Decugis	84.1
(12)	—	Novotna	83.4
12	17	Sanchez-Vicario	79.7
13	11	Coetzer	75.1
14	23	Capriati	71.3
15	15	Martinez	68.2
16	13	Testud	65.7
17	14	Van Roost	65.2
18	19	Frazier	62.0
19	16	Huber	60.5
20	22	Rubin	56.7
21	20	Dragomir	56.3
22	38	Fernandez	53.0
23	21	Schnyder	49.8
24	18	Likhovtseva	49.1
25	24	Sugiyama	49.0
26	27	Zvereva	48.7
27	47	Clijsters	47.7
28	43	Dokic	46.6
29	50	Lucic	45.7
30	25	Déchy	44.3
31	28	Raymond	40.3
32	26	Farina	37.9
33	46	Stevenson	37.2
34	30	Appelmans	36.6
35	45	Habsudova	34.1

We follow this with the calculations based on the past and future ATP systems

Best 14

The WTA uses the “Best 18” ranking system — totalling the points earned in the eighteen tournaments where one earned the most points. For most of the Nineties, the ATP uses a related ranking system, “Best 14” — the total points earned in one’s best *fourteen* events. If this system were applied to the WTA, the results would be as follows:

Best 14 Rank	WTA Rank	Name	Best 14 Total
1	1	Hingis	5613
2	2	Davenport	4675
3	3	V. Williams	4179
4	4	S. Williams	3021
(5)	—	Graf	2714
5	5	Pierce	2461
6	6	Seles	2310
7	7	Tauziat	2066
8	8	Schett	1980
9	10	Mauresmo	1905
10	9	Halard-Decugis	1820
11	11	Coetzer	1659
12	12	Kournikova	1575
13	14	Van Roost	1513
14	13	Testud	1509
15	16	Huber	1440
16	15	Martinez	1437
17	17	Sanchez-Vicario	1431
(18)	—	Novotna	1364
18	19	Frazier	1263
19	18	Likhovtseva	1248
20	20	Dragomir	1231
21	22	Rubin	1157
22	23	Capriati	1138
23	21	Schnyder	1128
24	24	Sugiyama	1088
25	26	Zvereva	968

Best 18 with Slotted Point Awards (ATP Year 2000 Award)

This is the new men's "ranking" system. I put "ranking" in quotes because it is *not* a ranking system. First, it is mathematically flawed in that not all players are treated equally (different systems are used for those who do and do not qualify for the Super Nines, making it discontinuous). Second, it is not a *ranking*; it is a performance measurement. One might offer an analogy to the controls on a car: A true ranking system is a speedometer. But the new ATP system is an odometer.

Nonetheless, it is possible to use the slotted system as a ranking system at the end of the year. (Just as one can measure a car's average speed using an odometer by driving for a set period of time and dividing the odometer distance by time.)

The slotted system counts a player's results in Slams, Super Nines (the equivalent of the Tier I tournaments on the WTA tour), and a handful of other events. Applying this system to the WTA produces the following:

In the table below, "Required Points" refers to points earned in the Required Events (Slams, Tier I, Chase Championship); "Optional Points" is what the players earned in their best other events.

Slotted Rank	WTA Rank	Player Name	Required Pts	Optional Pts	Total Slotted Pts
1	1	Hingis	4791	1093	5884
2	2	Davenport	2710	1403	4113
3	3	S. Williams	2265	756	3021
4	4	V. Williams	2571	1205	2776
(5)	—	Graf	2406	307	2713
5	5	Pierce	1492	857	2349
6	6	Seles	1673	637	2310
7	7	Tauziat	1313	723	2036
8	8	Schett	1440	572	2012
9	10	Mauresmo	1217	615	1832
10	9	Halard-Decugis	913	776	1689
11	11	Coetzer	1029	542	1571
12	12	Kournikova	918	535	1453
13	15	Martinez	894	515	1409
14	17	Sanchez-Vicario	952	431	1383
15	14	Van Roost	920	460	1380
16	16	Huber	884	488	1372
(17)	—	Novotna	991	373	1364
17	13	Testud	706	591	1297
18	18	Likhovtseva	852	419	1271
19	20	Dragomir	745	483	1228
20	21	Schnyder	652	433	1085
21	23	Capriati	529	532	1061
22	22	Rubin	622	369	991
23	24	Sugiyama	515	445	960
24	19	Frazier	276	602	878
25	25	Déchy	407	413	820

The effect of this system is to move Serena Williams, who earned most of her points in required events, ahead of sister Venus. It also hurts Testud and Frazier, who earned many of their points at minor events.

We follow this with some assorted systems which have never been used by the WTA.

Total Wins

The list below shows how the top 25 fared in terms of wins (I also show losses for balance). The reason this deviates so far from the rankings is that some of these players played large numbers of low-tier (Tier III and Tier IV) tournaments. Since they faced low-level opposition, their wins, quite properly, do not count as much toward the rankings. Others simply were unable to play many tournaments. Though their winning percentage was high (witness Seles and Serena Williams), their total wins were relatively low. Where two players have the same number of wins, I list the player with fewer losses first.

Note: As elsewhere, this list includes only official tour wins; exhibitions (including Grand Slam Cup and Fed Cup) are excluded. Also, walkovers are not calculated as wins or losses.

Rank	WTA Rank	Name	Wins	Losses
1	1	Hingis	70	12
2	2	Davenport	58	9
3	3	V. Williams	57	11
4	9	Halard-Decugis	47	20
5	8	Schett	46	23
6	5	Pierce	45	19
7	15	Martinez	38	22
7	14	Van Roost	38	25
9	4	S. Williams	37	7
9	7	Tauziat	37	23
9	11	Coetzer	37	25
12	6	Seles	36	12
12	13	Testud	36	25
14	12	Kournikova	35	19
14	18	Likhovtseva	34	29
16	—	Graf	33	9
17	22	Rubin	32	20
17	25	Déchy	32	23
19	10	Mauresmo	31	14
19	19	Frazier	31	19
19	16	Huber	31	26
22	20	Dragomir	30	22
23	21	Schnyder	29	23
24	23	Capriati	26	13
24	—	Novotna	26	15
24	24	Sugiyama	26	23
26	17	Sanchez-Vicario	24	17

Winning Percentage

Based on the data on wins, we find the following order for win percentage (where there is a tie, the player with the higher number of wins is listed first):

Rank	Name	Wins	Losses	Win %	WTA Rank
1	Davenport	58	9	86.6	2
2	Hingis	70	12	85.4	1
3	S. Williams	37	7	84.1	4
4	V. Williams	57	11	83.8	3
5	Graf	33	9	78.6	—
6	Seles	36	12	75.0	6
7	Pierce	45	19	70.3	5
8	Halard-Decugis	47	20	70.1	9
9	Mauresmo	31	14	68.9	10
10	Schett	46	23	66.7	8
10	Capriati	26	13	66.7	23
12	Kournikova	35	19	64.8	12
13	Novotna	26	15	63.4	—
14	Martinez	38	22	63.3	15
15	Frazier	31	19	62.0	19
16	Tauziat	37	23	61.7	7
17	Rubin	32	20	61.5	22
18	Van Roost	38	25	60.3	14
19	Coetzer	37	25	59.7	11
20	Testud	36	25	59.0	13
21	Sanchez-Vicario	24	17	58.5	17
22	Déchy	32	23	58.2	25
23	Dragomir	30	22	57.7	20
24	Schnyder	29	23	55.8	21
25	Huber	31	26	54.4	16
26	Likhovtseva	34	29	54.0	18
27	Sugiyama	26	23	53.1	24

It is perhaps worth noting that the Top Four are all very close in winning percentage, and that Davenport (the leader under this system) earned four of her wins in a Tier III event (Hingis and Serena Williams did not play any Tier III events), and also withdrew from two tournaments. If Davenport's Tier III wins (against very feeble opposition) are removed, her percentage becomes almost identical to Hingis; if her two withdrawals are counted as losses, she falls to an effective tie with Serena Williams. Serena Williams withdrew from no fewer than five tournaments without playing (taking a financial penalty as a result), and in only two instances can her injuries be verified. Thus the "winning percentage" statistic for 1999 is rather confused. The Top Four are the Top Four, but it is perhaps best not to try to determine which one had the "best" winning percentage.

Other Alternate Rankings

The next five ranking systems are all based on WTA point awards, although they have never been used for any ranking purpose. They reveal different aspects of player success.

Total Round Points

Consists of the total round points which a player has earned in tournaments in the last year. Note: *All* a player's tournaments are included here, not just their Best 18, although this has only the slightest effect on the rankings (e.g. it causes Martinez and Sanchez-Vicario to change places). In general, a player who does better in this ranking than in the WTA rankings is one who is failing to beat top players, and is attaining ranking by proceeding through easy matches. A player who stands lower in this ranking than the WTA ranking is one who perhaps has had losses but who also probably has beaten a number of higher-ranked players.

Rank	Name	Total Rnd Pts	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	3954	1
2	Davenport	2975	2
3	V. Williams	2662	3
4	Pierce	1777	5
5	S. Williams	1607	4
6	Graf	1584	—
7	Tauziat	1554	7
8	Seles	1480	6
9	Schett	1297	8
10	Halard-Decugis	1287	9
11	Coetzer	1243	11
12	Mauresmo	1112	10
13	Van Roost	1087	14
14	Testud	1046	13
15	Kournikova	1013	12
16	Martinez	993	15
17	Sanchez-Vicario	991	17
18	Novotna	910	—
19	Likhovtseva	883	18
20	Huber	878	16

Total Quality Points

The inverse of the proceeding: Total quality points from all tournaments. It roughly measures the number of high-level opponents one has defeated. In the event of a tie, the higher-ranked player is listed first.

Rank	Name	Total Qual Pts	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	2122	1
2	Davenport	1866	2
3	V. Williams	1756	3
4	S. Williams	1414	4
5	Graf	1130	—
6	Schett	936	8
7	Pierce	883	5
8	Seles	830	6
9	Mauresmo	794	10
10	Halard-Decugis	731	9
11	Huber	696	16
12	Tauziat	666	7
13	Coetzer	635	11
14	Kournikova	629	12
15	Testud	596	13
16	Martinez	576	15
17	Dragomir	561	20
18 (tie)	Van Roost	542	14
18 (tie)	Likhovtseva	542	18
20	Frazier	521	19

Round Points Per Tournament

This ranking measures, in effect, how far a player typically advanced in a tournament, regardless of opposition.

Rank	Name	Rnd Pts per Trn	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	208.1	1
2	Davenport	165.3	2
3	Graf	158.4	—
4	V. Williams	154.2	3
5	S. Williams	146.1	4
6	Seles	113.8	6
7	Pierce	88.9	5
8	Mauresmo	74.1	10
9	Tauziat	62.2	7
10	Novotna	56.9	—
11	Schett	56.4	8
12	Sanchez-Vicario	55.1	17
13	Halard-Decugis	53.6	9
14	Kournikova	53.3	12
15	Coetzer	49.7	11
16	Van Roost	43.5	14
17	Martinez	43.2	15
18	Testud	41.8	13
19	Capriati	40.3	23
20	Frazier	37.1	19

Quality Points Per Tournament

The reverse of the above, this calculates the difficulty of the opposition a player has overcome. For players outside the Top Five, it is a good measure of how they stack up against other players, and how likely they are to produce upsets. For the Top Five, it is rather less meaningful, because the different levels of quality point awards for the top players (that is, the fact that a win over #1 is worth much more than a win over #4) obscures their actual results. It will be noted that this list contains several players who are far outside the Top Twenty in the WTA lists (Dokic, Fernandez, Clijsters). Dokic is an anomaly, the result of her spectacular (and never-repeated) Wimbledon performance. But the numbers would seem to indicate that Clijsters has real potential, and that Mary Joe Fernandez, if she can play a full year without injury, could still achieve Top Twenty rank.

Rank	Name	Quality per Trn	WTA Rank
1	S. Williams	128.5	4
2	Graf	113.0	—
3	Hingis	111.7	1
4	Davenport	103.7	2
5	V. Williams	103.3	3
6	Seles	63.8	6
7	Mauresmo	52.9	10
8	Pierce	44.2	5
9	Schett	40.7	8
10	Kournikova	33.1	12
11	Capriati	31.0	23
12	Halard-Decugis	30.5	9
13	Novotna	28.5	—
14	Dokic	27.0	43
15	Huber	26.8	16
16	Tauziat	26.6	7
17	Fernandez	26.3	38
18	Coetzer	25.4	11
19	Clijsters	25.3	47
20	Martinez	25.0	15

Quality/Round Points Equalized: 2Q+R Per Tournament

Calculated by doubling total quality points, adding round points, and dividing the sum by tournaments. The effect of this is to make, very roughly, half of the typical player's points come from quality and half from round points. This is, in the author's opinion, about the best way to assess players' actual performances based solely on WTA ranking data.

Rank	Name	2Q+R per Trn	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	431.5	1
2	S. Williams	403.2	4
3	Graf	384.4	—
4	Davenport	372.6	2
5	V. Williams	360.8	3
6	Seles	241.5	6
7	Mauresmo	180.0	10
8	Pierce	177.2	5
9	Schett	137.8	8
10	Kournikova	119.5	12
11	Tauziat	115.4	7
12	Halard-Decugis	114.5	9
13	Novotna	113.9	—
14	Sanchez-Vicario	104.4	17
15	Capriati	102.3	23
16	Coetzer	100.5	11
17	Martinez	93.3	15
18	Testud	89.5	13
19	Huber	87.3	16
20	Van Roost	86.8	14

Winning Percentage Adjusting for Tournament Strength

The table below breaks down wins and losses according to the tier of the tournament played. The assumption is that a win at a high-tier event has more significance than a win at a low-tier event, while a loss at a low-tier event is more “shameful” than a loss at a high-tier event.

The final two columns allow us to adjust these numbers. The column labelled “+W” stands for “awards for wins.” This means that players are *rewarded* for wins in major events — Slams, Chase, Tier I, Tier II. The number of wins in these events is multiplied by 1.33 (arbitrary multiplier; the difference in tournament strength between a Tier II and a Tier III is often much greater than this). The next column, “+W-L” stands for “awards for wins, penalties for losses.” Here again, wins at bigger events are multiplied by 1.33 — but losses at lesser events (Tier III and Tier IV) are penalized by being multiplied by 1.5. The result is then roughly normalized (made to approximate actual winning percentages) by multiplying by .8.

Note that the result of these calculations is not a percentage, but is intended to range from 0 to 100. The higher the number, the better the player’s results. Note that, for players who did not play, or did not lose in, a Tier III or below, the figures in the final two columns are identical.

Player Name	WTA Rnk	Slams			Chase			Tier I			Tier II			Tier III			Tier IV			Overall			+ W	+W -L
		W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%		
Capriati	23	8	4	67				4	4	50	4	5	44	10	0	100				26	13	66.7	64	64
Coetzer	11	5	4	56		1	0	13	8	62	15	10	60	4	2	67				37	25	59.7	62	61
Davenport	2	21	3	88	4		100	4	2	67	25	4	86	4		100				58	9	86.6	91	91
Déchy	25	5	4	56				5	5	50	10	7	59	4	3	57	8	4	67	32	23	58.2	56	53
Dragomir	20	7	4	64				10	8	56	10	5	67	1	2	33	2	3	40	30	22	57.7	60	57
Frazier	19	4	4	50				2	4	33	12	7	63	10	3	77	3	1	75	31	19	62.0	59	57
Graf	—	17	2	89				11	4	73	5	3	63							33	9	78.6	84	84
Halard-Dec	9	9	4	69		1	0	10	6	63	10	8	56	5		100	13	1	93	47	20	70.1	68	67
Hingis	1	19	3	86	3	1	75	31	4	89	17	4	81							70	12	85.4	91	91
Huber	16	5	3	63	1	1	50	8	7	53	10	10	50	4	3	57	3	2	60	31	26	54.4	55	52
Kournikova	12	9	3	75		1	0	10	6	63	14	8	64	2	1	67				35	19	64.8	68	67
Likhovtsev	18	9	4	69		1	0	11	9	55	10	13	43	4	2	67				34	29	54.0	56	55
Martinez	15	11	4	73		1	0	10	7	59	12	10	55	5		100				38	22	63.3	65	65
Mauresmo	10	10	3	77		1	0	7	4	64	10	6	63				4		100	31	14	68.9	71	71
Novotna	—	11	4	73				10	6	63	5	3	63	0	1	0	0	1	0	26	15	63.4	67	66
Pierce	5	12	4	75	1	1	50	13	6	68	15	6	71	4	2	67				45	19	70.3	73	72
Rubin	22	4	4	50				8	6	57	5	6	45	9	3	75	6	1	86	32	20	61.5	58	56
Sanchez-V	17	9	4	69		1	0	6	5	55	5	6	45	4	1	80				24	17	58.5	89	89
Schett	8	12	4	75	1	1	50	15	7	68	14	9	61				4	2	67	46	23	66.7	60	59
Schnyder	21	5	4	56				11	8	58	7	8	47	6	2	75		1	0	29	23	55.8	69	68
Seles	6	16	4	80				10	5	67	10	3	77							36	12	75.0	56	55
Sugiyama	24	4	4	50				7	7	50	7	9	44	8	3	73				26	23	53.1	80	80
Tauziat	7	7	3	70	2	1	67	11	6	65	12	10	55	5	2	71		1	0	37	23	61.7	52	51
Testud	13	7	4	64		1	0	9	6	60	18	11	62	2	3	40				36	25	59.0	63	62
Van Roost	14	9	4	69	1	1	50	9	6	60	10	9	53	4	3	57	5	2	71	38	25	60.3	62	60
S. Williams	4	11	2	85				15	3	83	11	2	85							37	7	84.1	88	88
V. Williams	3	16	4	80	2	1	67	15	0	100	20	6	77	4		100				57	11	83.8	60	58

From this, we can calculate a Top Twenty under each of the three accounting systems:

Rank	Strict Win Percentage		Awards for Wins (+W)		Awards+Penalties (+W-L)	
	Player	Score	Player	Score	Player	Score
1	Davenport	86.6	Hingis	90.8	Hingis	90.8
2	Hingis	85.4	Davenport	90.5	Davenport	90.5
3	S. Williams	84.1	S. Williams	89.5	S. Williams	89.5
4	V. Williams	83.8	V. Williams	87.6	V. Williams	87.6
5	Graf	78.6	Graf	83.6	Graf	83.6
6	Seles	75.0	Seles	79.8	Seles	79.8
7	Pierce	70.3	Pierce	73.2	Pierce	72.0
8	Halard-Decugis	70.1	Mauresmo	71.0	Mauresmo	71.0
9	Mauresmo	68.9	Schett	69.4	Schett	68.4
10	Schett	66.7	Kournikova	68.0	Kournikova	67.4
11	Capriati	66.7	Halard-Decugis	67.5	Halard-Decugis	67.0
12	Kournikova	64.8	Novotna	67.5	Novotna	65.9
13	Novotna	61.9	Martinez	65.2	Martinez	65.2
14	Martinez	63.3	Capriati	64.2	Capriati	64.2
15	Frazier	62.0	Tauziat	63.4	Tauziat	61.9
16	Tauziat	61.7	Testud	61.9	Coetzer	60.8
17	Rubin	61.5	Coetzer	61.8	Testud	60.4
18	Van Roost	60.3	Van Roost	60.4	Sanchez-Vicario	59.0
19	Coetzer	59.7	Dragomir	59.9	Van Roost	58.1
20	Testud	59.0	Sanchez-Vicario	59.7	Dragomir	57.1

Wins Per Tournament

Calculates the number of wins each player averaged per tournament. Note: The list includes only the Top 25; it is nearly certain that some players outside the Top 25 will have achieved higher numbers than, say, Likhovtseva or Sugiyama by playing lower-tier tournaments. Wins (and losses) in qualifying are not shown (affecting the figures for Capriati, Dragomir, and Huber; if these were included, Capriati's score would fall to 1.9, Dragomir's to 1.30; Huber would move up to 1.31).

Rank	Player	Wins	Tournaments	Wins/Tourn	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	70	19	3.68	1
2	S. Williams	37	11	3.36	4
3	V. Williams	57	17	3.35	3
4	Graf	33	10	3.30	—
5	Davenport	58	18	3.22	2
6	Seles	36	13	2.77	6
7	Pierce	45	20	2.25	5
8	Mauresmo	31	15	2.07	10
9	Schett	46	23	2.00	8
10	Halard-Decugis	47	24	1.96	9
11	Kournikova	35	19	1.84	12
12	Capriati	26	15	1.73	23
13	Martinez	38	23	1.65	15
14	Novotna	26	16	1.63	—
15	Frazier	31	20	1.55	19
16	Rubin	32	21	1.52	22
17	Van Roost	38	25	1.52	14
18	Coetzer	37	25	1.48	11
19	Tauziat	37	25	1.48	7
20	Testud	36	25	1.44	13
21	Déchy	32	23	1.39	25
22	Dragomir	30	22	1.36	20
23	Sanchez-Vicario	24	18	1.33	17
24	Schnyder	29	24	1.21	21
25	Huber	31	26	1.19	16
26	Likhovtseva	34	29	1.17	18
27	Sugiyama	26	23	1.13	24

Percentage of Possible Points Earned

Tournaments differ in their “richness.” A win at a Slam, for instance, is worth twice as much as a win in an equivalent round of a Tier I. A player who plays mostly “rich” tournaments, such as Slams and Tier I events, will therefore earn more points than a player who has the same number of wins in lesser tournaments. We can control for this by comparing a player’s *actual* score with the *expected* results if one wins each level of tournament.

For these purposes, we must define values for each of the various tournament types. For this exercise, I have used the following values:

- **Slam:** 870 (520 round points + 350 quality points = 7 rounds * 25 pts/round * 2 slam bonus)
- **Chase Championship:** 590 (390 round points + 200 qual points = 4 rounds * 50 pts/round)
- **Lipton:** 440 (260 round points + 180 qual points = 6 rounds * 30 pts/round)
- **56-Draw Tier I:** 410 (260 round points + 150 qual points = 5 rounds * 30 pts/round)
- **28-Draw Tier I:** 388 (260 round points + 128 qual points = 4 rounds * 32 pts/round)
- **Tier II:** 320 (200 round points + 120 qual points = 4 rounds * 30 pts/round)
- **Tier III:** 228 (140 round points + 88 qual points = 4 rounds * 22 pts/round)
- **Tier IV:** 174 (110 round points for Tier IVA + 64 qual points = 4 rounds * 16 pts/round)

Note that other point assignments may be used, to favour those who play more higher- or lower-tier tournaments. The above is an approximation, based on the examination of several tournament fields: This is what one could typically expect to earn at such an event. Not all tournament winners would earn this precise amount (Graf and Serena Williams, for instance, earned much more for their Slam wins, because they were able to beat many top players, while Tauziat’s two tournament wins earned her less than the above figures because both events were weak. It is, of course, possible to calculate the maximum number of points a player could earn for any given tournament — but this is actually an unfair gauge, because chances are that a particular player will not play all her highest-round opponents. And this is not under the player’s own control.)

Based on these numbers, we can calculate an approximate figure for the number of points a player could have earned based on her schedule. This is the “Possible Points” field. The “Actual Points” is what the player actually earned in these events (note that Capriati’s qualifying points have been eliminated). The column after that, “Percent,” shows the percent of her possible points a player earned. The final column, “average richness,” is simply the possible points divided by the number of tournaments. This shows how strong a player’s schedule is. Graf, for instance, played only ten tournaments — but they included three Slams plus the Lipton and Indian Wells, all of which are very “rich.” Similarly, Seles and Serena Williams played few, but very high-tier, events. This gave them the opportunity to earn a lot of points in a relatively small number of tournaments.

The key figure, therefore, is “percent” — this is the calculation which shows how well a player lived up to expectations. In this category Hingis is the clear leader, with an astonishing 65.6% of possible points earned (this despite the fact that Hingis, as the #1 player, has fewer points available to her in tournaments than anyone else — she cannot beat herself!). This is followed by the usual suspects: Davenport, Serena Williams, Venus Williams, and Graf, in that order. These five are the only ones to earn more than 50% of their possible points. They are followed by Seles, Pierce, and Mauresmo, the only other players to pick up more than 25% of their possible points.

Player	Slams	Chase	Lipton	Tr I 56 draw	Tr I 28 draw	Tier II	Tier III	Tier IV	Possible Points	Actual Points	Percent	Avg Richness
Capriati	4		1	2	1	5	2		7184	1122	15.6%	479
Coetzer	4	1	1	5	2	10	2		10992	1878	17.1%	440
Davenport	4	1	1	1	1	9	1		8416	4841	57.5%	468
Déchy	4		1	3	1	7	3	4	9158	1028	11.2%	398
Dragomir	4		1	5	2	5	2	3	9324	1295	13.9%	424
Frazier	4		1	2	1	7	4	1	8454	1301	15.4%	423
Graf	3		1	2	1	3			5218	2714	52.0%	522
Halard-Decugis	4	1	1	2	3	8	2	3	10032	2018	20.1%	418
Hingis	4	1	1	5	2	6			9256	6076	65.6%	487
Huber	3	1	1	3	3	10	3	2	10266	1574	15.3%	395
Kournikova	3	1	1	4	1	8	1		8456	1642	19.4%	445
Likhovtseva	4	1	1	5	3	13	2		12340	1425	11.5%	426
Martinez	4	1	1	5	1	10	1		10376	1569	15.1%	451
Mauresmo	3	1	1	3		6		1	6964	1906	27.4%	464
Novotna	4		1	4	1	4	1	1	7630	1366	17.9%	477
Pierce	4	1	1	3	2	7	2		9212	2660	28.9%	461
Rubin	4		1	3	2	6	3	2	8878	1191	13.4%	423
Sanchez-Vicario	4	1	1	4		6	2		8526	1435	16.8%	474
Schett	4	1	1	4	2	9	1	1	10208	2233	21.9%	444
Schnyder	4		1	5	2	8	3	1	10164	1195	11.8%	424
Seles	4		1	3	1	4			6818	2310	33.9%	524
Sugiyama	4			4	3	9	3		9848	1127	11.4%	428
Tauziat	3	1	1	4	2	11	2	1	10206	2220	21.8%	408
Testud	4	1	1	3	2	11	3		10720	1642	15.3%	429
Van Roost	4	1	1	3	2	9	3	2	10428	1629	15.6%	417
S. Williams	3		1	3		4			5560	3021	54.3%	505
V. Williams	4	1	1	1	1	8	1		8096	4378	54.1%	476

For additional alternate ranking schemes, see *Statistics/Rankings Based on Head-to-Head Numbers*.

Head to Head — Results against Top Players

The Top 20 Head to Head

The table below shows how the Top 20 fared against each other in 1998. For completeness, the Top 25 are shown on the vertical axis, although only the Top 20 are listed across the top.

Reading the Table: For space reasons, the names of the Top 20 players have been abbreviated in the column headings. Scores are meant to be read across the rows. That is, the first number in the record is that of the person at the beginning of the row, not the top of the column. So, e.g., if you look down the column headed DAVENPO (i.e. Davenport) and the row labelled Graf, you will see the notation “1-2.” This means that Davenport and Graf played three times (1+2=3), with Graf winning one and Davenport two.

	C O E T Z E R	D A V E N P O	D E C A R D	F R A N Z I S	G R A F	H A L A R D	H I N G I S	H U B E R	K O U R N I K O V A	L I K H O V T S E V A	L I C H T E N S T E N	M A R T I N E Z	M A U R E S M O	N O V O T N A	P I E R C E	S A N C H E Z	S C H E T T	S E L E S	T A U Z I A T	T E S T U D	V A N R O O S T	S W I L L I A M S	V I L L I A M S
Capriati	0-0	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-1	0-1	0-1	1-0	0-1	1-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-1	3-1	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0
Coetzer		1-0	0-0	1-1	0-0	2-0	0-3	0-0	2-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	1-2	0-2	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-4
Davenport	0-1		2-0	4-0	2-1	2-1	3-0	3-0	0-1	1-0	1-0	3-1	1-0	1-0	0-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-2	3-2
Déchy	0-0	0-1	0-0	1-1	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-0	0-1	1-0	0-0	1-0	0-2	0-2	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1	1-0	1-0	0-1	0-0
Dragomir	0-0	0-2		0-0	0-0	0-1	0-1	0-2	1-0	1-0	0-0	1-0	2-1	0-1	0-1	1-1	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1
Frazier	1-1	0-4	0-0		1-0	0-1	0-2	1-0	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0
Graf	0-0	1-2	0-0	0-1		0-1	1-1	0-0	1-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	2-0	1-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-1	2-2
Halard-Dec	0-2	1-2	1-0	1-0	1-0		0-1	2-2	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-1	1-0	0-0	0-0	1-1	0-2	0-1
Hingis	3-0	0-3	1-0	2-0	1-1	1-0		1-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	2-1	2-0	4-0	4-0	4-0	2-0	2-0	2-0	2-0	2-0	1-3	3-2
Huber	0-0	0-3	2-0	0-1	0-0	2-2	0-1		0-1	1-0	0-0	1-0	1-0	0-2	0-1	1-0	0-0	1-2	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1
Kournikova	0-2	1-0	0-1	1-0	0-1	1-0	0-1	1-0		0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-0	1-1	0-1	0-2	1-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-3
Likhovtseva	0-0	0-1	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-1	0-0		0-0	1-0	0-1	0-0	1-1	0-2	1-3	0-2	0-0	1-4	0-1	0-0	0-0
Martinez	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0		0-0	0-0	2-3	0-2	0-2	0-4	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-1	0-1	0-1
Mauresmo	0-0	1-3	0-1	0-0	0-0	1-0	1-2	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-0		0-0	0-2	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-1	2-0	0-1	0-0	0-0
Novotna	0-0	0-1	1-2	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-2	0-1	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0		0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-1
Pierce	0-1	0-1	1-0	1-0	0-0	0-1	0-4	2-0	2-0	0-0	3-2	2-0	0-0		0-0	2-0	0-0	0-0	3-0	1-0	0-1	0-3	0-3
Rubin	1-0	0-1	1-0	0-0	0-1	1-0	1-3	0-0	0-2	0-0	1-2	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-1
Sanchez-Vic	0-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-4	1-0	0-0	1-1	2-0	0-0	0-0	0-0		0-3	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	1-1	0-1	0-1
Schett	0-0	0-1	1-1	0-1	0-2	0-0	0-4	0-1	1-1	2-0	2-0	1-0	1-0	0-2	3-0		0-1	3-1	0-0	1-1	0-0	0-0	0-2
Schnyder	0-1	0-1	0-1	1-1	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-3	2-1	0-0	0-3	0-1	1-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-2	0-1	0-1	0-1	0-0
Seles	2-1	0-1	1-0	0-0	1-1	1-0	0-2	0-0	1-0	3-1	4-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-0		0-0	1-0	0-0	0-2	0-1	0-1
Sugiyama	1-0	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-2	1-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-0	0-0	1-0	2-1	0-0	0-0	0-2	0-0	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-1
Tauziat	2-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-2	2-1	2-0	2-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-3	0-0		1-2	2-1	0-1	0-0	0-0
Testud	0-1	0-0	0-1	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-2	1-0	0-1	0-0	0-1	1-0	0-1	0-3	1-0	0-0	0-1	2-1		1-0	2-1	0-2	0-2
Van Roost	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	0-0	1-1	0-2	0-0	1-0	4-1	0-0	0-2	0-0	0-1	0-0	1-1	0-0	1-2	0-1		0-0	0-1	0-1
S. Williams	1-0	2-0	0-0	0-0	1-1	2-0	3-1	0-0	0-0	1-0	1-0	1-0	0-0	1-0	1-1	0-0	2-0	1-0	1-2	0-0		0-1	0-1
V. Williams	4-0	2-3	1-0	0-0	2-2	1-0	2-3	1-0	3-0	0-0	1-0	0-0	1-1	3-0	1-0	2-0	1-0	0-0	2-0	1-0	1-0		0-1

Wins Over Top Players

Matches Played/Won against the (Final) Top Twenty

Here as elsewhere, the “Top Twenty” also include Graf and Novotna. Thus a player can have a maximum of 21 Top 20 opponents if she herself is in the Top Twenty, or 22 Top Twenty opponents if she is outside the Top Twenty. (Thus Hingis, despite beating 20 players, did not defeat one top player, Davenport.)

The final column, % of wins against Top 20, calculates the fraction of a player’s wins earned against the Top Twenty — a measure of the difficulty one faced to earn those wins.

Player Name	WTA Rank	Top 20 Opponents Played	Top 20 Players Beaten	Top 20 Players Lost To	Total Top 20 Victories	Total Top 20 Losses	Total Wins, all opponents	% of wins against Top 20
Capriati	23	13	5	9	7	10	26	26.9%
Coetzer	11	11	7	6	9	13	37	24.3%
Davenport	2	18	15	7	29	9	58	50%
Déchy	25	13	6	8	6	11	32	18.8%
Dragomir	20	14	6	10	7	12	30	23.3%
Frazier	19	11	6	6	6	10	31	19.4%
Graf	—	11	9	7	11	9	33	33.3%
Halard-Decugis	9	16	9	10	10	13	47	21.3%
Hingis	1	21	20	5	40	10	70	57.1%
Huber	16	15	7	10	9	15	31	29.0%
Kournikova	12	15	6	10	6	15	35	17.1%
Likhovtseva	18	13	3	11	4	19	34	11.8%
Martinez	15	11	2	10	3	17	38	7.9%
Mauresmo	10	11	4	9	5	13	31	16.1%
Novotna	—	9	4	7	4	9	26	15.4%
Pierce	5	15	9	7	17	13	45	37.8%
Rubin	22	11	5	8	5	12	32	15.6%
Sanchez-Vicario	17	9	5	6	6	10	24	16.7%
Schett	8	17	9	12	15	18	46	32.6%
Schnyder	21	14	4	13	5	18	29	17.2%
Seles	6	13	8	7	15	9	36	41.2%
Sugiyama	24	11	4	8	5	12	26	19.2%
Tauziat	7	12	7	9	12	13	37	32.4%
Testud	13	15	6	11	8	15	36	22.2%
Van Roost	14	10	5	9	8	12	38	21.1%
S. Williams	4	14	13	5	18	6	37	48.6%
V. Williams	3	17	16	4	29	9	57	50.9%

In this measure, Hingis was clearly the top player on the Tour. She managed the astonishing feat of playing *all 25* of the final Top 25 players at least once. What is more, she had at least one win against every one of them except Davenport (and she beat Davenport at Hopman Cup). She also had clearly the highest fraction of her wins against the Top Twenty (meaning that she wasn’t earning points against low-ranked opponents). Her number of wins against Top Twenty players is more than a third greater than Davenport’s or Venus Williams’s total.

Won/Lost Versus the Top Players (Based on Rankings at the Time of the Match)

The following table shows each player's won/lost record against the Top 10, against the Second 10 (#11-#20), and against the Top 20 as a whole, *based on the rankings at the time*. (The next and previous tables give statistics based on the *final* Top 20.)

WTA Rank	Player Name	Overall W/L		Against Top 10			Against #11-#30			Against Top 20			Non-Top20		
		W	L	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%
23	Capriati	26	13	2	6	25.0%	4	4	50.0%	6	10	37.5%	20	3	87.0%
11	Coetzer	37	25	3	11	21.4%	4	3	57.1%	7	14	33.3%	30	11	73.2%
2	Davenport	58	9	15	4	78.9%	6	3	66.7%	21	7	75.0%	37	2	94.9%
25	Déchy	32	23	2	8	20.0%	3	2	60.0%	5	10	33.3%	27	13	67.5%
20	Dragomir	30	22	2	8	20.0%	5	3	62.5%	7	11	38.9%	23	11	67.6%
19	Frazier	31	19	3	8	27.3%	3	2	60.0%	6	10	37.5%	25	9	73.5%
(5)	Graf	33	9	6	6	50.0%	3	1	75.0%	9	7	56.3%	24	2	92.3%
9	Halard-Decugis	47	20	4	6	40.0%	5	6	45.5%	9	12	42.9%	38	8	82.6%
1	Hingis	70	12	20	7	74.1%	15	3	83.3%	35	10	77.8%	35	2	94.6%
16	Huber	31	26	4	11	26.7%	5	4	55.6%	9	15	37.5%	22	11	66.7%
12	Kournikova	35	19	2	12	14.3%	5	2	71.4%	7	14	33.3%	28	5	84.8%
18	Likhovtseva	34	29	2	10	16.7%	3	9	25.0%	5	19	20.8%	29	10	74.4%
15	Martinez	38	22	2	14	12.5%	1	2	33.3%	3	16	15.8%	35	6	85.4%
10	Mauresmo	31	14	4	7	36.4%	3	1	75.0%	7	8	46.7%	24	6	80.0%
(19)	Novotna	26	15	1	5	16.7%	3	1	75.0%	4	6	40.0%	22	9	71.0%
5	Pierce	45	19	1	10	9.1%	13	3	81.3%	14	13	51.9%	31	6	83.8%
22	Rubin	32	20	2	7	22.2%	3	6	33.3%	5	13	27.8%	27	7	79.4%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	24	17	0	6	0.0%	7	4	63.6%	7	9	43.8%	17	7	70.8%
8	Schett	46	23	4	13	23.5%	7	2	77.8%	11	15	42.3%	35	8	81.4%
21	Schnyder	29	23	1	5	16.7%	4	9	30.8%	5	14	26.3%	24	9	72.7%
6	Seles	36	12	2	6	25.0%	9	2	81.8%	11	8	57.9%	25	4	86.2%
24	Sugiyama	26	23	4	8	33.3%	1	2	33.3%	5	10	33.3%	16	13	55.2%
7	Tauziat	37	23	2	4	33.3%	8	8	50.0%	10	12	45.5%	27	11	71.1%
13	Testud	36	25	4	12	25.0%	3	2	60.0%	6	14	30.0%	30	11	73.2%
14	Van Roost	38	25	2	7	22.2%	4	2	66.7%	6	9	40.0%	32	16	66.7%
4	S. Williams	37	7	12	4	75.0%	6	2	75.0%	18	6	75.0%	19	1	95.0%
3	V. Williams	57	11	16	9	64.0%	13	0	100%	29	9	76.3%	28	2	93.3%

Won/Lost Versus the Top Players (Based on Final Rankings)

The following table shows each player's won/lost record against the Top 10, against the Second 10 (#11-#20), and against the Top 20 as a whole. **Note:** This is *not* the same as the players' wins over Top 10/Top 20 players, given in the previous table. What is shown here is the player's record against the women who *ended* the year in the Top 10/Top 20. At the time of the matches, some of these women will not have been at their final ranks. On the other hand, it could be argued that this is a better measure of success against top players — a player who ends 1999 at #4 (i.e. Serena Williams) had a better 1999 than a player who began the year at #4 but ended at #17 (Sanchez-Vicario), and a win against her should therefore mean more.

Special Note: For purposes of this calculation, Graf is counted as Top Ten (#5) and Novotna as Top 20 (#19).

WTA Rank	Player Name	Overall W/L		Against Top 10			Against #11-#30			Against Top 20			Non-Top20		
		W	L	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%	W	L	%
23	Capriati	26	13	3	9	25.0%	4	1	80.0%	7	10	41.2%	19	3	86.4%
11	Coetzer	37	25	5	12	29.4%	4	1	80.0%	9	13	40.9%	28	12	70.0%
2	Davenport	58	9	17	7	70.8%	12	2	85.7%	29	9	76.3%	29	0	100%
25	Déchy	32	23	1	7	12.5%	5	4	55.6%	6	11	35.3%	26	12	68.4%
20	Dragomir	30	22	2	8	20.0%	5	4	55.6%	7	12	36.8%	23	10	69.7%
19	Frazier	31	19	3	8	27.3%	3	2	60.0%	6	10	37.5%	25	9	73.5%
(5)	Graf	33	9	8	8	50.0%	3	1	75.0%	11	9	55.0%	22	0	100%
9	Halard-Decugis	47	20	4	8	33.3%	6	6	50.0%	10	14	41.7%	37	6	86.0%
1	Hingis	70	12	20	10	66.7%	20	0	100.0%	40	10	80.0%	30	2	93.8%
16	Huber	31	26	5	11	31.3%	4	4	50.0%	9	15	37.5%	22	11	66.7%
12	Kournikova	35	19	3	11	21.4%	3	4	42.9%	6	15	28.6%	29	4	87.9%
18	Likhovtseva	34	29	2	11	15.4%	2	8	20.0%	4	19	17.4%	30	10	75.0%
15	Martinez	38	22	2	14	12.5%	1	3	25.0%	3	17	15.0%	35	5	87.5%
10	Mauresmo	31	14	3	9	25.0%	2	4	33.3%	5	13	27.8%	26	1	96.3%
(19)	Novotna	26	15	1	6	14.3%	3	3	50.0%	4	9	30.8%	22	6	78.6%
5	Pierce	45	19	4	10	28.6%	13	3	81.3%	17	13	56.7%	28	6	82.4%
22	Rubin	32	20	2	7	22.2%	3	5	37.5%	5	12	29.4%	27	8	77.1%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	24	17	1	9	10.0%	5	2	71.4%	6	11	35.3%	18	6	75.0%
8	Schett	46	23	4	13	23.5%	11	5	68.8%	15	18	45.5%	31	5	86.1%
21	Schnyder	29	23	1	6	14.3%	4	12	25.0%	5	18	21.7%	24	5	82.8%
6	Seles	36	12	3	7	30.0%	12	2	85.7%	15	9	62.5%	21	3	87.5%
24	Sugiyama	26	23	3	7	30.0%	2	5	28.6%	5	12	29.4%	21	11	65.6%
7	Tauziat	37	23	1	8	11.1%	11	5	68.8%	12	13	48.0%	25	10	71.4%
13	Testud	36	25	5	10	33.3%	3	5	37.5%	8	15	34.8%	28	10	73.7%
14	Van Roost	38	25	3	10	23.1%	5	2	71.4%	8	12	40.0%	30	13	69.8%
4	S. Williams	37	7	13	3	81.3%	5	3	62.5%	18	6	75.0%	19	1	95.0%
3	V. Williams	57	11	14	8	63.6%	15	1	93.8%	29	9	76.3%	28	2	93.3%

Statistics/Rankings Based on Head-to-Head Numbers

Based on these numbers, we can offer a number of statistics/rankings. For instance:

Total Wins over Top Ten Players

Based on the Top Ten at the Time:

1. Hingis (20)
2. V. Williams (16)
3. Davenport (15)
4. S. Williams (12)
5. Graf (6)
6. Halard-Decugis (4)
- Huber (4)
- Mauresmo (4)
- Schett (4)
- Sugiyama (4)
- Testud (4)

Based on the Final Top Ten:

1. Hingis (20)
2. Davenport (17)
3. V. Williams (14)
4. S. Williams (13)
5. Graf (8)
6. Coetzer (5)
- Huber (5)
- Testud (5)
9. Halard-Decugis (4)
- Pierce (4)
- Schett (4)

Winning Percentage against Top Ten Players

Based on the Top Ten at the Time:

1. Davenport (78.9%)
2. S. Williams (75%)
3. Hingis (74.1%)
4. V. Williams (64%)
5. Graf (50%)
6. Halard-Decugis (40%)
7. Mauresmo (36.4%)
8. Sugiyama (33.3%)
- Tauziat (33.3%)
10. Frazier (27.3%)

Based on the Final Top Ten:

1. S. Williams (81.3%)
2. Davenport (70.8%)
3. Hingis (66.7%)
4. V. Williams (63.6%)
5. Graf (50%)
6. Halard-Decugis (33.3%)
7. Testud (33.3%)
8. Huber (31.3%)
9. Seles (30%)
10. Sugiyama (30%)

It is a comment on the dominance of the “Big Four” (Hingis, Davenport, and the Williams Sisters) that they were the only players on the Tour with winning records against the Top Ten (ignoring players with fewer than five matches against Top Ten players).

For additional information about winning percentages, see *Winning Percentage against Non-Top-20 Players*.

Wins Against Top Ten Players Analysed

Simply listing winning percentage against the Top 10 doesn't mean much. It's a lot harder to beat a Davenport than a Tauziat. The following five statistics attempt to evaluate these wins.

- **Inverse Rank.** This simply takes a player's rank, subtracts it from 11, and assigns that value for a win over a player. So, for instance, Hingis is #1. Therefore, under this scheme, a win over her is worth 10 points. Davenport, #2, is worth 9 points, and so on down to Mauresmo, #10, who is worth 1 point.
- **WTA Awards.** The WTA has a quality point allocation based on a player's rank: 100 points for beating #1, 75 for beating #2, 66 for #3, 55 for #4, 50 for #5, and 43 for the rest of the Top 10. This scheme simply awards points on this basis.
- **By Seeding.** This awards points based on seeding tier. Thus, beating #1 or #2 is worth 8 points; beating 3 or 4 is worth 4 points; beating #5-#8 is worth 2 points, and beating #9-#10 is worth 1.
- **Year-end Total.** Here, the award is based on the player's actual year-end score. Davenport had a final score of 5654, so a win over her is defined as being worth 56.5 (dividing by 100 to keep the numbers fairly small). Hingis had a final score of 5336, so a win over her is worth 53.7. And so forth.
- **Year-end Divisor.** Similar to the above, except that per-tournament score is used.

In every case, a total score is calculated, and then (to even out the effects of the number of matches one has played against the Top 10), this is divided by the number of matches against Top 10 players.

Observe that all of these numbers are based on arbitrary systems, and should be compared only with other numbers of the same type and in the same column. Also, statistics are based on the *final* Top Ten.

WTA Rank	Player Name	Inverse Rank		WTA Awards		By Seeding		Year-end Total		Year-end Divisor	
		Total	Per Mtch	Total	Per Mtch	Total	Per Mtch	Total	Per Mtch	Total	Per Mtch
1	Hingis	91	3.03	976	32.5	45	1.50	530.7	17.7	3115	103.8
2	Davenport	90	3.75	992	41.3	53	2.21	558.2	23.3	3294	137.2
3	V. Williams	85	3.86	827	37.6	53	2.41	468.9	21.3	2833	128.8
4	S. Williams	78	4.88	808	50.5	53	3.31	459.6	28.7	2613	163.3
(5)	Graf	53	3.31	491	30.7	34	2.13	293.6	18.4	1742	108.9
5	Pierce	8	0.57	172	12.3	6	0.43	81.8	5.8	450.6	32.2
6	Seles	8	0.80	93	9.3	3	0.30	46.9	4.7	356.3	35.6
7	Tauziat	3	0.33	43	4.8	2	0.22	21.8	2.4	98.2	10.9
8	Schett	13	0.76	172	10.1	7	0.41	85.4	5.0	393.5	23.1
9	Halard-Decugis	24	2.00	218	18.2	14	1.17	124.2	10.4	762.1	63.5
10	Mauresmo	21	1.75	218	18.2	17	1.42	128.9	10.7	663.6	55.3
11	Coetzer	23	1.35	254	14.9	14	0.82	137.7	8.1	749.4	44.1
12	Kournikova	14	1.00	161	11.5	11	0.79	90	6.4	452	32.3
13	Testud	23	1.53	239	15.9	13	0.87	123.7	8.2	853.9	56.9
14	Van Roost	9	0.69	129	9.9	5	0.38	63.7	4.9	271.9	20.9
15	Martinez	10	0.63	100	6.3	4	0.25	53.2	3.3	266	16.6
16	Huber	12	0.75	215	13.4	7	0.44	102.6	6.4	483.9	30.2
17	Sanchez-Vicario	7	0.70	55	5.5	4	0.40	30.2	3.0	274.6	27.5
18	Likhovtseva	6	0.46	86	6.6	3	0.23	42.2	3.2	304.8	23.4
(19)	Novotna	8	1.14	66	9.4	4	0.57	43.8	6.3	257.5	36.8
19	Frazier	13	1.18	136	12.4	6	0.55	71	6.5	458.4	41.7
20	Dragomir	4	0.40	86	8.6	3	0.30	40.9	4.1	225.3	22.5

These statistics consistently show Martina Hingis as having the best cumulative results but Serena Williams as having the strongest wins. Lindsay Davenport and Venus Williams contend for #2 behind Serena, with Davenport winning in three of five categories. Hingis and Graf contend for fourth. It should be noted, however, that Hingis, as the top-ranked player most of the year, had fewer opportunities; her number is expected to be slightly lower. And Serena's results are all on hardcourts. So we have no clear "winner."

How They Earned Their Points

The following tables evaluate the manner in which players earn points, breaking them up, e.g., by points earned on each surface, points earned from quality versus round points, points earned in Slams....

Fraction of Points Earned in Slams

WTA Rank	Player Name	Total Points	Points Earned in Slams	% of Points Earned in Slams	Points Earned outside Slams	% of Points Not Earned in Slams
1	Hingis	6076	2038	33.5%	4038	66.5%
2	Davenport	4841	1922	39.7%	2919	60.3%
3	V Williams	4378	940	21.5%	3438	78.5%
4	S Williams	3021	1204	39.9%	1817	60.1%
(5)	Graf	2714	1788	65.9%	926	34.1%
5	Pierce	2660	572	21.5%	2088	78.5%
6	Seles	2310	1082	46.8%	1228	53.2%
7	Tauziat	2220	342	15.4%	1878	84.6%
8	Schett	2233	644	28.8%	1589	71.2%
9	Halard-Decugis	2018	352	17.4%	1666	82.6%
10	Mauresmo	1906	916	48.1%	990	51.9%
11	Coetzer	1878	198	10.5%	1680	89.5%
12	Kournikova	1642	388	23.6%	1254	76.4%
13	Testud	1642	284	17.3%	1358	82.7%
14	Van Roost	1629	382	23.4%	1247	76.6%
15	Martinez	1569	556	35.4%	1013	64.6%
16	Huber	1574	444	28.2%	1130	71.8%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	1435	564	39.3%	871	60.7%
18	Likhovtseva	1425	362	25.4%	1063	74.6%
(19)	Novotna	1366	472	34.6%	894	65.4%
19	Frazier	1301	152	11.7%	1149	88.3%
20	Dragomir	1296	276	21.3%	1020	78.7%
21	Schnyder	1195	196	16.4%	999	83.6%
22	Rubin	1191	184	15.4%	1007	84.6%
23	Capriati	1140	406	35.6%	734	64.4%
24	Sugiyama	1127	212	18.8%	915	81.2%
25	Déchy	1028	190	18.5%	838	81.5%

The Top 25 (including Graf and Novotna) collectively earned 56,815 points in 1999. 17,066 of these, or 30.0%, were earned at Slams.

The mean of the fraction of points earned in the Slams is 27.9% (that is, this is the average of the players' fractions). The median is Kournikova's 23.6%. Thus any player who earned more than about 30% of her points at the Slams was "strong" at the Slams (Graf's 66% is, of course, astonishing); a player who earned less than 20% of her points at Slams had great difficulty at these events (perhaps, as in Tauziat's case, because the surfaces generally do not suit her game).

Quality Versus Round Points

WTA Rank	Player Name	Total Points	Round Points	Quality Points	% of Points from Quality	% of Points from Round Pts
1	Hingis	6076	3954	2122	34.9%	65.1%
2	Davenport	4841	2975	1866	38.5%	61.5%
3	V Williams	4378	2622	1756	40.1%	59.9%
4	S Williams	3021	1607	1414	46.8%	53.2%
(5)	Graf	2714	1584	1130	41.6%	58.4%
5	Pierce	2660	1777	883	33.2%	66.8%
6	Seles	2310	1480	830	35.9%	64.1%
7	Tauziat	2220	1554	666	30.0%	70.0%
8	Schett	2233	1297	936	41.9%	58.1%
9	Halard-Decugis	2018	1287	731	36.2%	63.8%
10	Mauresmo	1906	1112	794	41.7%	58.3%
11	Coetzer	1878	1243	635	33.8%	66.2%
12	Kournikova	1642	1013	629	38.3%	61.7%
13	Testud	1642	1046	596	36.3%	63.7%
14	Van Roost	1629	1087	542	33.3%	66.7%
15	Martinez	1569	993	576	36.7%	63.3%
16	Huber	1574	878	696	44.2%	55.8%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	1435	991	444	30.9%	69.1%
18	Likhovtseva	1425	883	542	38.0%	62.0%
(19)	Novotna	1366	910	456	33.4%	66.6%
19	Frazier	1301	780	521	40.0%	60.0%
20	Dragomir	1296	735	561	43.3%	56.7%
21	Schnyder	1195	802	393	32.9%	67.1%
22	Rubin	1191	717	474	39.8%	60.2%
23	Capriati	1140	644	496	43.5%	56.5%
24	Sugiyama	1127	658	469	41.6%	58.4%
25	Déchy	1028	629	399	38.8%	61.2%

Generally speaking, the higher the fraction of points one earns from quality, the better one is at pulling off “upsets.” This is especially true of lower-ranked players; a player like Hingis, who was #1 for most of the year, has somewhat fewer quality points available, as she could not defeat a #1 player at any of the slams, could only play #2 in a final, could only play #3 or #4 in a semifinal or final (by which time either player could have lost), etc.

For Comparison: The Top 25 earned a total of 56,815 points. 21,557 of these, or 37.9%, came from quality. The median quality percentage for the Top 25 is 38.3% (earned by Kournikova); the arithmetic mean (average) is 38.0%. Serena Williams’s 46.8% of points from quality is the clear winner; it demonstrates her ability to beat anyone (on hardcourts) but also to lose to much-lower-ranked players on other surfaces. Tauziat’s extremely low 30% figure also shows her strengths and weaknesses: Although in the Top Ten, she is a threat to top players only on grass and indoors.

Percentage of Points Earned on Each Surface

The first four numbers in this table should be fairly self-explanatory. The last three columns, Std Dev, Max-Min, and RMS, are perhaps less clear. These measures are included as an attempt to assess a player's balance. Std Dev is the standard deviation of the player's four surface percentages. The smaller it is, the less deviation there is from the mean, and presumably the more balanced the player is. Max-Min is the player's highest percentage minus the player's lowest percentage, that is, the gap between the player's least and most important surfaces. RMS, for Root Mean Square, measures the player's distance from the mean. The smaller the RMS value, the more "typical" a player is.

For Reference: For the Top 20 as a whole, 44.1% of all points were earned on hardcourts, 22.9% on clay, 7.9% on grass, and 25.0% indoors. (This is an interesting footnote in itself; we tend to treat indoors as the "fourth surface," or at least the third, after hardcourts and clay. In fact, however, indoors is the second surface, despite the fact that none of the slams are played indoors.)

Note: "Balance" is not the same as consistency. Take Tauziat: She earned 25% of her points on grass, despite playing only three of her 25 tournaments on grass. Thus she was much better on grass than other surfaces. She was not typical (she was, in fact, the most atypical player on the tour!), but she was balanced.

Note: Due to round-off, some percentages may not add up to 100, and MAX-MIN may differ by ± 1 from what appears to be the largest value minus the smallest value.

WTA Rank	Player	% Hard	% Clay	% Grass	% Indr	Std Dev	Max-Min	RMS
1	Hingis	47.5%	24.8%	0.0%	27.7%	0.19	47.4	1.01
2	Davenport	50.7%	8.1%	17.4%	23.8%	0.18	42.6	1.39
3	V Williams	43.9%	22.3%	5.2%	28.6%	0.16	38.7	0.36
4	S Williams	82.2%	7.8%	0.0%	10.1%	0.38	82.2	1.60
(5)	Graf	30.7%	42.3%	19.2%	7.8%	0.15	34.5	1.84
5	Pierce	36.1%	23.5%	4.4%	36.0%	0.15	31.8	0.64
6	Seles	60.2%	29.6%	3.0%	7.2%	0.26	57.2	1.05
7	Tauziat	7.2%	10.3%	24.7%	57.7%	0.23	50.5	2.71
8	Schett	45.5%	23.2%	5.2%	26.2%	0.16	40.3	0.34
9	Halard-Decugis	39.8%	24.2%	16.5%	19.5%	0.10	23.4	1.13
10	Mauresmo	56.3%	13.7%	0.0%	30.0%	0.24	56.3	1.13
11	Coetzer	44.2%	11.2%	9.4%	35.1%	0.17	34.9	0.68
12	Kournikova	19.6%	43.5%	15.0%	21.9%	0.13	28.5	1.40
13	Testud	44.3%	11.6%	4.3%	39.8%	0.20	40.1	0.89
14	Van Roost	40.2%	10.7%	10.7%	38.4%	0.17	29.5	0.84
15	Martinez	30.6%	56.2%	4.3%	8.9%	0.24	51.8	1.67
16	Huber	52.9%	5.0%	1.5%	40.7%	0.26	51.3	1.30
17	Sanchez-Vicario	33.9%	59.9%	2.4%	3.8%	0.27	57.4	1.96
18	Likhovtseva	31.0%	29.5%	11.0%	28.4%	0.09	20.0	0.60
(19)	Novotna	25.8%	23.8%	16.5%	33.8%	0.07	17.3	1.24
19	Frazier	73.5%	11.5%	0.2%	14.8%	0.33	73.3	1.34
20	Dragomir	35.7%	51.2%	3.3%	9.7%	0.22	47.9	1.50

We see at once that Serena Williams is by far the most lopsided player on the tour. Only Frazier even comes close. The most balanced is Novotna, with Likhovtseva second. The most typical player — that is, the one whose points profile most closely matches the norm — is Schett, followed by Venus Williams. Tauziat is most atypical, followed by Sanchez-Vicario, Graf (this due to her schedule), Martinez, and Serena.

Consistency

We often speak of a player's "consistency," but the term does not really have a clear definition. We can offer some models, however.

Standard Deviation of Scores by Tournament

One measure of a player's consistency is the standard deviation of a player's results over the tournaments she plays. The following list expresses a player's consistency by dividing the standard deviation of her score by the mean score. In mathematical parlance, if the player's scores are s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n , then the number given here is given by the formula (shown here in two forms):

$$\frac{\text{STDDEV}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)}{\text{MEAN}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)} \qquad \frac{\sigma(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)}{\mu(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)}$$

Thus (for the mathematicians out there), this is not actually the standard deviation; it has been normalized by dividing by the mean.

Note: This is not a ranking system; it is a measure of consistency. A player who loses in the second round of every tournament is more consistent (consistently bad) than a player who wins half of her tournaments and loses early in the other half — but the player who wins the tournaments will have a higher ranking.

In the list below, the lower the score, the more consistent the player is. I have not "ranked" the players, lest this be confused with a ranking scheme, but they are listed in order from least to most consistent by the "standard deviation" measure. Two decimal places are listed unless three are needed to break ties.

V. Williams	0.52
Hingis	0.657
Pierce	0.660
Seles	0.74
Schett	0.76
Kournikova	0.818
Davenport	0.825
Frazier	0.83
Van Roost	0.90
Testud	0.95
Halard-Decugis	0.96
Likhovtseva	0.97
Martinez	1.02
Coetzer	1.03
Novotna	1.08
Sanchez-Vicario	1.09
S. Williams	1.128
Tauziat	1.130
Graf	1.15
Huber	1.26
Dragomir	1.28
Mauresmo	1.51

Early-Round Losses

Another way of measuring consistency is how rarely one suffers early-round losses. The following table shows how many *first-round* losses each of the top players had, followed by *other early-round losses* (defined, arbitrarily, as cases where the player earned 55 or fewer points in the tournament; this is based on the 54 points awarded for a first-round loss in the year-end championships). For my convenience, this list is alphabetical. **Note:** First round losses at the Chase Championships are not included as first-round losses; being worth 54 points (and being suffered at a very high-level event), they have been listed as *early* losses. Players who lost in the first round at the Chase are marked with an asterisk (so you may transfer the results if you like); those who did not play at the Chase are marked “(x)”

Name	WTA Rank	Tournaments	1R Losses	Other Early Losses
Hingis	1	19	1	1
Davenport	2	18	1	1
V Williams	3	17	1	0
S Williams (x)	4	11	1	1
Graf (x)	(5)	10	1	0
Pierce	5	20	2	2
Seles (x)	6	13	1	1
Tauziat	7	25	7	8
Schett	8	23	3	5
Halard-Decugis*	9	24	4	6
Mauresmo*	10	15	2	6
Coetzer*	11	25	6	4
Kournikova*	12	19	3	4
Testud*	13	25	8	4
Van Roost	14	25	7	6
Martinez*	15	23	5	6
Huber	16	26	7	10
Sanchez-Vicario*	17	18	5	5
Likhovtseva*	18	29	10	7
Novotna (x)	(19)	16	6	0
Frazier (x)	19	20	5	3
Dragomir (x)	20	23	6	10
Schnyder (x)	21	24	8	9
Rubin (x)	22	21	6	8
Capriati (x)	23	16	2	8
Sugiyama (x)	24	23	8	6
Déchy (x)	25	23	6	12

So we can compile a list based on rates of first-round and early-round losses. Note that a lower number is better in this case:

Frequency of Early Losses

First-Round Loss Rate

Player Name	First Round Loss Rate
Hingis	5%
Davenport	6%
V Williams	6%
Seles	8%
S Williams	9%
Graf	10%
Pierce	10%
Capriati	13%
Schett	13%
Mauresmo	13%
Kournikova	16%
Halard-Decugis	17%
Martinez	22%
Coetzer	24%
Frazier	25%
Dragomir	26%
Déchy	26%
Huber	27%
Sanchez-Vicario	28%
Tauziat	28%
Van Roost	28%
Rubin	29%
Testud	32%
Schnyder	33%
Likhovtseva	34%
Sugiyama	35%
Novotna	38%

Early-Round Loss Rate

Player Name	Early Round Loss Rate
V Williams	5.9%
Graf	10.0%
Hingis	10.5%
Davenport	11.1%
Seles	15.4%
S Williams	18.2%
Pierce	20.0%
Schett	34.8%
Kournikova	36.8%
Novotna	37.5%
Coetzer	40.0%
Frazier	40.0%
Halard-Decugis	41.7%
Martinez	47.8%
Testud	48.0%
Van Roost	52.0%
Mauresmo	53.3%
Sanchez-Vicario	55.6%
Likhovtseva	58.6%
Tauziat	60.0%
Sugiyama	60.9%
Capriati	62.5%
Huber	65.4%
Rubin	66.7%
Dragomir	69.6%
Schnyder	70.8%
Déchy	78.3%

Winning Percentage against Non-Top-20 Players

A top player should consistently beat the players ranked well below her. The following table shows how the Top 20 fared against non-Top-20 players. Players are listed in order of decreasing success against low-ranked players (sorted based on results against on the then Top Twenty, i.e. opponents' rankings at the time of the match).

Player Name	WTA Rank	Win % against then-non-Top 20	Win % against final non-Top 20
S. Williams	4	95.0%	95.0%
Davenport	2	94.9%	100%
Hingis	1	94.6%	93.8%
V. Williams	3	93.3%	93.3%
Graf	(5)	92.3%	100%
Capriati	23	87.0%	86.4%
Seles	6	86.2%	87.5%
Martinez	15	85.4%	87.5%
Kournikova	12	84.8%	87.9%
Pierce	5	83.8%	82.4%
Halard-Decugis	9	82.6%	86.0%
Schett	8	81.4%	86.1%
Mauresmo	10	80.0%	96.3%
Rubin	22	79.4%	77.1%
Likhovtseva	18	74.4%	75.0%
Frazier	19	73.5%	73.5%
Coetzer	11	73.2%	70.0%
Testud	13	73.2%	73.7%
Schnyder	21	72.7%	82.8%
Tauziat	7	71.1%	71.4%
Novotna	(19)	71.0%	78.6%
Sanchez-Vicario	17	70.8%	75.0%
Dragomir	20	67.6%	69.7%
Déchy	25	67.5%	68.4%
Huber	16	66.7%	66.7%
Van Roost	14	66.7%	69.8%
Sugiyama	24	55.2%	65.6%

For addition data on results against players of various levels, see *Wins Over Top Players*.

Worst Losses

Worst Losses Based on Rankings at the Time

The tables below list the “worst” losses suffered by a player, based on the player’s rank *at the time of the loss*. This is followed by a list organized by the players’ rank *at year-end*. Losses are listed in decreasing order of severity Only the Top Twenty (plus Graf and Novotna) are listed. *Note: Because the WTA did not publish full ranking lists in some weeks, some players have had their rankings listed as simply “>100” (greater than 100) or “>150” (greater than 150).*

Player	WTA Rank	Losses to players outside Top 50	Losses to players outside Top 20
Coetzer	11	Clijsters (195) — Wimbledon Snyder (106) — Quebec City	Sidot (49) — Canadian Open Appelmans (42) — Filderstadt Plischke (38) — Rome Sugiyama (31) — Roland Garros Raymond (30) — Philadelphia Rubin (26) — Indian Wells Nagyova (26) — Hilton Head Nagyova (24) — Berlin Frazier (22) — Princess Cup
Davenport	2		Mauresmo (29) — Australian Open S. Williams (21) — Indian Wells
Dragomir	20	Abe (148) — Prostejov Appelmans (79) — Knokke-Heist Boogert (78) — ’s-Hertogenbosch Bacheva (78) — Filderstadt qualifying Gorrochategui (76) — Wimbledon Glass (61) — Hilton Head Grande (59) — Hobart	Morariu (37) — Rome Serna (35) — Zurich Huber (27) — Lipton Rubin (26) — Indian Wells Serna (24) — Gold Coast
Frazier	19	Stevenson (86) — Wimbledon Chi (82) — Oklahoma City Fernandez (68) — Australian Open Grande (59) — Hobart	Sidot (49) — Canadian Open Appelmans (42) — Filderstadt Capriati (30) — Quebec City Déchy (29) — Eastbourne Schnyder (24) — Zurich
Graf	(5)		Frazier (26) — San Diego S. Williams (21) — Indian Wells Halard-Decugis (21) — Berlin
Halard-Decugis	9	Stevenson (86) — Wimbledon	Black (46) — Pan Pacific Morariu (38) — Bol Appelmans (38) — Leipzig Sugiyama (28) — Princess Cup Huber (25) — Filderstadt S. Williams (24) — Paris Rubin (23) — San Diego
Hingis	1	Dokic (129) — Wimbledon	Rubin (26) — Indian Wells
Huber	16	Maleeva (>150) — ’s-Hertogenbosch Stoyanova (121) — Berlin Kuti Kis (107) — Estoril Clijsters (83) — Luxembourg Habsudova (67) — Portschach Stevenson (52) — Philadelphia	Plischke (47) — Australian Open Capriati (44) — Wimbledon Black (36) — Indian Wells Sidot (31) — Linz Frazier (28) — Stanford
Kournikova	12	Henin (70) — Philadelphia	Fernandez (47) — Berlin Dragomir (38) — Amelia Island Spirlea (26) — Linz Farina (22) — Indian Wells

Likhovtseva	18	Capriati (113) — Strasbourg Habsudova (72) — Sydney Hrdlickova (67) — Leipzig Panova (57) — Zurich	Schwartz (50) — Linz Déchy (48) — Gold Coast Leon Garcia (42) — Roland Garros Morariu (37) — Rome Huber (25) — Filderstadt Dragomir (24) — Moscow
Martinez	15	Petrova (123) — Moscow Loit (95) — Australian Open	Capriati (48) — Stanford Raymond (37) — Wimbledon Rubin (26) — Indian Wells Schett (24) — Sydney
Mauresmo	10		Dragomir (36) — Berlin Déchy (31) — Hilton Head Huber (27) — U. S. Open Schett (24) — Sydney S. Williams (24) — Paris Likhovtseva (23) — Lipton
Novotna	(19)	Maleeva (173) — Luxembourg Cervanova (111) — Budapest Sanchez Lorenzo (65) — Australian Open	Dragomir (36) — Berlin Plischke (34) — Roland Garros Sugiyama (30) — Canadian Open Dragomir (28) — New Haven Huber (27) — U. S. Open Farina (27) — Filderstadt
Pierce	5	Dokic (129) — Wimbledon Hrdlickova (67) — Leipzig	Sugiyama (32) — San Diego Sugiyama (27) — Moscow Martinez (22) — Roland Garros S. Williams (21) — Indian Wells
Sanchez-Vicario	17	Weingartner (67) — Sopot Leon Garcia (53) — Hilton Head Kremer (52) — Lipton	Plischke (38) — Rome Raymond (37) — Wimbledon Déchy (29) — Eastbourne Schett (24) — Sydney
Schett	8	Osterloh (85) — Indian Wells Barabanschikova (71) — Warsaw Chladkova (68) — Linz	Morariu (40) — Zurich Dragomir (38) — Amelia Island Plischke (34) — Roland Garros Huber (29) — San Diego Frazier (28) — Stanford
Seles	6	Lucic (134) — Wimbledon	Kremer (40) — Eastbourne Nagyova (27) — Indian Wells Likhovtseva (22) — Hilton Head
Tauziat	7	Lucic (134) — Wimbledon Capriati (113) — Strasbourg Cocheteux (82) — Prostějov Oremans (56) — Hannover	Capriati (43) — Canadian Open Capriati (40) — U. S. Open Leon Garcia (42) — Roland Garros Nagyova (33) — New Haven Huber (29) — San Diego S. Williams (24) — Paris Frazier (24) — Los Angeles
Testud	13	Weingartner (106) — Lipton Pratt (81) — Birmingham Gagliardi (75) — 's-Hertogenbosch Tanasugarn (63) — Wimbledon	De Swardt (46) — Roland Garros Déchy (43) — Paris Serna (42) — U. S. Open Morariu (37) — Los Angeles Dragomir (28) — New Haven Farina (25) — Moscow S. Williams (21) — Indian Wells

Van Roost	14	Schwartz (125) — Roland Garros Stevenson (114) — Birmingham Hopmans (>100) — Prostejov Clijsters (83) — Luxembourg Brandi (57) — 's-Hertogenbosch Rittner (53) — Indian Wells Lucic (53) — Lipton	Sanchez Lorenzo (44) — New Haven Fernandez (38) — U. S. Open Kremer (34) — Stanford Sidot (31) — Leipzig Mauresmo (29) — Australian Open Déchy (28) — Filderstadt Farina (25) — Hamburg Halard-Decugis (22) — Auckland Likhovtseva (22) — Berlin
S. Williams	4		Fernandez (37) — Roland Garros
V. Williams	3	Jeyaseelan (140) — Amelia Island Schwartz (125) — Roland Garros	

Worst Losses Based on Year-End Rankings

Player	WTA Rank	Losses to players outside Top 50	Losses to players outside Top 20
Coetzer	11	Snyder (74) — Quebec City	Clijsters (47) — Wimbledon Plischke (36) — Rome Spirlea (35) — U.S. Open Nagyova (34) — Hilton Head Nagyova (34) — Berlin Sidot (33) — Canadian Open Appelmans (30) — Filderstadt Raymond (28) — Philadelphia Zvereva (27) — Eastbourne Sugiyama (24) — Roland Garros Rubin (22) — Indian Wells
Davenport	2		
Dragomir	20	Abe (119) — Prostejov Boogert (88) — 's-Hertogenbosch Glass (78) — Hilton Head Bacheva (73) — Filderstadt qualifying Gorrochategui (70) — Wimbledon Grande (54) — Hobart	Serna (39) — Zurich Serna (39) — Gold Coast Morariu (37) — Rome Appelmans (30) — Knokke-Heist Rubin (22) — Indian Wells
Frazier	19	Chi (107) — Oklahoma City Grande (54) — Hobart	Stevenson (46) — Wimbledon Fernandez (38) — Australian Open Sidot (33) — Canadian Open Appelmans (30) — Filderstadt Déchy (25) — Eastbourne Capriati (23) — Quebec City Schnyder (21) — Zurich
Graf	(5)		
Halard-Decugis	9	Black (51) — Pan Pacific	Stevenson (46) — Wimbledon Morariu (37) — Bol Appelmans (30) — Leipzig Sugiyama (24) — Princess Cup Rubin (22) — San Diego
Hingis	1		Dokic (43) — Wimbledon Rubin (22) — Indian Wells
Huber	16	Stoyanova (118) — Berlin Kuti Kis (92) — Estoril Maleeva (89) — 's-Hertogenbosch Black (51) — Indian Wells	Clijsters (47) — Luxembourg Stevenson (46) — Philadelphia Habsudova (45) — Portschach Plischke (36) — Australian Open Spirlea (35) — Gold Coast Sidot (33) — Linz Capriati (23) — Wimbledon
Kournikova	12	Henin (69) — Philadelphia	Fernandez (38) — Berlin Spirlea (35) — Linz Farina (26) — Indian Wells
Likhovtseva	18	Leon Garcia (53) — Roland Garros	Panova (49) — Zurich Habsudova (45) — Sydney Hrdlickova (44) — Leipzig Schwartz (42) — Linz Morariu (37) — Rome Déchy (25) — Gold Coast Capriati (23) — Strasbourg Schnyder (21) — Stanford Schnyder (21) — Hilton Head

Martinez	15	Loit (98) — Australian Open Petrova (95) — Moscow	Raymond (28) — Wimbledon Capriati (23) — Stanford Rubin (22) — Indian Wells
Mauresmo	10		Déchy (25) — Hilton Head
Novotna	(19)	Cervanova (102) — Budapest Maleeva (89) — Luxembourg	Sanchez Lorenzo (41) — Australian Open Plischke (36) — Roland Garros Farina (26) — Filderstadt Sugiyama (24) — Canadian Open
Pierce	5		Hrdlickova (44) — Leipzig Dokic (43) — Wimbledon Spirlea (25) — Cairo Sugiyama (24) — San Diego Sugiyama (24) — Moscow Schnyder (21) — Gold Coast
Sanchez-Vicario	17	Weingartner (83) — Sopot Leon Garcia (53) — Hilton Head	Plischke (36) — Rome Kremer (31) — Lipton Raymond (28) — Wimbledon Déchy (25) — Eastbourne
Schett	8	Barabanschikova (90) — Warsaw Osterloh (80) — Indian Wells Chladkova (57) — Linz	Morariu (37) — Zurich Plischke (36) — Roland Garros
Seles	6		Lucic (50) — Wimbledon Nagyova (35) — Indian Wells Kremer (31) — Eastbourne
Tauziat	7	Oremans (100) — Hannover Cocheteux (64) — Prostějov Leon Garcia (53) — Roland Garros	Lucic (50) — Wimbledon Nagyova (35) — New Haven Capriati (23) — Strasbourg Capriati (23) — Canadian Open Capriati (23) — U. S. Open
Testud	13	Weingartner (83) — Lipton De Swardt (75) — Roland Garros Tanasugarn (72) — Wimbledon Gagliardi (68) — 's-Hertogenbosch Pratt (58) — Birmingham	Serna (39) — U. S. Open Morariu (37) — Los Angeles Farina (26) — Moscow Déchy (25) — Paris Schnyder (21) — Sydney
Van Roost	14	Hopmans (76) — Prostějov Brandi (55) — 's-Hertogenbosch Rittner (59) — Indian Wells	Lucic (50) — Lipton Clijsters (47) — Luxembourg Stevenson (46) — Birmingham Schwartz (42) — Roland Garros Sanchez Lorenzo (41) — New Haven Fernandez (38) — U. S. Open Sidot (33) — Leipzig Kremer (31) — Stanford Farina (26) — Hamburg Déchy (25) — Filderstadt
S. Williams	4		Fernandez (38) — Roland Garros
V. Williams	3	Jeyaseelan (149) — Amelia Island	Schwartz (42) — Roland Garros

Fraction of Points Earned in Biggest Win

In general, the lower this number, the more consistent a player has been, as she did not use one freak result to significantly change her result.

The table shows the approximate point value of the player's biggest win, what percentage of her points this represents, what her score would have been without this win, approximately where she would have stood in the rankings without that win, and what the win was. Players who would have retained their rankings even without their biggest wins are marked in *italics*. For simplicity, I have *not* added in a player's nineteenth tournament, if any, after subtracting the "Big Win" (since no player earned more than 30 points in tournament 19 anyway, it hardly matters).

Note: A "big win" does not constitute the result that took a player deepest into a tournament, but the result that was worth the most points. In the column labelled "Big Win," it is assumed that the player won the tournament listed unless this is followed by the round in which the player lost (e.g. "F"=final, "SF"=semifinal, QF=Quarterfinal).

WTA Rank	Player Name	Total Points	Big Win Amount	Big Win Percent	Score W/O Big Win	Resulting Ranking	Big Win
<i>1</i>	<i>Hingis</i>	<i>6076</i>	<i>828</i>	<i>13.6%</i>	<i>5248</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>Australian Open</i>
2	Davenport	4841	840	17.4%	4001	3	Wimbledon
3	<i>V Williams</i>	<i>4378</i>	<i>483</i>	<i>11.0%</i>	<i>3895</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>Rome</i>
4	S Williams	3021	1046	34.6%	1975	10	U. S. Open
(5)	Graf	2714	1064	39.2%	1650	(12)	Roland Garros
5	<i>Pierce</i>	<i>2660</i>	<i>288</i>	<i>10.8%</i>	<i>2372</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Linz</i>
6	Seles	2310	430	18.6%	1880	11	Australian Open SF
7	Tauziat	2220	344	15.5%	1876	12	Moscow
8	Schett	2233	244	10.9%	1989	10	Moscow F
9	Halard-Decugis	2018	285	14.1%	1733	12	Los Angeles F
10	Mauresmo	1906	766	40.2%	1140	23	Australian Open F
11	Coetzer	1878	364	19.4%	1514	17	Pan Pacific F
12	Kournikova	1642	258	15.7%	1384	19	Hilton Head F
13	Testud	1642	210	12.8%	1432	18	Linz F
14	Van Roost	1629	185	11.4%	1444	17	Moscow SF
15	Martinez	1569	286	18.2%	1283	21	Roland Garros QF
16	Huber	1574	346	22.0%	1228	21	U. S. Open QF
17	Sanchez-Vicario	1435	330	23.0%	1105	25	Roland Garros SF
18	Likhovtseva	1425	156	10.9%	1269	21	Hannover SF
(19)	Novotna	1366	311	22.8%	1055	25	Hannover
19	Frazier	1301	171	13.1%	1130	24	Japan Open
20	Dragomir	1296	254	19.6%	1042	25	Berlin SF
21	Schnyder	1195	237	19.8%	958	29	Gold Coast
22	Rubin	1191	293	24.6%	898	29	Indian Wells SF
23	Capriati	1140	233	20.4%	907	29	Strasbourg
24	Sugiyama	1127	149	13.2%	978	26	Princess Cup SF
25	Déchy	1028	148	14.4%	880	29	Paris SF

Winning and Losing Streaks

The following table records a player's longest winning and losing streaks, as well as tabulating all winning streaks of ten or more matches and all losing streaks of three or more matches.

Player Name	Rank	Longest Win Streak	Longest Loss Streak	Streaks of 10+ Wins	Streaks of 3+ Losses	Events in Longest Win Streak (# of wins in parenthesis)	Events in Longest Loss Streak
Coetzer	11	4	4	0	2	Pan Pacific F (4) <i>or</i> Oklahoma City F (4)	Zurich QF; Quebec 2R; Philadelphia 1R; Chase 1R
Davenport	2	13	2	1	0	Wimbledon (7), Stanford (4), San Diego SF (2)	Pan Pacific QF; Indian Wells 2R
Dragomir	20	5	3	0	1	Amelia Island F (5)	US Open 2R; Filderstadt Q; Zurich 1R
Frazier	19	8	3	0	1	Japan Open (5), Madrid SF (3)	Roland Garros 2R; Eastbourne 1R; Wimbledon 1R
Graf	—	13	2	1	0	Roland Garros (7), Wimbledon F (6)	Wimbledon F; San Diego 2R
Halard-Dec	9	8	2	0	0	Auckland (5), Hobart SF (3)	(Five two-match streaks)
Hingis	1	12	2	2	0	Australian Open (7), Pan Pacific (4), Paris QF (1)	Roland Garros F; Wimbledon 1R
Huber	16	4	2	0	0	US Open QF (4)	(Seven two-match streaks)
Kournikova	12	4	3	0	1	Hilton Head F (4) <i>or</i> Amelia Island SF (4)	Leipzig QF; Philadelphia 1R; Chase 1R
Likhovtseva	18	3	4	0	4	Hannover SF (3) <i>or</i> Hilton Head QF (3) <i>or</i> Strasbourg F (3) <i>or</i> US Open R16 (3)	Wimbledon 3R; Stanford 1R; San Diego 1R; Los Angeles 1R <i>or</i> Filderstadt 2R; Zurich 1R; Moscow 1R; Linz 1R
Martinez	15	5	3	0	2	Sopot (5)	Princess Cup QF; Filderstadt 1R; Moscow 1R <i>or</i> Leipzig QF; Philadelphia 1R; Chase 1R
Mauresmo	10	6	2	0	0	Australian Open F (6) <i>or</i> Bratislava (4), Linz SF (2)	(Three two-match streaks)
Novotna	—	6	3	0	2	Hannover (4), Indian Wells (2)	Wimbledon QF, Canadian Open 2R, New Haven 2R <i>or</i> U.S. Open 3R, Luxembourg 1R, Filderstadt 1R
Pierce	5	6	2	0	0	Linz (4); Leipzig SF (2)	(Two two-match streaks)
Sanchez-Vic	17	6	3	0	2	Cairo (5); Hamburg SF (2)	Australian Open 2R; Lipton 2R; Hilton Head 2R <i>or</i> US Open R16; Filderstadt 1R; Chase 1R
Schett	8	4	2	0	0	US Open QF (4)	(Three two-match streaks)
Seles	6	10	2	1	0	Amelia Island (5); Roland Garros SF (5)	Roland Garros SF; Eastbourne 2R
Tauziat	7	6	5	0	1	Leipzig (4); Philadelphia SF (2)	Wimbledon QF; San Diego 1R; Los Angeles 1R; Canadian Open 2R; New Haven 1R
Testud	13	4	3	0	2	Indian Wells SF (4) <i>or</i> Linz F (4)	Roland Garros 2R; Birmingham 2R; 's-Hertogenbosch 2R <i>or</i> Filderstadt SF; Zurich 1R; Moscow 1R
Van Roost	14	4	3	0	2	Auckland F (4) <i>or</i> Australian Open QF (4)	Paris SF; Indian Wells 1R; Lipton 2R <i>or</i> Berlin 2R; Roland Garros 1R; Birmingham 2R
S. Williams	4	16	1	2	0	Paris (5); Indian Wells (6); Lipton F (5)	— (Lost 1R at Filderstadt following US Open <i>or</i> Grand Slam Cup win)
V. Williams	3	12	1	2	0	Hamburg (4); Rome (5); Roland Garros (3)	— (Lost 1R at Amelia Island following Lipton win)

Number of Significant Results

For our purposes, a “significant result” is one which earns a player at least 100 points. The following table shows the number of significant results earned by the Top 25. (The figure in the “100+ Points” column is the number of the player’s tournaments in which she earned 100+ points; similarly in the “200+ Points” column.) The final column shows what percentage of a player’s events earned a significant score (greater than 100 points)

WTA Rank	Player Name	Tournaments Played	Events Earning 100+ Points	Events Earning 200+ Points	Events Earning 400+ Points	% Significant Events
1	Hingis	19	17	13	6	89.5%
2	Davenport	18	14	9	4	77.8%
3	V Williams	17	15	11	3	88.2%
4	S Williams	11	5	5	4	45.5%
(5)	Graf	10	7	2	2	70.0%
5	Pierce	20	12	4	0	60.0%
6	Seles	13	8	5	1	61.5%
7	Tauziat	25	8	6	0	32.0%
8	Schett	23	10	3	0	43.5%
9	Halard-Decugis	24	7	3	0	29.2%
10	Mauresmo	15	6	2	1	40.0%
11	Coetzer	25	7	1	0	28.0%
12	Kournikova	19	6	2	0	31.6%
13	Testud	25	5	1	0	20.0%
14	Van Roost	25	8	0	0	32.0%
15	Martinez	23	4	1	0	17.4%
16	Huber	26	5	1	0	19.2%
17	Sanchez-Vicario	18	5	1	0	27.8%
18	Likhovtseva	29	4	0	0	13.8%
(19)	Novotna	16	6	2	0	37.5%
19	Frazier	20	5	0	0	25.0%
20	Dragomir	23	4	2	0	17.4%
21	Schnyder	24	2	1	0	8.3%
22	Rubin	21	4	1	0	19.0%
23	Capriati	16	4	2	0	25.0%
24	Sugiyama	23	3	0	0	13.0%
25	Déchy	23	4	0	0	17.4%

For other measures of consistency, see the sections on *Points Per Quarter* and *All-Surface Players*.

Points Per Quarter

For those who want trends, we can also determine how well players did in each part of the year. In the lists which follow, quarters are reckoned based on when a tournament ends. So, e.g., Wimbledon began in June but ended in July; its points are counted toward the July total. I have listed players in terms of total points earned, but also calculate the points per tournament, and list the note in brackets the top players in these categories. In a few places I have listed players outside the Top 10 for the quarter who had a high per-tournament score. Note that in a handful of instances these lists include players not in the Top 20.

First Quarter

(Constituting the period from the beginning of the year to the Lipton)

Rank	Player	Points	Tournaments	Per Tournament
1	Hingis	1776	6	296.0
2	Mauresmo	1102	4	275.5
3	S. Williams	1315	5	263.0
4	V. Williams	1098	5	219.6
5	Davenport	934	5	186.8
6	Seles	723	4	180.8
7	Graf	1045	6	174.2
8	Novotna	755	5	151.0
9	Coetzer	862	6	143.7
10	Pierce	523	4	130.8
11	Schett	670	6	111.7
12	Rubin	643	6	107.2

Second Quarter

(Constituting the period from Hilton Head to Eastbourne)

Rank	Player	Points	Tournaments	Per Tournament
(1) ¹	Graf ¹	1148	2	574.0
(1) ¹	Hingis ¹	1507	4	376.8
2	V. Williams	978	4	244.5
3	Seles	685	4	171.3
4	Halard-Decugis	723	5	144.6
5	Kournikova	852	6	142.0
6	Davenport ²	392	3	130.7
7	Pierce	625	5	125.0
8	Sanchez-Vicario	859	7	122.7
9	Martinez	690	6	115.0
10	Fernandez	325	3	108.3
11	Capriati	429	4	107.3
12	Dragomir	664	7	94.9

¹ In this three-month period, Graf played only two tournaments — but one of them was the French Open. Her score must therefore be considered inflated.

² Injury caused Davenport to play a limited schedule in this period, as well as her only Tier III event of the year. Her ranking may therefore be considered low.

Third Quarter

(Constituting the period from Wimbledon to the Princess Cup and Luxembourg)

Rank	Player	Points	Tournaments	Per Tournament
1	S. Williams ¹	1470	2	735.0
2	Davenport	2434	7	347.7
3	Hingis	1589	5	317.8
4	V. Williams	1455	5	291.0
5	Graf ²	521	2	260.5
6	Seles	902	5	180.4
(7)	(Dokic)	511.5	4	127.9
(7)	(Clijsters)	490.5	4	122.6
(7)	(Lucic)	557	5	111.4
7	Pierce	554	5	110.8
8	Halard-Decugis	595	6	99.2
9	Capriati	358	4	89.5
10	Schett	530	6	88.3
11	Frazier	593	7	84.7
12	Coetzer	552	7	78.9
13	Sugiyama	470	6	78.3
(14)	Stevenson ³	382.5	5	76.5

- 1 In this three-month period, Serena Williams played only two tournaments (Los Angeles, U.S. Open) while withdrawing from two (Canadian Open, Luxembourg) at the last moment. She won both tournaments she played, but one was the U.S. Open. Her limited schedule gives her an impossibly high per-event score. Had she played more, her points per tournament would have gone down, though she likely would still have been #1. The player who earned the most *points* in this quarter was Davenport, who won three titles and never fell before the semifinals.
- 2 Graf played two tournaments in this period, then retired. In one, she reached the final (of Wimbledon); in the other, she lost first round — and retired. Her results in this period are biased both high and low, and has little meaning.
- 3 Note that Stevenson's *only* wins in this quarter was her semifinal showing at Wimbledon, which earned her 378.5 points. She played four other events in the quarter — and lost in the opening round of each.

Fourth Quarter

(Constituting the period from Filderstadt to the Chase Championships and Pattaya City.)

Rank	Player	Points	Tournaments	Per Tournament
1	Davenport	1081	3	360.3
2	Hingis	1204	4	301.0
3	V. Williams	847	3	282.3
4	Tauziat	1244	7	177.7
5	Pierce	958	6	159.7
6	Schett	516	5	103.2
7	Mauresmo	287	3	95.7
8	Testud	580	7	82.9
9	Huber	577	7	82.4
10	Van Roost	486	6	81.0
11	Capriati	287	4	71.8
(12)	Appelmans	271	4	67.8

This allows us to calculate another consistency ranking, based on who had the best results from quarter to quarter. In the list below, I have added up the player's per-tournament score for each of the four quarters. Lowest is best, i.e. most consistent. Players not in the Top 10 in any given quarter are assigned an arbitrary value of 14. (This means, obviously, that the maximum possible score is 56.)

Rank	Name	WTA Rank	Consistency Score
1	Hingis	1	7
2	V Williams	3	13
3	Davenport	2	14
4	Graf	(5)	27
5 (tie)	Pierce	5	29
	Seles	6	29
7	S Williams	4	32
8	Mauresmo	10	37
9	Halard-Decugis	9	40
10	Schett	8	41
11	Tauziat	7	46
12	Kournikova	12	47
13	Coetzer	11	49
14 (tie)	Novotna	(19)	50
	Testud	13	50
	Sanchez-Vicario	17	50
	Capriati	23	50
18 (tie)	Martinez	15	51
	Huber	16	51
20	Van Roost	14	52
21	Frazier	19	53
22 (tie)	Dragomir	20	54
	Rubin	22	54
24	Sugiyama	24	55
25 (tie)	Likhovtseva	18	56
	Schnyder	21	56
	Déchy	25	56

Slam Results

From the standpoint of difficulty, the Slams are overrated. Slam results are worth twice as much as the results of Tier I events, even though Tier I events are played in a shorter time against a tougher field (to win the Italian Open, a player must win five or six matches in no more than seven days, with every opponent probably in the Top Fifty; to win Roland Garros requires seven matches in no less than twelve days, with probably at least two opponents outside the Top Fifty). Still, they are the events people remember, and so deserve some separate consideration.

The following summarizes the top players' slam results. The column, "Total Opponent Rank" adds up the rankings of one's opponents. The next column divides this by the number of matches played. The lower this number, the tougher the average opponent was, and thus the greater one's achievement (note: Players ranked outside the Top 100 have been calculated as "100"). It is not properly a scheme for ranking; it simply calculated how tough, overall, the players' draw was.

Player	WTA Rnk	Won-Lost in Slams	Pts Earned	Slams	Points/Slam	Versus Top 10	Total Opp. Rnk	Per Opponent
Capriati	23	8-4 (66.7%)	406	4	101.5	1-2	643	53.6
Coetzer	11	5-4 (55.6%)	198	4	49.5	0-1	547	60.8
Davenport	2	21-3 (87.5%)	1922	4	480.5	5-2	1060	44.2
Déchy	25	5-4 (55.6%)	190	4	47.5	0-1	694	77.1
Dragomir	20	7-4 (63.6%)	276	4	69.0	0-2	534	52.9
Frazier	19	8-8 (50%)	152	4	38.0	0-1	518	64.8
Graf	—	17-2 (89.5%)	1788	3	596.0	4-2	970	51.1
Halard-D	9	9-4 (69.2%)	352	4	88.0	0-2	732	56.3
Hingis	1	19-3 (86.4%)	2038	4	509.5	5-2	1040	47.3
Huber	16	5-3 (62.5%)	444	3	148.0	1-1	195	24.4
Kournikova	12	9-3 (75.0%)	388	3	129.3	0-3	597	49.8
Likhovtseva	18	9-4 (69.2%)	362	4	90.5	0-0	711	54.7
Martinez	15	11-4 (73.3%)	556	4	139.0	1-3	724	48.3
Mauresmo	10	10-3 (76.9%)	916	3	305.3	2-2	551	42.4
Novotna	—	11-4 (73.3%)	472	4	124.0	0-1	915	61.0
Pierce	5	12-4 (75%)	572	4	143.0	0-2	888	55.5
Rubin	22	4-4 (50%)	184	4	46.0	0-1	426	53.3
Sanchez-V	17	9-4 (69.2%)	564	4	141.0	0-2	541	41.6
Schett	8	12-4 (75.0%)	644	4	161.0	1-3	771	48.2
Schnyder	21	5-4 (55.6%)	196	4	49.0	0-1	398	44.2
Seles	6	16-4 (80.0%)	1082	4	270.5	1-3	914	45.7
Sugiyama	24	4-4 (50%)	212	4	53.0	0-1	293	36.6
Tauziat	7	7-3 (70.0%)	342	3	114.0	0-0	623	62.3
Testud	13	7-4 (63.6%)	284	4	71.0	0-1	620	56.4
Van Roost	14	9-4 (69.2%)	382	4	95.5	0-1	849	65.3
S. Williams	4	11-2 (84.6%)	1204	3	401.3	3-0	659	50.7
V. Williams	3	15-4 (78.9%) ¹	940	4	235.0	0-3	905	47.6

¹ Venus Williams received a walkover in the third round of the U.S. Open. The standard is *not* to count this toward a player's won/lost record. If it is counted, her record improves to 16-4, or a winning percentage of 80%. For purposes of the "Per Opponent" ranking, this is not counted as a match.

Surface Rankings

Most ratings to this point have been “overall” ratings, regardless of surface. However, players do most definitely have preferred surfaces. We may therefore compute “surface rankings.” The following tables show how the Top 25 did on each surface. Some other players have been added when their results warrant it. Results are listed in order of points per tournament *on each surface*.

It is effectively certain that some players outside the Top 25 have exceeded some of the lower Top 25 players on certain surfaces (especially grass). I have noted these where I have been aware of them, but have not checked this for all players.

Hardcourts

Summary of Hardcourt Results

The following lists the top players, the tournaments they played on hardcourts, the points earned on the surface, their record and winning percentage. The list is in alphabetical order.

Player Name	Won/Lost (Percentage)	Vs. Top 10	Tournaments Played	Total Pts/ # of Tourn
Capriati	8-5 (61.5%)	0-2	Australian Open (30), Lipton (17), Stanford (49), Canadian Open (79), U. S. Open (174) [Also lost in Sydney qualifying]	349/5
Coetzer	18-10 (64.3%)	1-5	Sydney (36), Australian Open (126), Indian Wells (59), Lipton (126), Stanford(128), San Diego (155), Canadian Open (77), New Haven (62), U.S. Open (2), Princess Cup (60)	831/10
Davenport	32-6 (84.2%) ¹	6-3	Sydney (365), Australian Open (380), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (115), Stanford (303), San Diego (128), Los Angeles (128), New Haven (201), U. S. Open (516), Princess Cup (318)	2455/10
Déchy	7-8 (46.7%)	0-3	Gold Coast (54), Hobart (38), Australian Open (2), Lipton (30), Los Angeles (1), Canadian Open (23), New Haven (34), U. S. Open (2)	184/8
Dragomir	12-9 (57.1%)	1-5	Gold Coast (28), Hobart (18), Australian Open (60), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (65), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (41), Canadian Open (24), New Haven (183), U. S. Open (42)	463/9
Frazier	22-10 (68.8%)	3-6	Hobart (58), Australian Open (72), Indian Wells (32), Lipton (32), Japan Open (171), Stanford (155), San Diego (139), Los Angeles (69), Canadian Open (1), U. S. Open (90), Princess Cup (137)	956/11
Graf	15-5 (75%)	2-3	Sydney (186), Australian Open (204), Indian Wells (283), Lipton (159), San Diego (1)	833/5
Halard-D	20-8 (71.4%) ²	2-3	Auckland (162), Sydney (60), Australian Open (30), Indian Wells (32), Lipton (23), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (285), New Haven (41), U. S. Open (112), Princess Cup (58)	804/10
Hingis	33-5 (86.8%)	9-3	Sydney (200), Australian Open (828), Indian Wells (102), Lipton (167), San Diego (356), Los Angeles (140), Canadian Open (429), U.S. Open (662)	2884/8
Huber	15-11 (57.7%)	2-6	Gold Coast (53), Sydney (30), Australian Open (96), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (50), Stanford (1), San Diego (149 inc. qualifying), Los Angeles (36), Canadian Open (69), New Haven (1), U.S. Open (346)	832/11
Kournikova	9-6 (60.0%)	0-3	Sydney (49), Australian Open (100), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (67), Stanford (75), San Diego (30)	322/6
Likhovtseva	13-11 (54.2%)	0-5	Gold Coast (22), Sydney (1), Australian Open (82), Indian Wells (30), Lipton (79), Stanford (1), San Diego (1), Canadian Open (54), New Haven (41), U. S. Open (130)	442/11

Martinez	14-10 (58.3%)	0-5	Sydney (28), Australian Open (68), Indian Wells (26), Lipton (23), Stanford (1), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (75), Canadian Open (56), U.S. Open (104), Princess Cup (54)	480/10
Mauresmo	14-7 (66.7%)	3-3	Sydney (19 inc. qualifying), Australian Open (766), Lipton (32), San Diego (1), New Haven (97), U. S. Open (104), Princess Cup (54)	1073/7
Novotna	9-6 (60.0%)	0-2	Australian Open (90), Indian Wells (79), Lipton (125), Canadian Open (1), New Haven (1), U. S. Open (56)	353/6
Pierce	20-8 (71.4%)	0-5	Gold Coast (144), Australian Open (232), Indian Wells (88), Lipton (59), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (65), Canadian Open (182), U. S. Open (190)	961/8
Rubin	18-8 (69.2%)	2-5	Auckland (28), Hobart (115), Australian Open (134), Indian Wells (293), Lipton (26), Stanford (49), San Diego (61), Canadian Open (66), U. S. Open (2)	774/9
Sanchez-V	9-7 (56.3%)	0-2	Sydney (73), Australian Open (46), Lipton (1), San Diego (49), Los Angeles (65), Canadian Open (98), U.S. Open (154)	486/7
Schett	22-10 (68.8%)	3-6	Auckland (59), Sydney (203), Australian Open (226), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (112), Stanford (1), San Diego (49), Los Angeles (81), Canadian Open (87), U.S. Open (196)	1015/10
Schnyder	16-9 (64.0%)	1-4	Gold Coast (237), Sydney (93), Australian Open (30), Indian Wells (46), Lipton (54), Stanford (49), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (36), Canadian Open (1), U. S. Open (90)	637/10
Seles	21-7 (75%)	2-4	Australian Open (430), Indian Wells (59), Lipton (67), Canadian Open (258), New Haven (156), U. S. Open (226), Princess Cup (194)	1390/7
Sugiyama	18-10 (64.3%)	3-6	Gold Coast (97), Sydney (1), Australian Open (2), Indian Wells (61), Japan Open (114), San Diego (85), Los Angeles (41), Canadian Open (81), U. S. Open (84), Princess Cup (149)	715/10
Tauziat	4-7 (36.4%)	0-0	Indian Wells (40), Lipton (32), San Diego (1), Los Angeles (1), Canadian Open (1), New Haven (1), U.S. Open (84)	160/7
Testud	17-10 (63.0%)	2-4	Sydney (1), Australian Open (140), Indian Wells (187), Lipton (1), Stanford (81), San Diego (116), Los Angeles (1), Canadian Open (93), New Haven (66), U.S. Open (44)	728/10
Van Roost	14-9 (60.9%)	0-2	Auckland (95), Sydney (120), Australian Open (166), Indian Wells (1), Lipton (1), Stanford (1), San Diego (73), New Haven (1), U. S. Open (80)	655/9
S. Williams	26-3 (89.7%)	10-2	Sydney (28), Australian Open (98), Indian Wells (468), Lipton (418), Los Angeles (424), U. S. Open (1046)	2482/6
V. Williams	26-5 (83.9%)	5-5	Sydney (73), Australian Open (196), Lipton (426), Stanford (226), San Diego (298), New Haven (345), U. S. Open (358)	1922/7

- 1 Davenport withdrew from her quarterfinal match at the Lipton. If we count this as a loss, her record falls to 32-7 and her winning percentage to 82.1%
- 2 Halard-Decugis withdrew from her semifinal match at Hobart. If we count this as a loss, her record falls to 20-9 and her winning percentage to 69.0%

Winning Percentage on Hardcourts

Where two players have equal winning percentages, the player with the higher number of wins on hardcourts is listed first. Where this fails, the player with the higher WTA rank is listed first

Rank	Player	Winning %	WTA Rank
1	S. Williams	89.7%	4
2	Hingis	86.8%	1
3	Davenport	84.2%	2
4	V. Williams	83.9%	3
5 (tie)	Seles	75.0%	6
	Graf	75.0%	—
7 (tie)	Pierce	71.4%	5
	Halard-Decugis	71.4%	9
9	Rubin	69.2%	22
10 (tie)	Schett	68.8%	8
	Frazier	68.8%	19
12	Mauresmo	66.7%	10
13 (tie)	Coetzer	64.3%	11
	Sugiyama	64.3%	24
15	Schnyder	64.0%	21
16	Testud	63.0%	13
17	Capriati	61.5%	23
18	Van Roost	60.9%	14
19 (tie)	Kournikova	60.0%	12
	Novotna	60.0%	—
21	Martinez	58.3%	15
22	Huber	57.7%	16
23	Dragomir	57.1%	20
24	Sanchez-Vicario	56.3%	17
25	Likhovtseva	54.2%	18
26	Déchy	46.7%	25
27	Tauziat	36.4%	7

Points Per Tournament on Hardcourts

Hard Rank	Player Name	WTA Rank	Surface Points	Tourn on Surface	Points/Tourn
1	S. Williams	4	2482	6	413.7
2	Hingis	1	2884	8	360.5
3	V. Williams	3	1922	7	274.6
4	Davenport	2	2455	10	245.5
5	Seles	6	1390	7	198.6
6	Graf	—	833	5	166.6
7	Mauresmo	10	1073	7	153.3
8	Pierce	5	961	8	120.1
9	Schett	8	1015	10	101.5
10	Frazier	19	956	11	86.9
11	Rubin	22	774	9	86.0
12	Coetzer	11	831	10	83.1
13	Halard-Decugis	9	804	10	80.4
14	Huber	16	832	11	75.6
15	Testud	13	728	10	72.8
16	Van Roost	14	655	9	72.8
17	Sugiyama	24	715	10	71.5
18	Capriati	23	349	5	69.8
19	Sanchez-Vicario	17	486	7	69.4
20	Schnyder	21	637	10	63.7
21	Novotna	—	353	6	58.8
22	Kournikova	12	322	6	53.7
23	Dragomir	20	463	9	51.4
24	Martinez	15	480	10	48.0
25	Likhovtseva	18	442	11	40.2
26	Déchy	25	184	8	23.0
27	Tauziat	7	160	7	22.9

Best and Worst Results on Hardcourts

The following tables list a player's *best* and *worst* results on this surface. Of these, the worst result may be the better measure of ability — a player who avoids bad losses is at least more consistent than one with a mixture of good and bad results.

<i>Best Result</i>			<i>Worst Result</i>		
1	S. Williams	1046	1	Hingis	102
2	Hingis	828	2	V. Williams	73
3	Mauresmo	766	3	Seles	59
4	Davenport	516	4	S. Williams	28
5	Seles	430	5	Capriati	17
6	V. Williams	426	<i>All other Top 25 players, including Coetzer, Davenport, Déchy, Dragomir, Frazier, Graf, Halard-Decugis, Huber, Kournikova, Likhovtseva, Martinez, Mauresmo, Novotna, Pierce, Rubin, Sanchez-Vicario, Schett, Schnyder, Sugiyama, Tauziat, Testud, and Van Roost, had at least one first round loss on hardcourts.</i>		
7	Huber	346			
8	Rubin	293			
9	Halard-Decugis	285			
10	Graf	283			
11	Schnyder	237			
12	Pierce	232			
13	Schett	226			
14	Testud	187			
15	Dragomir	183			
16	Capriati	174			
17	Frazier	171			
18	Van Roost	166			
19	Coetzer	155			
20	Sanchez-Vicario	154			
21	Sugiyama	149			
22	Martinez	134			
23	Likhovtseva	130			
24	Novotna	125			
25	Kournikova	100			
26	Tauziat	84			
27	Déchy	54			

Clay

Summary of Clay Results

The following lists the top players, the tournaments they played on clay, the points earned on the surface, their record and winning percentage. The list is in alphabetical order.

Player Name	Won/Lost (Percentage)	Vs. Top 10	Tournaments Played	Total Pts/ # of Tourn
Capriati	10-3 (76.9%)	1-1	Amelia Island (24), Berlin (26), Strasbourg (233), Roland Garros (146)	429/4
Coetzer	6-6 (50%)	0-2	Hilton Head (38), Amelia Island (73), Hamburg (73), Rome (24), Berlin (1), Roland Garros (2)	211/6
Davenport	9-2 (81.8%)	0-1	Amelia Island (27), Madrid (179), Roland Garros (186)	392/3
Déchy	10-6 (62.5%)	0-2	Hilton Head (79), Amelia Island (38), Budapest (22), Rome (32), Strasbourg (47), Roland Garros (52)	270/6
Dragomir	14-7 (66.7%)	2-2	Hilton Head (30), Amelia Island (223), Hamburg (1), Rome (23), Berlin (254), Roland Garros (132), Knokke-Heist (1)	664/7
Frazier	4-2 (66.7%)	0-1	Madrid (104), Roland Garros (46)	150/2
Graf	9-1 (90.0%)	3-0	Berlin (84), Roland Garros (1064)	1148/2
Halard-D	13-3 (81.3%) ¹	1-1	Bol (95), Warsaw (14), Berlin (268), Roland Garros (112)	489/4
Hingis	19-2 (90.5%)	4-2	Hilton Head (394), Rome (185), Berlin (382), Roland Garros (546)	1507/4
Huber	4-3 (57.1%)	0-0	Estoril (18), Berlin (30), Portschach (30)	78/3
Kournikova	13-5 (72.2%)	2-2	Hilton Head (258), Amelia Island (216), Rome (59), Berlin (1), Roland Garros (180)	714/5
Likhovtseva	10-6 (62.5%)	1-2	Hilton Head (151), Hamburg (1), Rome (1), Berlin (73), Strasbourg (127), Roland Garros (68)	421/6
Martinez	20-6 (76.9%)	2-6	Hilton Head (54), Amelia Island (166), Hamburg (60), Rome (74), Berlin (50), Roland Garros (286), Sopot (191)	881/7
Mauresmo	7-4 (63.6%)	0-2	Hilton Head (1), Rome (172), Berlin (42), Roland Garros (46)	261/4
Novotna	7-5 (58.3%)	0-1	Hilton Head (163), Budapest (1), Hamburg (60), Berlin (1), Roland Garros (100)	325/5
Pierce	11-5 (68.8%)	0-2	Amelia Island (73), Cairo (39), Hamburg (196), Rome (283), Roland Garros (34)	625/5
Rubin	6-4 (60.0%)	0-0	Amelia Island (38), Berlin (1), Madrid (79), Roland Garros (46)	164/4
Sanchez-V	14-5 (73.7%)	0-3	Hilton Head (1), Cairo (170), Hamburg (123), Rome (44), Berlin (190), Roland Garros (330)	859/6
Schett	12-6 (66.7%)	2-3	Hilton Head (54), Amelia Island (30), Hamburg (195), Warsaw (12), Berlin (120), Roland Garros (106)	517/6
Schnyder	12-8 (60%)	0-0	Hilton Head (170), Amelia Island (54), Cairo (41), Rome (40), Berlin (85), Madrid (1), Roland Garros (74), Portschach (49)	514/8
Seles	11-2 (84.6%)	0-1	Hilton Head (40), Amelia Island (286), Roland Garros (358)	684/3
Spirlea	9-6 (60%)	1-2	Hilton Head (32), Cairo (157), Hamburg (1), Rome (55), Berlin (1), Roland Garros (96)	314/6
Sugiyama	2-4 (33.3%)	0-0	Rome (1), Berlin (1), Strasbourg (47), Roland Garros (96)	145/4
Tauziat	5-5 (50%)	0-0	Hamburg (49), Rome (40), Berlin (59), Strasbourg (39), Roland Garros (42)	229/5
Testud	5-3 (62.5%)	0-1	Rome (85), Roland Garros (34), Sopot (71)	190/3
Van Roost	5-4 (55.6%)	1-1	Hamburg (36), Rome (112), Berlin (24), Roland Garros (2)	174/4
S. Williams	6-3 (66.7%)	0-2	Rome (96), Berlin (79), Roland Garros (60)	235/3

V. Williams	12-2 (85.7%)	4-0	Amelia Island (1), Hamburg (336), Rome (483), Roland Garros (158)	978/4
Zvereva	6-6 (50%)	0-2	Hilton Head (92), Cairo (1), Rome (1), Berlin (30), Roland Garros (34), Sopot (22)	180/6

1 Halard-Decugis withdrew from her second round match at Warsaw. If we count this as a loss, her record falls to 13-4 and her winning percentage to 76.5%

Winning Percentage on Clay

Where two players have equal winning percentages, the player with the higher number of wins on clay is listed first. Where this fails, the player with the higher WTA rank is listed first

Rank	Player	Winning %	WTA Rank
1	Hingis	90.5%	1
2	Graf	90.0%	—
3	V. Williams	86.7%	3
4	Seles	84.6%	6
5	Davenport	81.8%	2
6	Halard-Decugis	81.3%	9
7 (tie)	Martinez	76.9%	15
	Capriati	76.9%	23
9	Sanchez-Vicario	73.7%	17
10	Kournikova	72.2%	12
11	Pierce	68.3%	5
12 (tie)	Dragomir	66.7%	20
	Schett	66.7%	8
	S. Williams	66.7%	4
	Frazier	66.7%	19
16	Mauresmo	63.6%	10
18 (tie)	Likhovtseva	62.5%	18
	Déchy	62.5%	25
	Testud	62.5%	13
20 (tie)	Schnyder	60.0%	21
	Spirlea	60.0%	35
	Rubin	60.0%	22
23	Novotna	58.3%	—
24	Huber	57.1%	16
25	Van Roost	55.6%	14
26 (tie)	Coetzer	50.0%	11
	Zvereva	50.0%	27
	Tauziat	50.0%	7
29	Sugiyama	33.3%	25

Points Per Tournament on Clay

Clay Rank	Player Name	WTA Rank	Surface Points	Tourn on Surface	Points/Tourn
(1) ¹	Graf ¹		1148	2	574.0
(1) ¹	Hingis ¹		1507	4	376.8
2	V. Williams		978	4	244.5
3	Seles		684	3	228.0
4	Sanchez-Vicario		859	6	143.2
5	Kournikova		714	5	142.8
6	Davenport		392	3	130.7
7	Martinez		881	7	125.9
8	Pierce		625	5	125.0
9	Halard-Decugis		489	4	122.3
10	Capriati		429	4	107.3
11	Dragomir		664	7	94.9
12	Schett		517	6	86.2
13	S. Williams		235	3	78.3
14	Frazier		150	2	75.0
15	Likhovtseva		421	6	70.2
16	Mauresmo		261	4	65.3
17	Novotna		325	5	65.0
18	Schnyder		514	8	64.3
19	Testud		190	3	63.3
20	Spirlea		314	6	52.3
21	Tauziat		229	5	45.8
22	Déchy		270	6	45.0
23	Van Roost		174	4	43.5
24	Rubin		164	4	41.0
25	Sugiyama		145	4	36.3
26	Coetzer		211	6	35.2
27	Zvereva		180	6	30
28	Huber		78	3	26.0

- 1 Graf's ranking situation is anomalous, as she only played two tournaments on clay, one of them a Slam. The Slam bonus biases her result. There is no straightforward way to correct for this, as we cannot assume any particular result in other events. But we observe that Hingis had a better winning *percentage* on clay, as well as a higher point total, and her *worst* result on clay (185 points) was much better than Graf's worst result (84 points). Hingis must be considered the best *active* player on the surface since Graf has retired; as a result, I list both as #1.

Best and Worst Results on Clay

The following tables list a player's *best* and *worst* results on this surface. Of these, the worst result may be the better measure of ability — a player who avoids bad losses is at least more consistent than one with a mixture of good and bad results.

<i>Best Result</i>		<i>Worst Result</i>		
1	Graf	1064	1 Hingis	185
2	Hingis	546	2 Graf	84
3	V. Williams	483	3 S. Williams	60
4	Seles	358	4 Martinez	50
5	Sanchez-Vicario	330	5 Frazier	46
6	Martinez	286	6 Seles	40
7	Pierce	283	7 Tauziat	39
8	Halard-Decugis	268	8 Pierce	34
9	Kournikova	258	9 Testud	34
10	Dragomir	254	10 Davenport	27
11	Capriati	233	11 Capriati	24
12	Schett	195	12 Huber	18
13	Davenport	186	13 Halard-Decugis	14
14	Mauresmo	172	14 Schett	12
15	Schnyder	170		
16	Novotna	163	<i>All of the following had at least one opening-round loss on clay: Coetzer, Dragomir, Déchy, Kournikova, Likhovtseva, Mauresmo, Novotna, Rubin, Sanchez-Vicario, Schnyder, Sugiyama, Van Roost, V. Williams</i>	
17	Spirlea	157		
18	Likhovtseva	151		
19	Van Roost	112		
20	Frazier	104		
21	S. Williams	96		
	Sugiyama	96		
23	Zvereva	92		
24	Testud	85		
25	Rubin	79		
	Déchy	79		
27	Coetzer	73		
28	Tauziat	59		
29	Huber	30		

Grass

Summary of Grass Results

The following lists the top players, the tournaments they played on grass, the points earned on the surface, their record and winning percentage. The list is in alphabetical order.

Player Name	Won/Lost (Percentage)	Vs. Top 10	Tournaments Played	Total Pts/ # of Tourn
Capriati	1-1 (50%)	0-0	Wimbledon (56)	56/1
Coetzer	4-2 (66.7%)	0-0	Eastbourne (108), Wimbledon (78)	176/2
Davenport	7-0 (100%)	2-0	Wimbledon (840)	840/1
Déchy	5-3 (62.5%)	0-1	Birmingham (1), Eastbourne (108), Wimbledon (134)	243/3
Dragomir	1-2 (33.3%)	0-0	's-Hertogenbosch (1), Wimbledon (42)	43/2
Frazier	0-2 (0%)	0-0	Eastbourne (1), Wimbledon (2)	3/2
Graf	6-1 (85.7%)	1-1	Wimbledon (520)	520/1
Halard-Decugis	7-1 (87.5%)	1-0	Birmingham (234), Wimbledon (98)	332/2
Hingis	0-1 (0%)	0-0	Wimbledon (2)	2/1
Huber	1-2 (33.3%)	0-0	's-Hertogenbosch (22), Wimbledon (2)	24/2
Kournikova	6-2 (75.0%)	0-2	Eastbourne (138), Wimbledon (108)	246/2
Likhovtseva	4-2 (66.7%)	0-1	Eastbourne (75), Wimbledon (82)	157/2
Martinez	2-1 (66.7%)	0-0	Wimbledon (68)	68/1
Mauresmo	—		<i>Did not play on grass</i>	
Novotna	4-1 (80%)	0-1	Wimbledon (226)	226/1
Pierce	3-1 (75%)	0-0	Wimbledon (116)	116/1
Rubin	0-2 (0%)	0-0	Eastbourne (1), Wimbledon (2)	3/2
Sanchez-Vicario	1-2 (33.3%)	0-0	Eastbourne (1), Wimbledon (34)	35/2
Schett	3-1 (75.0%)	0-1	Wimbledon (116)	116/1
Schnyder	0-1 (0.0%)	0-0	Wimbledon (2)	2/1
Seles	2-2 (50.0%)	0-0	Eastbourne (1), Wimbledon (68)	69/2
Spirlea	1-2 (33.3%)	0-0	Eastbourne (36), Wimbledon (2)	38/2
Sugiyama	2-2 (50%)	0-0	Eastbourne (34), Wimbledon (30)	64/2
Tauziat	11-3 (78.6%)	0-0	Birmingham (132), Eastbourne (201), Wimbledon (216)	549/3
Testud	2-2 (50.0%)	0-0	Birmingham (1), 's-Hertogenbosch (1), Wimbledon (68)	70/3
Van Roost	4-3 (57.1%)		Birmingham (1), 's-Hertogenbosch (39), Wimbledon (134)	174/3
S. Williams	—		<i>Did not play on grass</i>	
V. Williams	4-1 (80%)	0-1	Wimbledon (228)	228/1
Zvereva	8-2 (80%)	1-0	Birmingham (47), Eastbourne (300), Wimbledon (42)	389/3

Note: Because only four tournaments are played on grass, and no player can play more than three grass events, it is not productive to attempt a full statistical analysis. We therefore list only the points-per-tournament ranking.

Points Per Tournament on Grass

Grass Rank	Player Name	WTA Rank	Surface Points	Tourn on Surface	Points/Tourn
1	Davenport	2	840	1	840.0
2	Graf	—	520	1	520.0
3	Novotna	—	266	1	266.0
4	J. Dokic	43	492.5	2	246.3
5	A. Stevenson	46	468.5	2	234.25
6	V. Williams	3	228	1	228.0
7	Clijsters	47	194.5	1	194.5
8	Tauziat	7	549	3	183.0
9	Halard-Decugis	9	332	2	166.0
10	Lucic	50	483	3	161.0
11	Zvereva	27	389	3	129.7
12	Kournikova	12	246	2	123.0
13 (tie)	Pierce	5	116	1	116.0
13 (tie)	Schett	8	116	1	116.0
15	Coetzer	11	176	2	88.0
16	Déchy	25	243	3	81.0
17	Likhovtseva	18	157	2	78.5
18	Martinez	15	68	1	68.0
19	Van Roost	14	174	3	58.0
20	Capriati	23	56	1	56.0
21	Seles	6	69	2	34.5
22	Sugiyama	24	64	2	32.0
23	Testud	13	70	3	23.3
24	Dragomir	20	43	2	21.5
25	Spirlea	35	38	2	19.0
26	Sanchez-Vicario	17	35	2	17.5
27	Huber	16	24	2	12.0

The following players did not win any matches on grass, and so are “off scale” in this ranking: Frazier, Hingis, Rubin, Schnyder

The following players did not play on grass: Mauresmo, S. Williams

Indoors

Summary of Indoor Results

The following lists the top players, the tournaments they played indoors, the points earned on the surface, their record and winning percentage. The list is in alphabetical order.

Player Name	Won/Lost (Percentage)	Vs. Top 10	Tournaments Played	Total Pts/ # of Tourn
Capriati	7-4 (63.6%)	0-3	Hannover (1), Filderstadt (49), Zurich (1), Quebec City (201), Philadelphia (36)	288/5
Coetzer	9-7 (56.3%)	2-3	Pan Pacific (364), Oklahoma City (151), Filderstadt (1), Zurich (88), Quebec City (1), Philadelphia (1), Chase (54)	660/7
Davenport	10-1 (90.9%) ¹	6-0	Pan Pacific (73), Filderstadt (65), Philadelphia (417), Chase (599)	1154/4
Déchy	10-6 (62.5%)	1-2	Prostejov (26), Hannover (1), Paris (148), Filderstadt (103), Zurich (1), Bratislava (52)	331/6
Dragomir	3-4 (42.9%)	0-1	Prostejov (18), Hannover (36), Zurich (1), Moscow (71) [Also lost in Filderstadt Qualifying]	126/4
Frazier	5-5 (50%)	0-1	Oklahoma City (1), Filderstadt (61), Zurich (1), Quebec City (69), Philadelphia (60)	192/5
Graf	4-2 (66.7%)	0-2	Pan Pacific (92), Hannover (121)	213/2
Halard-D	7-8 (46.7%)	0-2	Pan Pacific (1), Paris (66), Filderstadt (1), Zurich (103), Moscow (80), Leipzig (1), Philadelphia (87), Chase (54)	393/8
Hingis	18-4 (81.8%)	7-4	Pan Pacific (427), Paris (52), Filderstadt (308), Zurich (243), Philadelphia (229), Chase (424)	1683/6
Huber	11-10 (52.4%)	2-5	Pan Pacific (1), Hannover (36), Luxembourg (26), Filderstadt (156), Zurich (59), Moscow (90), Linz (1), Leipzig (130), Philadelphia (1), Chase (140)	640/10
Kournikova	7-6 (53.8%)	0-4	Pan Pacific (90), Oklahoma City (86), Linz (34), Leipzig (95), Philadelphia (1), Chase (54)	360/6
Likhovtseva	6-10 (37.5%)	1-2	Pan Pacific (46), Hannover (156), Paris (56), Filderstadt (61), Zurich (1), Moscow (1), Linz (1), Leipzig (28), Philadelphia (1), Chase (54)	405/10
Martinez	2-5 (28.6%)	0-3	Filderstadt (1), Moscow (1), Leipzig (83), Philadelphia (1), Chase (54)	140/5
Mauresmo	10-3 (79.9%)	1-2	Paris (285), Bratislava (110), Linz (123), Chase (54)	572/4
Novotna	6-3 (66.7%)	1-1	Pan Pacific (150), Hannover (311), Luxembourg (1), Filderstadt (1)	463/4
Pierce	12-5 (70.6%)	1-3	Filderstadt (229), Zurich (175), Moscow (1), Linz (288), Leipzig (133), Chase (132)	958/6
Rubin	8-6 (57.2%)	0-2	Oklahoma City (47), Filderstadt (1), Zurich (51), Moscow (1), Quebec City (114), Philadelphia (36)	250/6
Sanchez-V	0-2 (0%)	0-1	Filderstadt (1), Chase (54)	55/2
Schett	9-6 (60%)	0-4	Hannover (69), Filderstadt (93), Zurich (46), Moscow (244), Linz (1), Chase (132)	585/6
Schnyder	2-5 (28.6%)	0-0	Hannover (1), Zurich (59), Moscow (1), Linz (28), Leipzig (1)	90/5
Seles	2-1 (66.7%)	0-0	Pan Pacific (167)	167/1
Sugiyama	4-7 (36.4%)	1-2	Pan Pacific (40), Hannover (41), Paris (1), Zurich (1), Moscow (118), Linz (1), Leipzig (1)	203/7
Tauziat	17-8 (68%)	2-4	Prostejov (1), Hannover (36), Paris (1), Filderstadt (1), Zurich (210), Moscow (344), Linz (54), Leipzig (270), Philadelphia (120), Chase (245)	1282/10

Testud	12-9 (57.1%)	2-6	Hannover (73), Paris (1), Filderstadt (178), Zurich (1), Moscow (1), Linz (210), Leipzig (49), Philadelphia (87), Chase (54)	654/9
Van Roost	14-9 (60.9%)	1-3	Prostejov (12), Paris (128), Luxembourg (117), Filderstadt (36), Zurich (95), Moscow (185), Leipzig (1), Philadelphia (49), Chase (120)	743/9
S. Williams	5-1 (83.3%)	1-0	Paris (303), Filderstadt (1)	304/2
V. Williams	15-3 (83.3%)	5-3	Hannover (206), Oklahoma City (197), Zurich (469), Philadelphia (125), Chase (253)	1250/5

1 Davenport withdrew from her quarterfinal match at Filderstadt. If we count this as a loss, her record falls to 10-2 and her winning percentage to 83.3%

Winning Percentage Indoors

Where two players have equal winning percentages, the player with the higher number of wins indoors is listed first. Where this fails, the player with the higher WTA rank is listed first

Rank	Player	Winning %	WTA Rank
1	Davenport	90.9%	2
2 (tie)	V. Williams	83.3%	3
	S. Williams	83.3%	4
4	Hingis	81.8%	1
5	Mauresmo	76.9%	10
6	Pierce	70.6%	5
7	Tauziat	68.0%	7
8 (tie)	Novotna	66.7%	—
	Graf	66.7%	—
	Seles	66.7%	6
11	Capriati	63.6%	23
12	Déchy	62.5%	25
13	Van Roost	60.9%	14
14	Schett	60.0%	8
15 (tie)	Testud	57.1%	13
	Rubin	57.1%	22
17	Coetzer	56.3%	11
18	Kournikova	53.8%	12
19	Huber	52.4%	16
20	Frazier	50.0%	19
21	Halard-Decugis	46.7%	9
22	Dragomir	42.9%	20
23	Likhovtseva	37.5%	18
24	Sugiyama	36.4%	25
25 (tie)	Martinez	28.6%	15
	Schnyder	28.6%	21
27	Sanchez-Vicario	0.0%	17

Points Per Tournament Indoors

Indoor Rank	Player Name	WTA Rank	Surface Points	Tourn on Surface	Points/ Tourn
1	Davenport		1154	4	288.5
2	Hingis		1683	6	280.5
3	V. Williams		1250	5	250.0
4	Seles		167	1	167.0
5	Pierce		958	6	159.7
6	S. Williams		304	2	152.0
7	Mauresmo		572	4	143.0
8	Tauziat		1282	10	128.2
9	Novotna		463	4	115.8
10	Graf		213	2	106.5
11	Schett		585	6	97.5
12	Coetzer		660	7	94.3
13	Van Roost		743	9	82.6
14	Testud		654	9	72.7
15	Huber		640	10	64.0
16	Kournikova		360	6	60.0
17	Capriati		288	5	57.6
18	Déchy		331	6	55.2
19	Halard-D		393	8	49.1
20	Rubin		250	6	41.7
21	Likhovtseva		405	10	40.5
22	Frazier		192	5	38.4
23	Dragomir		126	4	31.5
24	Sugiyama		203	7	29.0
25	Martinez		140	5	28.0
26	Sanchez-V		55	2	27.5
27	Schnyder		90	5	18.0

Best and Worst Results Indoors

The following tables list a player's *best* and *worst* results on this surface. Of these, the worst result may be the better measure of ability — a player who avoids bad losses is at least more consistent than one with a mixture of good and bad results.

<i>Best Result</i>			<i>Worst Result</i>		
1	Davenport	599	1	Seles	167
2	V. Williams	469	2	V. Williams	125
3	Hingis	427	3	Graf	92
4	Coetzer	364	4	Davenport	65
5	Tauziat	344	5	Mauresmo	54
6	Novotna	311	6	Hingis	52
7	S. Williams	303	<p><i>All other Top 25 players, including Capriati, Coetzer, Déchy, Dragomir, Frazier, Halard-Decugis, Huber, Kournikova, Likhovtseva, Martinez, Novotna, Pierce, Rubin, Sanchez-Vicario, Schett, Schnyder, Sugiyama, Tauziat, Testud, Van Roost, and Serena Williams, had at least one first round loss on hardcourts.</i></p> <p><i>Note: Seles played only one indoor event, and Graf only two. Observe also that Mauresmo's 54 point figure is for her first-round loss at the Chase Championships.</i></p>		
8	Pierce	288			
9	Mauresmo	285			
10	Schett	244			
11	Testud	210			
12	Capriati	201			
13	Van Roost	185			
14	Seles	167			
15	Huber	156			
	Likhovtseva	156			
17	Déchy	148			
18	Graf	121			
19	Sugiyama	118			
20	Rubin	114			
21	Halard-Decugis	103			
22	Kournikova	95			
23	Martinez	83			
24	Dragomir	71			
25	Frazier	69			
26	Schnyder	59			
27	Sanchez-Vicario	54			

All-Surface Players

This allows us to produce a sort of a pseudo-ranking for “best all-surface player.” For this we add up a player’s ranking on all four surfaces based on points per tournament. (Note: Because of the shortness of the grass season, grass scores have been divided in half, rounding up, and a maximum value of 9 has been used. For all other surfaces, a maximum of 16 has been used.) Note that this is not really a measure of who is better on all surfaces; it simply measures who has been an all-surface player *this year*. (We should note that, while this statistic has had meaning in past years, in 1999 it is almost meaningless due to Graf’s playing only half the season, Seles missing the entire fall indoor season and much of the clay season, Serena Williams’s frequent absences, and other biasing factors.)

Rank	Player	Surface Score	WTA Rank
1	V. Williams	11	3
2	Davenport	12	2
3	Hingis	14	1
4	Graf	18	—
5	Seles	21	6
6	Pierce	28	5
7	S. Williams	29	4
8 (tie)	Schett	39	8
	Mauresmo	39	10
10 (tie)	Halard-Decugis	43	9
	Kournikova	43	12
	Novotna	43	—
13	Tauziat	44	7
14	Sanchez-Vicario	45	17
15 (tie)	Coetzer	48	11
	Martinez	48	16
17	Frazier	49	19
18	Capriati	51	23
19 (tie)	Dragomir	52	20
	Rubin	52	22
21 (tie)	Testud	54	13
	Van Roost	54	14
	Huber	54	15
24 (tie)	Likhovtseva	56	18
	Déchy	56	25
26 (tie)	Schnyder	57	21
	Sugiyama	57	24

Tournament Wins by Surface

Here are the number of tournaments each player won on the various surfaces. As elsewhere, tournaments are divided into Major (Tier II and up; note that this does *not* mean “Slam,” which is how some use the term) and Minor (Tier III and below). **Note:** In the lists below, “0” and “-” have different meanings. “0” means *did not win any of the tournaments of this level she played on this surface*. “-” means “Did not play any tournaments of this level on this surface.”

The final column lists the number of surfaces on which a player won tournaments.

WTA Rank	Player Name	Hard		Clay		Grass		Indoor		Won On
		Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	Major	Minor	
1	Hingis	3	-	2	-	0	-	2	-	3
2	Davenport	3	-	0	1	1	-	2	-	4
3	V Williams	2	-	2	-	0	-	1	1	3
4	S Williams	3	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	2
(5)	Graf	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	1
5	Pierce	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	-	1
6	Seles	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	1
7	Tauziat	0	-	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
8	Schett	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0
9	Halard-Decugis	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	-	2
10	Mauresmo	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	1	1
11	Coetzer	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0
12	Kournikova	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0
13	Testud	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
14	Van Roost	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
15	Martinez	0	-	0	1	0	-	0	-	1
16	Huber	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	Sanchez-Vicario	0	-	0	1	-	-	0	-	1
18	Likhovtseva	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0
(19)	Novotna	0	-	0	0	0	-	1	0	1
19	Frazier	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	0	1
20	Dragomir	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	Schnyder	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	-	1
22	Rubin	0	1	0	0	0	-	0	0	1
23	Capriati	0	-	0	1	0	-	0	1	2
24	Sugiyama	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0
25	Déchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

For additional information on results by surface, see the section on *Percentage of Points Earned on Each Surface*.

Assorted Statistics

The Busiest Players on the Tour

Total Tour Matches Played by Top Players

The following table shows how the Top 25 ranked in total matches played. Note that this does not correlate closely with ranking *or* with tournaments played; while Hingis leads because of her high win percentage, Schett is second because of a combination of winning fairly often and playing fairly often, while Likhovtseva manages to be seventh because, even though she doesn't win all that often, she plays incessantly.

Ranking	Player	Matches Played
1	Hingis	82
2	Schett	69
3	V. Williams	68
4 (tie)	Davenport	67
	Halard-Dec	67
6	Pierce	64
7 (tie)	Likhovtseva	63
	Van Roost	63
9	Coetzer	62
10	Testud	61
11 (tie)	Martinez	60
	Tauziat	60
13	Huber	57 (+3 qualifying)
14	Déchy	55
15	Kournikova	54
16 (tie)	Dragomir	52 (+1 qualifying)
	Rubin	52
	Schnyder	52
19	Frazier	50
20	Sugiyama	49
21	Seles	48
22	Mauresmo	45 (+3 qualifying)
23	S. Williams	44
24	Graf	42
25 (tie)	Novotna	41
	Sanchez-V	41
27	Capriati	39 (+2 qualifying)

Total Tour Events Played by the Top 150

The following table sorts the Top 150 (as of November 22, 1999) based on events played in the past year. All players who have played that many events are listed, along with their rankings (in parentheses). Top 25 players are shown in **bold**. The second column shows how many players played each number of events.

# of Events	# to Play	Players
35	1	Shaughnessy (97)
34	0	—
33	0	—
32	2	Srebotnik (63), Watanabe (114)
31	2	Kremer (31), Kleinova (66)
30	7	Brandi (55), Pratt (58), Bacheva (73), Gersi (77), Nejedly (87), Reeves (124), Jidkova (126)
29	7	Likhovtseva (18) , Sidot (33), Wartusch (91), Vavrinec (103), Barna (115), Stoyanova (118), Lubiani (132)
28	4	Black (51), Ellwood (106), Ad. Serra-Zanetti (113), Cristea (128)
27	5	Pitkowski (32), Serna (39), Panova (40), Smashnova (49), Marosi (141)
26	11	Huber (16) , Farina (26), Talaja (29), Plischke (36), Schwartz (42), Chladkova (57), Gagliardi (68), Courtois (79), Abe (119), Ramon (127), Poutchek (135)
25	17	Tauziat (7) , Coetzer (11) , Testud (13) , Van Roost (14) , Nagyova (34), Spirlea (35), Sanchez Lorenzo (41), Drake (56), De Lone (67), Noorlander (84), Lee (96), Loit (98), Nemeckova (109), Miyagi (133), Latimer (138), Hopkins (144), Sandu (146)
24	18	Halard-Decugis (9) , Schnyder (21) , Déchy (25) , Raymond (28), Morariu (37), Hrdlickova (44), Snyder (74), Osterloh (80), Barabanschikova (90), Kuti Kis (92), Molik (94), Cervanova (102), Tu (105), Garbin (117), Tatarkova (120), Washington (125), Krizan (136), Parkinson (148)
23	11	Schett (8) , Martinez (15) , Dragomir (20) , Sugiyama (24) , Appelmans (30), Torrens Valero (52), Grande (54), Cocheteux (64), Chi (107), Nacuk (112), Sucha (139)
22	7	Rittner (59), Carlsson (61), Weingartner (83), Oremans (100), Diaz-Oliva (108), Vento (111), Guse (147)
21	6	Frazier (19) , Rubin (22) , Montolio (60), Hopmans (76), Dechaume-Balleret (101), Yoshida (143)
20	11	Pierce (5) , Zvereva (27), Habsudova (45), Zuluaga (48), Myskina (65), Li (86), Boogert (88), Foldenyi (110), Wagner (123), Po (129), Jeyaseelan (149)
19	5	Hingis (1) , Kournikova (12) , Dementieva (62), Callens (81), Mandula (104)
18	11	Davenport (2) , Sanchez-Vicario (17) , Stevenson (46), Leon Garcia (53), Tanasugarn (72), Ruano-Pascual (85), Labat (116), Asagoe (122), Webb (134), Yi (140), Kloesel (150)
17	5	V. Williams (3) , Glass (78), Kostanic (99), Saeki (121), Papadaki (137)
16	4(+1)	[Novotna (19)] , Capriati (23) , De Swardt (75), Pisnik (82)
15	4	Mauresmo (10) , Dokic (43), Suarez (71), Rippner (93)
14	2	Petrova (95), Kruger (130)
13	3	Seles (6) , Fernandez (38), Lucic (50),
12	3	Henin (69), Gorrochategui (70), Irvin (131)
11	3	S. Williams (4) , Clijsters (47), Maleeva (89)
10	1(+1)	[Graf (5)] , Marrero (145)
9	1	Arendt (142)

The Biggest Tournaments

Theoretically, all tournaments of the same tier are of equal difficulty. In reality, it's not even close. Tournaments like Filderstadt and Philadelphia and San Diego are so strong that Top Ten players can go unseeded, while Leipzig didn't feature a single Top Five player.

In general, we can assume that all Slams and the Chase Championships are at maximum strength; with minor exceptions, everyone who can play will play. This is *not* true of Tier I and Tier II tournaments. Unfortunately, there is no simple way of "rating" tournaments; it is not the sort of statistic the WTA calculates. The sections below offer two proposals.

Tournament Strength Based on the Four Top Players Present

Proposal #1: Take the total rankings of the top four players present. Add to this the scores of the top two present. (That is, count the top two twice and the #3 and #4 players once.) This gives an indication of just *how* tough things are when "the going gets tough": it shows what you can expect to be up against in the semifinal and final rounds. (So, for example, the top four players at Sydney in 1999 were Davenport, ranked #1; Hingis, ranked #2; Sanchez-Vicario, ranked #4; and Venus Williams, ranked #5. So the total "value" of this tournament is $1+1+2+2+4+5=15$.)

Based on the following, we rate the 24 Tier I and Tier II tournaments on the Tour as follows (note that a *lower* difficulty score is better). Where two tournaments are of equal difficulty, the list is in calendar order:

Tournament Rank	Tier	Tournament	Difficulty Score	Winner
1	I	Pan Pacific	13	Hingis
1	I	Indian Wells	13	S. Williams
1	I	Lipton	13	V. Williams
1	II	San Diego	13	Hingis
5	II	Sydney	15	Davenport
6	II	Filderstadt	16	Hingis
6	II	Philadelphia	16	Davenport
8	I	Hilton Head	19	Hingis
9	II	Los Angeles	20	S. Williams
10	I	Zurich	22	V. Williams
11	I	Berlin	23	Hingis
11	I	Canadian Open	23	Hingis
13	II	New Haven	24	V. Williams
14	I	Rome	25	V. Williams
15	II	Amelia Island	26	Seles
16	II	Stanford	31	Davenport
16	II	Princess Cup	31	Davenport
18	II	Hannover	33	Novotna
19	II	Hamburg	35	V. Williams
20	II	Eastbourne	42	Zvereva
21	II	Paris	46	S. Williams
21	II	Linz	46	Pierce
23	I	Moscow	47	Tauziat
24	II	Leipzig	49	Tauziat

As a secondary calculation, we may calculate the average difficulty of a player's tournament wins. Again, a lower score is better. Players in **bold** are those who have won three or more tournaments this year (which is perhaps the minimum for this to be meaningful).

Player	Score
Hingis	17.8
Davenport	23.3
V. Williams	23.8
Seles	26
S. Williams	26.3
Novotna	33
Zvereva	43
Pierce	46
Tauziat	48

If we throw in Slam victories (with a value of 13 each), this becomes

Player	Score
Hingis	17.1
Davenport	21.2
S. Williams	23.0
V. Williams	23.8
Seles	26
Novotna	33
Zvereva	43
Pierce	46
Tauziat	48

The Top Tournaments Based on Top Players Present

Proposal #2: The following table assesses tournaments based on the top players who play. It starts with tournaments played by the #1 player, and lists the number of other Top Ten players present. Then it lists tournaments headlined by #2, etc. Only tournaments from Tier II up are listed. The difficulty with this system is that a tournament with (say) four Top Ten players headed by the #5 player might be considered stronger than a tournament with only one Top Ten player, but that one player being #2.

Tourn Rank	Tournament	Top Player Present	# of Top 10 players	Top Player Missing	Ranks of Missing Top 10 Players	Winner
1	U. S. Open	#1/Hingis	10	<i>Top 50 present</i>		S. Williams
2	Roland Garros	#1/Hingis	10	#30/Huber		Graf
3	Lipton	#1/Hingis	10	#27/Sugiyama		V. Williams
4	Australian Opn	#1/Davenport	10	#11/Tauziat		Hingis
4	Wimbledon	#1/Hingis	10	#11/S.Williams		Davenport
6	Indian Wells	#1/Hingis	7	#5/V.Williams	#5, #6, #10	S. Williams
7	San Diego	#1/Davenport	8	#5/Seles	#5, #7	Hingis
8	Pan Pacific	#1/Davenport	5	#5/Sanchez-Vi	#5, #6, #8, #9, #10	Hingis
9	Chase Champ	#1/Hingis	8	#4/S. Williams	#4, #6	
10	Philadelphia	#1/Hingis	6	#4/S.Williams	#4, #5, #6, #8	Davenport
11	Sydney	#1/Davenport	7	#3/Novotna	#3, #6, #7	Davenport
12	Filderstadt	#1/Hingis	8	#3/V.Williams	#3, #5	Hingis
13	Los Angeles	#1/Hingis	5	#3/Graf*	#3*, #4, #5, #7, #9	S. Williams
14	Stanford	#1/Davenport	4	#2/Hingis	#2, #3, #5, #6, #7, #10	Davenport
15	Canadian Open	#1/Hingis	6	#2/Davenport*	#2, #3*, #4, #8	Hingis
16	Paris	#1/Hingis	2	#2/Davenport	#2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #8, #10	S. Williams
17	Hilton Head	#1/Hingis	5	#2/Davenport	#2, #5, #6, #8, #10	Hingis
18	Zurich	#1/Hingis	7	#2/Davenport	#2, #4, #5	V. Williams
19	Berlin	#1/Hingis	7	#2/Davenport	#2, #3, #5	Hingis
20	Rome	#1/Hingis	6	#2/Davenport	#2, #3, #4, #6	V. Williams
21	New Haven	#2/Davenport	6	#1/Hingis*	#1, #3*, #6, #8	V. Williams
22	Amelia Island	#2/Davenport	5	#1/Hingis	#1, #3, #5, #7, #9	Seles
23	Princess Cup	#2/Davenport	4	#1/Hingis	#1, #3, #4, #6, #7, #10	Davenport
24	Hannover	#3/Novotna	5	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #4, #5, #9	Novotna
25	Hamburg	#4/Novotna	4	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #3, #5, #9, #10	V. Williams
26	Eastbourne	#4/Seles	3	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #3, #5, #6, #8, #10	Zvereva
27	Moscow	#6/Pierce	4	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #7	Tauziat
28	Linz	#6/Pierce	3	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #9, #10	Pierce
29	Leipzig	#6/Pierce	3	#1/Hingis	#1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #7, #10	Tauziat

* Steffi Graf retired after San Diego, as #3, but was not removed from the rankings until New Haven. The highest-ranked player, other than Graf, to miss Los Angeles was #4 Venus Williams; all other tournaments in the period lacked someone ranked above Graf.

Strongest Tournament Performances

The list below shows the biggest performances (highest number of points earned) in 1999. Every result of more than 350 points is listed. It will be noted that 23 of these 32 scores were compiled by the “Big Four” — Hingis (9), Davenport (6), Venus Williams (4), and Serena Williams (4). Graf had two, Seles two, and Mauresmo, Dokic, Lucic, Stevenson, and Coetzer one each (all of the last five in non-winning efforts).

Ordinal	Score	Player	Event
1	1064	Graf	Roland Garros Win
2	1046	Serena Williams	U. S. Open Win
3	840	Davenport	Wimbledon Win
4	828	Hingis	Australian Open Win
5	766	Mauresmo	Australian Open Final
6	662	Hingis	U. S. Open Final
7	599	Davenport	Chase Championship Win
8	546	Hingis	Roland Garros Final
9	520	Graf	Wimbledon final
10	516	Davenport	U. S. Open SF
11	483	Venus Williams	Rome Win
12	482.5	Dokic	Wimbledon QF
13	469	Venus Williams	Zurich Win
14	468	Serena Williams	Indian Wells Win
15	454	Lucic	Wimbledon SF
16	430	Seles	Australian Open SF
17	429	Hingis	Canadian Open Win
18	427	Hingis	Pan Pacific Win
19	426	Venus Williams	Lipton Win
20 (tie)	424	Serena Williams	Los Angeles Win
20 (tie)	424	Hingis	Chase Championship Final
22	418	Serena Williams	Lipton Final
23	417	Davenport	Philadelphia Win
24	394	Hingis	Hilton Head Win
25	382	Hingis	Berlin Win
26	380	Davenport	Australian Open SF
27	378.5	Stevenson	Wimbledon SF
28	365	Davenport	Sydney Win
29	364	Coetzer	Pan Pacific Final
30 (tie)	358	Seles	Roland Garros SF
30 (tie)	358	Venus Williams	U. S. Open SF
32	356	Hingis	San Diego W

Bagels

The following chart lists the Bagels (6-0 sets) experienced or inflicted by top 20 players and higher tournaments. The “bagel” set is shown in **bold**. Double bagels are shown in **bold** for the entire line. If the bagel was inflicted at a low-tier (Tier III or Tier IV event), or in qualifying, it is shown in *italics*.

Player	Bagels inflicted	Bagels experienced
Coetzer	Sydney: def. Lucic 6-4 3-6 6-0 Rome: def. Di Natale 6-3 6-0 San Diego: def. Kournikova 6-0 1-6 6-1	<i>Oklahoma City: lost to V. Williams 4-6 0-6</i> Lipton: lost to S. Williams 4-6 0-6 Amelia Island: lost to Seles 3-6 0-6 Princess Cup: lost to Frazier 0-6 4-6
Davenport	Australian Open: def. Habsudova 6-0 6-4 Australian Open: def. V. Williams 6-4 6-0 Lipton: def. Appelmans 6-0 6-3 Lipton: def. Likhovtseva 6-2 6-0 <i>Madrid: def. Frazier 6-0 6-2</i> Wimbledon: def. Fusai 6-0 6-3 Stanford: def. Frazier 6-0 6-4 San Diego: def. Spirlea 6-0 6-2 New Haven: def. Dragomir 4-6 6-2 6-0 U.S. Open: def. Morariu 6-0 6-3 U.S. Open: def. Dragomir 6-0 6-2 Princess Cup: def. Smashnova 6-0 6-1 Filderstadt: def. Farina 6-0 6-1 Chase Championships: def. Tauziat 7-6 6-0	
Dragomir	Lipton: def. Spirlea 6-0 6-4 Hilton Head: def. Osterloh 6-2 6-0 New Haven: def. Novotna 7-6 6-0	New Haven: lost to Davenport 6-4 2-6 0-6 U. S. Open: lost to Davenport 0-6 2-6 <i>Filderstadt Qualifying: lost to Bacheva 0-6 2-6</i>
Frazier	<i>Japan Open: def. Inoue 6-0 6-3</i> <i>Japan Open: def. Guse 7-6 6-0</i> Stanford: def. Schett 6-4 6-0 Stanford: def. Kremer 7-5 6-0 Princess Cup: def. Coetzer 6-0 6-4	Indian Wells: lost to Pierce 0-6 3-6 <i>Madrid: lost to Davenport 0-6 2-6</i> Stanford: lost to Davenport 0-6 4-6
Graf	Sydney: def. Sugiyama 6-0 6-4 Australian Open: def. Suarez 6-0 6-3 Pan Pacific: def. Reeves 6-0 6-1 Indian Wells: def. Sugiyama 6-0 6-1 Indian Wells: def. Novotna 6-2 6-0 Lipton: def. Capriati 6-1 6-0 Roland Garros: def. Maleeva 6-2 6-0	
Halard-Decu	<i>Auckland: def. Labat 6-0 6-2</i> <i>Hobart: def. Wagner 6-0 6-3</i> Paris: def. Vento 6-4 6-0 Lipton: def. Middleton 6-3 6-0 Berlin: def. Zvereva 6-2 6-0 Berlin: def. Stoyanova 6-1 6-0 Wimbledon: def. Nacuk 6-1 6-0 Princess Cup: def. Pratt 6-1 6-0	<i>Bol: lost to Morariu 2-6 0-6</i> Berlin: lost to Hingis 0-6 1-6

Hingis	Sydney: def. Van Roost 6-2 6-0 Lipton: def. Weingartner 6-0 6-2 Hilton Head: def. Zvereva 6-0 7-6 Berlin: def. Sanchez-Vicario 6-4 6-0 Berlin: def. Halard-Decugis: 6-0 6-1 San Diego: def. V. Williams 6-4 6-0 Canadian Open: def. Morariu 6-0 6-3 U.S. Open: def. Huber 6-2 6-0 Filderstadt: def. Capriati 6-4 6-0 Philadelphia: def. Rubin 6-0 6-3	Wimbledon: lost to Dokic 2-6 0-6
Huber	Berlin: def. Stoyanova 6-1 6-0 U. S. Open: def. Talaja 2-6 6-2 6-0 <i>Luxembourg: def. Weingartner 6-0 5-0 ret.</i> Leipzig: def. Smashnova 6-0 3-6 6-3	Pan Pacific: lost to Kournikova 6-7 0-6 U.S. Open: lost to Hingis 2-6 0-6
Kournikova	Pan Pacific: def. Huber 7-6 6-0 Lipton: def. Brandi 6-7 6-0 6-2 Hilton Head: def. Schnyder 6-7 6-0 6-3 Amelia Island: def. Schnyder 6-0 6-2 Roland Garros: def. Schnyder 6-1 3-6 6-0 Linz: lost to Spirlea 0-6 6-0 6-1	Australian Open: lost to Pierce 0-6 4-6 <i>Oklahoma City: def. Rubin 7-5 0-6 6-3</i> San Diego: lost to Coetzer 0-6 6-1 1-6 Linz: lost to Spirlea 0-6 6-0 1-6 Philadelphia: lost to Pierce 7-6 6-7 0-6
Likhovtseva	Hilton Head: def. Snyder 6-0 6-3 Eastbourne: def. Morariu 2-6 6-4 6-0 Eastbourne: lost to Tauziat 6-0 2-6 1-6 Wimbledon: def. Molik 6-2 6-0 Canadian Open: def. Drake 6-0 7-5	Paris: lost to Van Roost 5-7 0-6 Lipton: lost to Davenport 2-6 0-6 New Haven: lost to Seles 0-6 6-7
Martinez	Sydney: def. McQuillan 6-0 6-3 Australian Open: def. Rippner 6-0 6-4 Hilton Head: def. Fusai 6-0 6-0 Hilton Head: def. Dechaume-Balleret 6-3 6-0 Berlin: def. Kleinova 6-4 6-0 Rome: lost to Sanchez-Vicario 1-6 6-0 5-7 U.S. Open: def. Dechaume-Balleret 6-0 6-0	Amelia Island: lost to Seles 0-6 1-6 Rome: lost to Pierce 6-4 0-6 6-7 Princess Cup: lost to Seles 2-6 0-6
Mauresmo	Australian Open: def. Loit 6-0 7-5 Paris: def. Van Roost 6-0 7-6 Hilton Head: lost to Déchy 4-6 6-0 4-6	San Diego: lost to Testud 4-6 0-6
Novotna	Indian Wells: def. Fernandez 6-0 6-3 Lipton: def. Smashnova 6-0 6-1 U. S. Open: def. Krizan 6-0 6-3	Australian Open: lost to Sanchez Lorenzo 3-6 0-6 Indian Wells: lost to Graf 2-6 0-6 New Haven: lost to Dragomir 6-7 0-6
Pierce	Australian Open: def. Kournikova 6-0 6-4 Indian Wells: def. Frazier 6-0 6-3 Indian Wells: def. Grande 6-1 6-0 Amelia Island: def. Cristea 6-0 6-0 Rome: def. Martinez 4-6 6-0 7-6 Wimbledon: def. Wagner 6-3 6-0 U. S. Open: def. Montolio 6-0 7-6	Hamburg: lost to V. Williams 0-6 3-6
Sanchez-V	<i>Cairo: def. Gagliardi 7-5 6-0</i> <i>Cairo: def. Spirlea 6-1 6-0</i> Hamburg: def. Sanchez Lorenzo 6-3 6-0 Rome: def. Brandi 6-0 6-2	Sydney: lost to Schett 6-1 1-6 0-6 Berlin: defeated Martinez 6-1 0-6 7-5 Berlin: lost to Hingis 4-6 0-6

Schett	<p><i>Auckland: Schett def. Wagner 6-1 6-0</i> Sydney: def. Sanchez-Vicario 1-6 6-1 6-0 Australian Open: def. Kandarr 6-4 6-0 Hamburg: def. Tauziat 3-6 6-4 6-0 Berlin: def. Schnitzer 6-0 6-3 U.S. Open: def. Singian 6-0 6-1 U.S. Open: def. Ruano-Pascual 6-0 6-1 U.S. Open: def. Likhovtseva 6-0 6-1 Zurich: lost to Morariu 6-7 6-0 4-6</p>	<p><i>Auckland: lost to Van Roost 6-3 1-6 0-6</i> <i>Warsaw: lost to Barabanschikova 6-2 5-7 0-6</i> Stanford: lost to Frazier 4-6 0-6</p>
Seles	<p>Australian Open: def. Krizan 6-1 6-0 Australian Open: def. Testud 6-0 6-3 Hilton Head: def. Barabanschikova 6-3 6-0 Amelia Island: def. Fusai 6-0 6-2 Amelia Island: def. Coetzer 6-3 6-0 Amelia Island: def. Martinez 6-0 6-1 Wimbledon: def. Weingartner 6-0 6-0 New Haven: def. Likhovtseva 6-0 7-6 Princess Cup: def. Vavrinec 6-1 6-0 Princess Cup: def. Martinez 6-2 6-0</p>	
Tauziat	<p>Eastbourne: lost to Zvereva 6-0 5-7 3-6</p>	<p><i>Prostejov: lost to Cocheteux 0-6 6-7</i> Hamburg: lost to Schett 6-3 4-6 0-6 <i>Strasbourg: lost to Capriati 1-6 0-6</i> Eastbourne: def. Likhovtseva 0-6 6-2 6-1 Chase Championships: lost to Davenport 6-7 0-6</p>
Testud	<p>Indian Wells: def. Barabanschikova 7-6 6-0 San Diego: def. Mauresmo 6-4 6-0 Leipzig: def. Schnyder 3-6 6-1 6-0</p>	<p>Australian Open: lost to Seles 0-6 3-6 Indian Wells: lost to S. Williams 5-7 0-6</p>
Van Roost	<p><i>Auckland: def. Grande 7-5 6-0</i> <i>Auckland: def. Brandi 6-4 6-0</i> <i>Auckland: def. Schett 3-6 6-1 6-0</i> Australian Open: def. Noorlander 7-6 6-0 Paris: def. Ruano-Pascual 6-4 6-0 Paris: def. Likhovtseva 7-5 6-0 Indian Wells: lost to Rittner 6-0 4-6 3-6 Hamburg: def. Rittner 6-4 6-0 Rome: def. Arendt 6-1 6-0 U. S. Open: def. Drake 6-1 6-0</p>	<p>Sydney: lost to Hingis 2-6 0-6 Paris: lost to Mauresmo 0-6 6-7 Roland Garros: lost to Schwartz 1-6 0-6 Stanford: lost to Kremer 0-6 0-1 (retired) U.S. Open: lost to Fernandez 5-7 0-6</p>
S. Williams	<p>Indian Wells: def. Black 6-0 7-5 Indian Wells: def. Testud 7-5 6-0 Lipton: def. Serna 6-1 6-0 Lipton: def. Coetzer 6-4 6-0 Roland Garros: def. Courtois 6-4 6-0 U.S. Open: def. Po 6-1 6-0</p>	<p>Roland Garros: lost to Fernandez 3-6 6-1 0-6</p>
V. Williams	<p><i>Oklahoma City: def. Coetzer 6-4 6-0</i> Hamburg: def. Pierce 6-0 6-3 Roland Garros: def. Zvereva 7-6 6-0 New Haven: def. Serna 6-0 6-4 U.S. Open: def. Fernandez 2-6 6-1 6-0</p>	<p>Australian Open: Lost to Davenport 4-6 0-6 San Diego: lost to Hingis 4-6 0-6</p>

The Dominance of the Big Four

In 1999, the “Big Four” — Lindsay Davenport, Martina Hingis, Serena Williams, and Venus Williams — almost completely dominated the sport of women’s tennis. The following table shows how complete their dominance was in the events they played

Event	Tier	Big Four present	Winner
Sydney	II	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams	Davenport
Australian Open	Slam	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams	Hingis
Pan Pacific	I	Davenport, Hingis	Hingis
<i>Hannover</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>V. Williams</i>	<i>Novotna</i>
Paris	II	Hingis, S. Williams	S. Williams
Oklahoma City	III	V. Williams	V. Williams
Indian Wells	I	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams	S. Williams
Lipton	I	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams	V. Williams
Hilton Head	I	Hingis	Hingis
<i>Amelia Island</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>Davenport, V. Williams</i>	<i>Seles</i>
Hamburg	II	V. Williams	V. Williams
Rome	I	Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams	V. Williams
Berlin	I	Hingis, S. Williams	Hingis
Madrid	III	Davenport	Davenport
<i>Roland Garros</i>	<i>Slam</i>	<i>Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams</i>	<i>Graf</i>
Wimbledon	Slam	Davenport, Hingis, V. Williams	Davenport
Stanford	II	Davenport, V. Williams	Davenport
San Diego	II	Davenport, Hingis, V. Williams	Hingis
Los Angeles	II	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams	S. Williams
Canadian Open	I	Hingis	Hingis
New Haven	II	Davenport, V. Williams	V. Williams
U. S. Open	Slam	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams, V. Williams	S. Williams
Princess Cup	II	Davenport	Davenport
Filderstadt	II	Davenport, Hingis, S. Williams	Hingis
Zurich	I	Hingis, V. Williams	V. Williams
Philadelphia	II	Davenport, Hingis, V. Williams	Davenport
Chase Championship	Champ	Davenport, Hingis, V. Williams	Davenport

This is a total of 27 tournaments in which one or more of the Big Four was entered; they won 24 of them, or 89%. What is more, they won *every one of them* (twelve in a row) from Wimbledon on. The only events where (at least one of) the Big Four was present but did not win were Hannover, where only Venus Williams was present (losing to Jana Novotna in the final); Amelia Island, where Davenport and Venus Williams were present (won by Seles); and Roland Garros, where all four were present (Graf defeated Hingis in the final). It will be noted that two of the three players who won events featuring the Big Four have since retired.

In the seven tournaments won by Hingis, the Big Four put in sixteen appearances (an average of 2.3 appearances per win). In Davenport’s seven wins, the Big Four put in seventeen appearances (average of 2.4 appearances for each win). Venus Williams had six wins, and thirteen appearances (2.2 appearances per win). Serena Williams won four tournaments with twelve appearances (three appearances per win). Thus Serena actually had the best chance of winning a field where all several of the best players were present.

Projections for 2000

Note: The title of this section may seem to imply that it offers predictions. This is not its purpose. A prediction is an attempt to forecast the future. This section does not make forecasts. It is, instead, an analysis: What players have accomplished, how this compares with their career accomplishments, and what will have to happen for them to improve.

The following list is in order based on ranking. All of the Top 25 are covered, as are certain players whose 1999 results were in some way interesting.

#1: Martina Hingis

Was 1999 a good year for Martina Hingis? This is a difficult question. Yes, she finished the year at #1, leading the tour in most statistical categories. And yet, when she began the year, she probably had three major goals: To regain the #1 ranking, to win the French Open, and to win her “home” tournament at Zurich. She failed in two out of three.

2000 could be an equally roller-coaster-ish experience. Hingis started 1999 very strongly, reaching the final at Sydney, then winning the Australian Open and the Pan Pacific. These tournaments represent roughly a quarter of her total points, and the largest share of her lead over her rivals. Bad results at these events could threaten her #1 ranking. But then she entered a bad patch in 1999: quarterfinals at Paris and Indian Wells, semifinal at the Lipton, before putting things back together at Hilton Head. She had a solid clay season, then flamed out at Wimbledon. It is quite possible that Hingis could lose and regain the #1 ranking twice in the first seven months of 2000.

The final months of 1999 were, however, positive in at least one regard: Although Hingis only won three of eight tournaments after Wimbledon, she had no bad losses. She reached seven of eight finals (winning three), and had losses only to Davenport (two), Venus Williams (one), and Serena Williams (two). Her only loss before a final was a semifinal loss to Serena Williams. All of these were on the other players’ favorite surfaces (hardcourts and indoors). Hingis could still improve her clay results, and will likely do better at Wimbledon next year. Although Hingis will continue to have trouble with the Big Bashers, it is by no means certain that she will lose the #1 ranking in 2000. Even if she does, she can hardly finish lower than #3 — not bad for a player who will probably by then be the smallest player in the Top Ten.

#2: Lindsay Davenport

Looking at Davenport’s results, one can only wonder how good she might have been had she not been so hobbled by injuries. When she was on, she was incredible (as her results at Sydney and Philadelphia and the final rounds of the Chase show). But she spent so much time injured that it really hurt her position.

Davenport, like Hingis, had an up-and-down year. After a strong start, she had a horrible time from the Pan Pacific on. If she can play Pacific hardcourts as well as she did last year, and then regain her 1998 hardcourt form at Indian Wells and the Lipton, she could be back at #1 before the French Open — but then will have Wimbledon to defend. And, perhaps, Serena Williams (the world’s best hardcourt player this year) to contend with. Davenport’s final ranking will be strongly dependent on her results in the summer hardcourt season; this is where Venus or Serena Williams could really hurt her. It seems certain, however, that she will end in the Top Four.

#3: Venus Williams

If balance means anything, Venus Williams is perhaps the best player on the tour. She is the only player to win important events on hardcourts (Lipton, New Haven), clay (Hamburg, Rome), and indoors (Zurich) and also reach the quarterfinal of Wimbledon. Her six titles are exceeded only by Hingis’s and Davenport’s seven. But there is the problem: Hingis and Davenport. She had two wins over each — but generally in small events. When the event really counted (at the Slams and the Chase), Hingis and Davenport came out the winners. This meant that Williams, although competitive in winning percentage, came out well behind Hingis in the rankings.

And Williams is still suspect on clay, as her results at Amelia Island (the worst loss of the entire year for a Top Twenty player, based on opponent's rank) and Roland Garros attest.

The good news for Williams is that she started the year rather poorly, with only a quarterfinal at the Australian Open and no wins until Oklahoma City. In 2000 she will be seeded for the semis at Melbourne. Taking advantage of her higher ranking could push her up to #2, if Davenport has another bad spring (and Davenport seems to be making a tradition of this; she had a bad 1998 and a worse 1999). A win at one of the two hardcourt slams (still her best surface by far) could put her in contention for #1.

#4: Serena Williams

Serena Williams has an interesting task in 2000: To hold on to her incredible results on American hardcourts while improving her really quite poor results on other surfaces. If Serena did as well on clay and grass — and even on Australian hardcourts — as she did in America, she would be #1 despite playing a very limited schedule.

But her results are still one-dimensional (82% of her points on hardcourts, and almost all American hardcourts, at that! Serena had five major results in 1999: Paris, Indian Wells, Lipton, Los Angeles, and the U.S. Open. The rest of the year might as well not have happened). And the limitations of her schedule are holding her back significantly. In 1999, she was the second-best player in the world based on the events she played. But she only played eleven tournaments! With such a limited schedule, it will be almost impossible for her to reach the #1 ranking unless she can beat everyone (including her sister) on everything. If Serena is to reach the very top of the game, the Williams family must change strategies: It either must let Venus and Serena play more of the same tournaments, or it must let Serena have more tournaments at the expense of Venus — or the sisters will have to be content to play more low-grade tournaments.

#5: Mary Pierce

The numbers say Pierce is over-ranked. She ended the year at #5 because of two noteworthy events: The retirement of Graf and the repeated injuries of Seles. Pierce reached a lot of finals, but had only one win (at a weak Tier II). She never once beat one of the top players (Hingis, Davenport, Graf, or the Williams Sisters).

Pierce was clearly better than any woman on the tour except the Big Four, Graf, and Seles, but she continues to be prone to bad losses. Her results were overall quite steady: She was about equally good in all parts of the year. If she can put together a consistent string of strong results, she could stay at #5 (though her chances of moving up to compete with the Big Four seem very slight indeed). If she has a truly bad patch (and she had several such in 1998), she could fall to about #8 or so.

#6: Monica Seles

If one ignores the fact that Seles is Seles, her 1999 results were generally solid: One title, two Grand Slam semifinals plus a quarterfinal, plus finals at the Canadian Open and the Princess Cup. Her per-tournament numbers were clearly #5 in the world; despite the rankings, she was obviously better than #5 Mary Pierce.

At least until injuries took their toll. Seles missed most of the clay season (everything after Amelia Island except for Roland Garros) — her favorite time of the year. She also lost the entire fall indoor season. These hurt her scores significantly.

More important were her results against the Big Four. She played Hingis twice, and lost both times. She lost twice to Serena Williams as well, and once each to Venus Williams and Davenport. She didn't have a single win against them. Most of these matches weren't even particularly close; only once (against Serena, at the U.S. Open) did Seles win a set.

To make matters worse, Seles had most of her best results early in 1999. If she does not start 2000 in form, she could fall further. Still, if she can be injury-free in 2000, she should eventually make it back to #5. But #5 in a four-player field; her chances of moving past Hingis, Davenport, or the Williams Sisters seem almost nil.

#7: Nathalie Tauziat

Tauziat is very much an anomaly in the rankings — the best player in the world, after the Big Four, indoors, and probably on grass as well. On hardcourts and clay, her results are almost pitiful.

Tauziat can be very grateful to the present ranking system, which rewards her fast court success without really penalizing her for poor results on slower surfaces. That combination of the ranking system and a series of injuries to top players has brought her to a career high in the rankings.

And she could very well keep it for some time — perhaps all the way to her retirement, if reports of her future plans are correct. Tauziat has nothing to defend prior to the grass season. If she can start out 2000 with even a slight improvement, she could make her position secure for quite some time to come. If, however, she has another spring as bad as 1999 (in her first ten tournaments, she had only eight wins, and did not win two in a row until Birmingham), she could find her ranking in grave danger if she does poorly in the grass season.

Given the performances of the top six players compared to the rest of the tour, it will be very difficult for Tauziat to move up.

#8: Barbara Schett

Barbara Schett is something of an enigma. She is the only player in the Top Ten not to win a tournament in 1999. She reached one final (Moscow) and a handful of semifinals (Auckland, Sydney, Hamburg). Her best showing at a Slam was a quarterfinal loss to Venus Williams at the U.S. Open. She had three wins over players who were then in the Top Five (two over Sanchez-Vicario and one over Novotna), but she beat only one of the players who ended the year in the Top Ten (Tauziat).

Overall, Schett's results were consistent; she was about equally strong on all surfaces and at all times of the year. But this makes it difficult to project her future results. There is no obvious place for improvement, except that she needs to beat more top players. She stands at the head of a large group of closely clumped players (Halard-Decugis, Mauresmo, Coetzer). If her results slip just a little, she could fall several places. But if she improves only slightly, she could certainly move up to #7, and possibly even contend with Pierce for #6.

#9: Julie Halard-Decugis

If Serena Williams had the biggest breakthrough on the tour in 1999, Julie Halard-Decugis perhaps qualifies as the biggest surprise. Early in her career, she was a solid but by no means spectacular player, usually ranked somewhere around #15–#25. Then she sustained a series of injuries, and was not able to return to full-time play until 1998. Nothing in her previous record gave any hint that, in 1999, in her late twenties, she would turn into a Top Ten player. Some of this is the ranking system, but some of it is improved results, as well, including a win over then-#1 Davenport at San Diego.

And Halard might well improve even further; while her general results were solid, she had a rather weak 9-4 record at the Slams. In 2000, she should be seeded at the Australian Open, and will have a real chance to improve that record.

She does face a slight danger at the start of the year, which she began with eight straight wins. It is reported that she will not defend one of these events. These were, however, Tier IV events. A failure to defend these points will not hurt her much. She may face more trouble during the clay season, when she reached the final of Bol and Berlin. She has relatively little to defend in the rest of the spring.

#10: Amelie Mauresmo

Until 1999, Mauresmo seemed to be very fit; she was able to play 23 events in 1998. Then, suddenly, she started to succeed (Australian Open final, Paris final, Rome semifinal, Linz semifinal, plus a win at Bratislava). And her body came apart. She was forced into several long idle periods, and ended with only fifteen tournaments. Assessing her year becomes very difficult; was she as good as her best results, or were the several early losses more typical?

Mauresmo's ranking will be in great danger in the early part of 2000, since she earned 40% of her points in her tremendous Australian Open run. If, instead, she loses in the Round of Sixteen in 2000 (which would be her expected result given her likely #9 seed), she will probably fall out of the Top Fifteen. Failure to defend her Paris finalist showing could push her all the way out of the Top Twenty. From then on, however, she has relatively little to defend, and should be able to rebuild her ranking.

#11: Amanda Coetzer

Coetzer began 1999 in fine form. While she lost in the Round of Sixteen at the Australian Open, she followed that up with wins over Davenport (then #1) and Seles to reach the final of the Pan Pacific. Those points will be very difficult to replace; Coetzer may fall to #15 or so around March.

The good news is, for the second year in a row, she had poor results in 1999 on clay — what ought to be her best surface. In 1998 she had one good clay result at Hilton Head (the biggest win of her career). This year, she had nothing; her clay record was only 6–6. If she can return to the clay form that let her beat Steffi Graf at the 1997 French Open, she could achieve quite a bit in the middle part of 2000.

She also can hope to have a better end to her year; from the U.S. Open on, Coetzer was only 2-7. If Coetzer can improve on those poor results, she could make it back to the Top Ten.

#12: Anna Kournikova

This was supposed to be the year: The year that Anna Kournikova took her very real talent — the talent that took her to the 1997 Wimbledon semifinal and the 1998 Lipton final — and converted it into a Top Ten ranking.

Then a whole bunch of funny things happened. She started the year without a serve. She had a very good clay season, including a final at Hilton Head and a semifinal run at Amelia Island, but proceeded to fire her coach, and lose her edge, and suffer an injury that cost her most of the summer hardcourt season and a large part of the fall indoor season. She also saw her results decline. The player who beat four Top Ten players in a row at the Lipton in 1998 had only two Top Ten wins in all of 1999 (both at Hilton Head).

She also had managed some of the strangest scorelines in tennis: 1-6 6-1 1-6 against Schett at the Lipton. 0-6 6-1 1-6 against Coetzer in San Diego. 0-6 6-0 1-6 against Spirlea at Linz.

For Kournikova, the keys in 1999 will be consistency and health. If she can play a full year, she might make the Top Ten even on her present form. If she can fully put her game together, using her speed and her wide variety of shots, she might be able to get up to #7 or #8.

If she can't manage to do at least one of the two, she may end 2000 as (still) the highest-ranked Tour player without a title. And, perhaps, with a mental state which makes a win permanently impossible.

#13: Sandrine Testud

In recent years, Testud has fallen into a fairly regular pattern: Playing a lot of tournaments, reaching a lot of quarterfinals, with a certain number of early losses (ignored under the Best 18 ranking system) and a few stronger results (this year, semifinal at Indian Wells, semifinal at Sopot, semifinal at Filderstadt, final at Linz). These sorts of results all but guarantee her a ranking in the #11-#18 range. Chances are that she will continue in that range in 2000. Where she falls in the range will depend on how often she can advance beyond the quarterfinal.

#14: Dominique Van Roost

Dominique Van Roost is best remembered for her fine result at the 1997 Australian Open (a result she technically equalled this year, with another quarterfinal showing, but without the upsets she managed in 1997). Historically, however, Van Roost's best results have been indoors, and this year is no exception; 40% of her points were earned under a roof. Other than her results on southern hemisphere hardcourts, she never once reached an outdoor semifinal, and had six first-round losses.

This gives Van Roost two possibilities to increase her ranking: She can improve her outdoor performances (not a good prospect; she had far too many losses to low-ranked players in 1999) or she can

play more indoor events. Van Roost already plays a heavy schedule; she really ought to add the Pan Pacific to her calendar. The extra points from just that one event could perhaps move her close to the Top Ten. Barring that, she is likely to stay in the #12 to #16 range.

#15: Conchita Martinez

In 1998, Conchita Martinez's results consisted of little more than the Australian Open final and some clay points. When the Australian Open result came off in 1999, her ranking fell terribly. Martinez responded by finally reacting to the current ranking system. In 1997 she played only 19 events; in 1998, 18. In 1999 she increased that to 23 tournaments, and was rewarded with a slow return to a respectable ranking.

Martinez still has a surface problem, though; she achieved most of her best results on clay, and was particularly weak on indoor surfaces. With her ranking back up to the point where she will be seeded, she should be able to move up still a few more places. If she wishes to get back to the Top Ten, though, she will have to start winning on something other than clay.

#16: Anke Huber

Huber's 1999 ranking followed a sort of a roller coaster pattern: A deep trough in the middle of the year followed by a return to the Top Twenty. This was largely the effect of results from previous years; injuries took a significant toll on her in 1998. 1999 was clearly better for her; despite missing the French Open, she still managed to play 26 tournaments (second only to Likhovtseva among the Top Twenty). This ability to play the whole year is largely responsible for her ranking resurgence.

But Huber still has reason to be concerned. Her clay results were pitiful, and she accomplished nothing on grass. She had many very bad losses — only Van Roost had more losses to Non-Top-Fifty players. She must improve her consistency.

To her advantage, she will be getting seeded again in 2000, and has little to defend in the first part of the year. Given her history of solid results at the Australian Open, she could well get close to the Top Ten in the early part of 2000. But unless she can cease the bad losses, her chances of moving higher seem slight.

#17: Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario

And they say that surfaces don't mean much to the women! Don't tell that to Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario, who might almost have skipped the entire non-clay portion of the season. She earned 60% of her points on clay (two and a half times the usual fraction), and it would have been 63% were it not for the 54 points she received for losing easily at the Chase. And this despite the benefit of high seeds for most of the year, especially in the first half. Without the benefit of seeding, if she continues to perform as she did in 1999, she could end 2000 out of the Top Twenty.

The good news is that she was playing through an injury for most of the first part of 1999. This would seem to imply that she can hope for at least some improvement in her results for early 2000.

#18: Elena Likhovtseva

The more one examines Likhovtseva's results, the stranger it is that she is in the Top Twenty. Only twice in 1999 did she get past a quarterfinal: She reached the semifinal at Hannover (a weak Tier II) and the final at Strasbourg (an even weaker Tier III). She had more first-round losses than any other player in the Top Twenty. She had a dismal record against the Top Ten. Her winning percentage was barely above fifty percent.

The one thing Likhovtseva had going for her was endurance: She led the Top Twenty with 29 tournaments. Only two other Top Fifty players managed to play more than 27 tournaments. This, combined with a ranking system which ignores losses, allowed her to (barely) bring herself back into the Top Twenty.

Playing her present schedule, however, with her present results will make it very hard for Likhovtseva to move up. To improve her ranking, she needs to win more, and that requires her to defeat more top players. Her best bet might be to shift the balance of tournaments she plays. In 1999, Likhovtseva played all four Slams, the Chase, all nine Tier I tournaments, and thirteen of fifteen possible Tier II events — meaning that

27 of her 29 events were high-Tier tournaments. She would probably do better to skip some of those events (especially the stronger Tier II events such as San Diego and Filderstadt, where every player she faces is likely to be in the Top Twenty), and play more Tier III events. That would appear to be her only hope of reaching the Top Fifteen.

#19: Amy Frazier

The men's tour is known for "one-surface wonders" — players who succeed only on one type of court. This is less true of the women's game, but only less so. Exhibit A is Serena Williams (82% of her points on hardcourts). Exhibit B is Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario (60% of her points on clay). Exhibit C is Amy Frazier, who earned nearly three-fourths of her points on hardcourts, and almost all of the other points at low-tier events.

This imbalance makes it hard for Frazier to improve her ranking unless she can start beating more of the very top players. As a new Top Twenty player (she started the year in the #35-#40 range), she will have the advantage of being able to get into more and better tournaments in 2000. But she needs to find a way to take advantage.

#20: Ruxandra Dragomir

1999 was a year of Big Retirements. Steffi Graf was, of course, the biggest name, but Jana Novotna also left the game, depriving it of two long-time Top Ten players in one year. The side effect of this was to open extra positions at the top of the game.

Dragomir was the leading beneficiary of this. Having started the year in #35-#40 range, she gradually made her way into the Top 25, but would not have made it to #20 without the retirement of Graf and Novotna.

The noteworthy feature of Dragomir's year was her clay success. She reached her only final, Amelia Island, on clay, and also had a semifinal showing. (On other surfaces, she had one semifinal, at New Haven, plus third round showing at the Lipton, and never got past the second round of any other tournament.) She also had two of her three Top Ten wins on clay (the third being against a rapidly fading Novotna at New Haven).

Thus Dragomir's goal must be to translate her clay success to other surfaces. If she can do that, she could perhaps reach the Top Ten. Otherwise, she will stay about where she is.

#21: Patty Schnyder

The best thing Patty Schnyder can say about 1999 is that it's over. After winning Gold Coast in the first week of the year, she only once advanced beyond the quarterfinal in 23 tournaments in the rest of the year (the one exception was her semifinal showing at Hilton Head). Even quarterfinals were relatively few; she made it that far just four times, with three of them on clay (the other was on slow hardcourts at Sydney), and none after Berlin. She had eight first-round losses.

Schnyder's results in 1998 proved that she is better than this (though perhaps not as much better as her 1998 #8 ranking might imply; she had five titles in 1998, but four were at Tier III or lower events). But there is no sign yet that she is recovering her form. Her position will be in grave danger in 2000; her best result of the year was Gold Coast; she can expect a sharp drop in her ranking thereafter.

#22: Chanda Rubin

For Chanda Rubin, 1999 held one major highlight: Beating Martina Hingis to reach the semifinal of Indian Wells. Other major results were winning the Tier IV at Hobart, reaching the semifinal at the Tier III at Madrid, and reaching the final at the Tier III at Quebec City.

A lack of results at important events is readily seen. Other than Indian Wells, Rubin did not reach a quarterfinal of a Tier II or higher tournament.

The question then becomes whether Rubin can recover that form she had at Indian Wells, even on hardcourts. If she can, she could move up quite a few positions. If not, she may actually fall as the year progresses.

#23: Jennifer Capriati

A great deal has been made of Jennifer Capriati's return to the tour. There is no doubt that she has finally gotten serious about her comeback. But too much should not be made of her results.

Capriati had exactly four significant results in 1999: Round of Sixteen at Roland Garros and the U.S. Open, plus wins at Strasbourg and Quebec City. Other than that, she never once reached a quarterfinal, and only once (Canadian Open) won two matches in a tournament.

We should note, in addition, that Capriati beat only one Top Ten player (Tauziat, and all on clay or hardcourts, surfaces where Tauziat is very bad). Against the rest of the Top Ten, she went 0-7. At Strasbourg she faced only one Top Twenty player (Tauziat). At Quebec City, again, only one Top Twenty player: #20 Amy Frazier. At the U.S. Open, she beat Tauziat. At Roland Garros, she never faced a Top Twenty player.

Capriati's numbers in the final half of 1999 imply that she could again reach the Top Twenty. But if she continues on her present form, she is unlikely to get past about #16. Only if she can start beating the top players can she hope to return to the Top Ten.

#24: Ai Sugiyama

In 1998, Sugiyama ended the year in the Top Twenty. In 1999, something happened. She started losing in her own hemisphere. (Her best results in 1998 were in Japan and other Pacific events.) Her results were not really bad (she had two wins over Mary Pierce), but she could not defend her titles at Gold Coast and the Japan Open. Without those, she left the Top Twenty.

Sugiyama remains Japan's best player by a wide margin. It would not take much to put her back in the Top Twenty. To move into the Top Fifteen is probably not a real possibility, though.

#25: Nathalie Déchy

When one looks at Déchy's results, one wonders a bit why she is ranked so low. She didn't have many big results (semifinal at Paris and Bratislava; Round of 16 at Wimbledon; quarterfinal at Amelia Island and Filderstadt and some lesser tournaments). But her winning percentage was better than most.

The reason for her low ranking is that she played an unusually weak set of events — seven events of Tier III or lower. If Déchy can translate these results in lower-tier events into wins at bigger tournaments, she could easily break into the Top Twenty.

#27: Natasha Zvereva

The commentators all say it: The player who has been #1 in doubles for much of the past decade has what it takes to be Top Ten in singles. Certainly she could be in the Top Twenty, though the Top Ten is very crowded these days. But somehow it just doesn't happen. In the last two years, Zvereva has become almost a pure grasscourt player. Her win at Eastbourne represents over 30% of her points; all told, she earned 40% of her points on grass.

If somehow she can take that grass success and move it to any other surface, the Top Twenty would be certain. If, however, she continues as she has this year, and then loses at Eastbourne, she will certainly fall out of the Top Thirty.

#30: Sabine Appelmans

At one point in 1999, it was reported that Sabine Appelmans was retiring. Whether the report is true or false, it certainly seems to have energized her. Until Wimbledon, she was struggling to stay in the Top 100. Starting with around the U.S. Open, she has been earning points at a rate that would put her in the Top Fifteen. She had been Top Fifteen in the past, reaching the Australian Open quarterfinal and playing in the Chase Championships in 1997. It now appears that she has a real chance to get back into the Top Twenty.

#35: Irina Spirlea

1999 saw a number of players go into all-but-inexplicable declines. In the case of Patty Schnyder, it was her coach. Anna Kournikova can blame her serve and her lack of a coach. Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario can place at least part of the blame on injury.

But can anyone explain Irina Spirlea? Hers is the most dramatic fall of all — from Top Ten in late 1997 to #35 now. It's not age; she isn't that old. It's not injuries; she played 25 events in 1999. But only twice in the entire year — at Cairo and the U.S. Open — did she earn more than 100 points in an event. She had fourteen first round losses, meaning that she lost her first match more than half the time.

It's hard to imagine her going anywhere but up from here. But only if someone can figure out what is wrong....

The Kids of Wimbledon:

Jelena Dokic, Alexandra Stevenson, Kim Clijsters, Mirjana Lucic

Jelena Dokic, WTA #43, holds a strange distinction: she earned 482.5 of her 698.5 points (69%) at Wimbledon. Even more amazing, she earned 85% of her quality points at Wimbledon. This would seem unique and without precedent, were it not for the fact that #50 Mirjana Lucic earned 454 of her 640 points (71%) at Wimbledon. Alexandra Stevenson (#46) is a little more normal; she only earned 57% of her points at Wimbledon. But all three of these youngsters appeared, played one great tournament, then vanished again.

Even though she is presently the lowest-ranked, Lucic appears to have the best prospects. Until illness and family troubles harmed her prospects, she had had a fine career on clay, with two titles and a semifinal showing at Rome 1998. This year, she hardly played on clay. If she can play the clay season in 2000, she might make the Top 30 or higher by next Wimbledon.

Dokic and Stevenson both struggled after Wimbledon; Stevenson, for instance, did not win another match until late fall. It is difficult to foresee success for either in the immediate future.

Kim Clijsters (#47) is rather another matter, even though she earned the fewest points at Wimbledon. Unlike the other three, she had real and important post-Wimbledon results, including a win at Luxembourg (with victories over Huber, Appelmans, and Van Roost) and a final at Bratislava (beating Appelmans and Déchy). Projecting these results over an entire year would seem to imply a place in the Top Twenty. But a few sloppy results say that she may not be ready to go beyond that.

Doubles

Analysing doubles is much more complex than singles, because of the complications of different teams — and also because some players play doubles much more often than others. Martina Hingis, for instance, played 19 singles tournaments but only nine doubles tournaments (and she did not play singles in one of those nine). Elena Likhovtseva, by contrast, played 29 singles tournaments — and 28 doubles events.

The following section, therefore, only sketches the state of doubles.

The Final Top 25 in Doubles

Doubles Ranking	Player	1998 Year-End Doubles Ranking	1999 Year-End Singles Ranking
1	Anna Kournikova	10	12
2	Martina Hingis	2 ¹	1
3	Larisa Neiland	11	214
4	Lindsay Davenport	4	2
5	Lisa Raymond	5	28
6	Corina Morariu	49	37
7	Rennae Stubbs	5	254
8	Elena Likhovtseva	9	18
9	Arantxa Sanchez-Vicario	12	17
10	Venus Williams	36	3
10	Serena Williams	36	4
12	Natasha Zvereva	1	27
13	Alexandra Fusai	7	177
14	Nathalie Tauziat	7	7
15	Caroline Vis	15	—
16	Ai Sugiyama	13	24
17	Irina Spirlea	33	35
18	Patricia Tarabini	14	—
19	Elena Tatarkova	22	120
20	Mary Pierce	56	5
21	Mariaan De Swardt	17	75
22	Chanda Rubin	30	22
23	Sandrine Testud	70	13
24	Conchita Martinez	16	15
25	Kimberly Po	51	129

1. Yes, I know, Hingis won the Grand Slam in doubles in 1998. And yes, she wound up #2 anyway. Don't look at me; I didn't invent this ranking system. Under a rational divisor-based system, Hingis would have been easily #1 in doubles in 1998 — and clearly, though less decisively, #1 in 1999 as well.

Team Doubles Titles, Sorted from Most to Least

Team	Combined Final Rank	Titles Won (Tier)	# of Titles
Hingis/Kournikova	3	Australian Open (Slam), Chase (Champ), Indian Wells (I), Rome (I), Eastbourne (II)	5
Raymond/Stubbs	12	Zurich (I), Moscow (I), New Haven (II), Philadelphia (II), Oklahoma City (III)	5
Williams/Williams	20	Roland Garros (Slam), U.S. Open (Slam), Hannover (II)	3
Davenport/Morariu	10	Wimbledon (Slam), Stanford (II), San Diego (II)	3
Spirlea/Vis	32	Paris (II), Linz (II), Luxembourg (III)	3
Fusai/Tauziat	27	Berlin (I), Prostějov (IV)	2
Martinez/Tarabini	42	Amelia Island (II), Princess Cup (II)	2
Neiland/Sanchez-Vicario	12	Hamburg (II), Los Angeles (II)	2
Likhovtseva/Sugiyama	24	Sydney (II), Strasbourg (III)	2
Morariu/Neiland	9	Gold Coast (III), Birmingham (III)	2
Montalvo/Suarez	87	Sopot (III), Sao Paulo (IV)	2
Davenport/Zvereva	16	Pan Pacific (I)	1
Hingis/Novotna	(2+[5]=7)	Lipton (I)	1
Likhovtseva/Novotna	(8+[5]=13)	Hilton Head (I)	1
Novotna/Pierce	(20+[5]=25)	Canadian Open (I)	1
Neiland/Pierce	23	Leipzig (II)	1
Rubin/Testud	45	Filderstadt (II)	1
Courtois/Sanchez-Vicario	48	Cairo (III)	1
Farina/Grande	92	's-Hertogenbosh (III)	1
Frazier/Schlukebir	121	Quebec City (III)	1
Morariu/Po	31	Japan Open (III)	1
Ruano Pascual/Suarez	84	Madrid (III)	1
Carlsson/Loit	107	Pattaya City (IV)	1
Clijsters/Courtois	189	Bratislava (IV)	1
Cristea/Selyutina	106	Warsaw (IV)	1
De Swardt/Tatarkova	40	Hobart (IV)	1
Farina/Habsudova	73	Portschach (IV)	1
Farina/Schett	62	Auckland (IV)	1
Golarsa/Srebotnik	109	Antwerp (IV)	1
Kostanic/Pastikova	204	Bol (IV)	1
Kostanic/Pisnik	135	Kuala Lumpur (IV)	1
Koulikovskaya/Nacuk	186	Budapest (IV)	1
Koulikovskaya/Wartush	168	Tashkent (IV)	1
Krizan/Srebotnik	61	Palermo (IV)	1
Martincova/Wagner	170	Knokke-Heist (IV)	1
Noorlander/Papadaki	163	Bogota (IV)	1
Ortuno/Torrens-Valero	183	Estoril (IV)	1

The Top Fifteen Players/Results

This table is generally equivalent to the table of results in the section on singles, save that the format is somewhat simplified. The list shows each tournament the player played and the partner with whom she played. This is followed, in parenthesis, by the tier of the tournament, a notation showing how far the player advanced, and the number of wins her team had to reach that point.

Jana Novotna is included in the list because her results clearly justify it, even though she has been removed from the WTA ranking list and no longer had a doubles ranking.

Note: It has not been possible to entirely reconcile the WTA's ranking numbers for some players. Results given here are based on published material. Discrepancies have been noted where known, though it is likely that not all have been located. In some cases, the missing events may be challengers or qualifying matches.

Rank	Player	# of Tourns	Results
1	Kournikova	13	Australian Open w/Hingis (Slam, Win, 6) Pan Pacific w/Seles (I, QF, 1) Oklahoma City w/de Swardt (III, SF [withdrew], 2) Indian Wells w/Hingis (I, Win, 4) Lipton w/Likhovtseva (I, SF, 3) Hilton Head w/Coetzer (I, QF, 2) Amelia Island w/Coetzer (II, QF [withdrew], 2) Rome w/Hingis (I, Win, 4) Roland Garros w/Hingis (Slam, F, 5) Eastbourne w/Hingis (II, Win, 4) Stanford w/Likhovtseva (II, F, 3) Philadelphia w/Huber (II, 1R, 0) Chase w/Hingis (Champ, Win, 3)
2	Hingis	9	Australian Open w/Kournikova (Slam, Win, 6) Pan Pacific w/Novotna (I, F, 3) Indian Wells w/Kournikova (I, Win, 4) Lipton w/Novotna (I, W, 4 (+1 walkover)) Rome w/Kournikova (I, Win, 4) Roland Garros w/Kournikova (Slam, F, 5) Eastbourne w/Kournikova (II, Win, 4) Filderstadt w/Davenport (II, QF [withdrew], 1) Chase w/Kournikova (Champ, Win, 3)

3	Neiland	27	<p>Gold Coast w/Morariu (III, Win, 4) Sydney w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, QF, 1) Australian Open w/Sanchez-Vicario (Slam, QF, 3) Pan Pacific w/Huber (I, 1R, 0) Hannover w/Tatarkova (II, 2R, 1) Lipton w/Sanchez-Vicario (I, QF, 2) Hilton Head w/Sanchez-Vicario (I, 2R, 0) Amelia Island w/ Tatarkova (II, SF, 1(+1 walkover)) Hamburg w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, Win, 4) Rome w/Sanchez-Vicario (I, 2R, 0) Berlin w/Sanchez-Vicario (I, QF, 2) Roland Garros w/Sanchez-Vicario (Slam, QF, 3) Birmingham w/Morariu (III, Win, 4) Eastbourne w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Sanchez-Vicario (Slam, 3R, 2) Stanford w/Lucic (II, 1R, 0) San Diego w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, 2R, 1) Los Angeles w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, Win, 4) Canadian Open w/Sanchez-Vicario (I, F, 4) New Haven w/Srebotnik (II, SF, 2) U.S. Open w/Sanchez-Vicario (Slam, SF, 4) Filderstadt w/Sanchez-Vicario (II, F, 3) Zurich w/Halard-Decugis (I, 1R, 0) Moscow w/Van Roost (I, 2R, 1) Linz w/Krizan (II, F, 3) Leipzig w/Pierce (II, Win, 4) Chase w/Sanchez-Vicario (Champ, F, 2)</p>
4	Davenport	13	<p>Australian Open w/Zvereva (Slam, F, 5) Pan Pacific w/Zvereva (I, Win, 4) Indian Wells w/Zvereva (I, QF, 1) Hilton Head w/Zvereva (I, SF, 2) Roland Garros w/Pierce (Slam, SF, 4) Wimbledon w/Morariu (Slam, Win, 6) Stanford w/Morariu (II, Win, 4) San Diego w/Morariu (II, Win, 4) U.S. Open w/Morariu (Slam, QF, 3) Princess Cup w/Morariu (II, QF, 1) Filderstadt w/Hingis (II, QF [withdrew], 1) Philadelphia w/Morariu (II, SF [withdrew], 2) Chase w/Morariu (Champ, SF, 1)</p>

5	Raymond	21	<p>Sydney w/Stubbs (II, 1R, 0) Australian Open w/Stubbs (Slam, SF, 5) Pan Pacific w/Stubbs (I, QF, 1) Oklahoma City w/Stubbs (III, Win, 4) Indian Wells w/Stubbs (I, QF, 1) Hilton Head w/Stubbs (I, QF, 1) Amelia Island w/Stubbs (II, F, 3) Berlin w/Fernandez (I, 1R, 0) Roland Garros w/Stubbs (Slam, 1R, 0) Birmingham w/Stubbs (III, SF, 2) Eastbourne w/Coetzer (II, QF, 1) Wimbledon w/Stubbs (Slam, 3R, 2) Stanford w/Fernandez (II, SF, 2) Los Angeles w/Stubbs (II, F, 3) New Haven w/Stubbs (II, Win, 4) U.S. Open w/Stubbs (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Stubbs (II, SF, 2) Zurich w/Stubbs (I, Win, 4) Moscow w/Stubbs (I, Win, 4) Philadelphia w/Stubbs (II, Win, 4) Chase w/Stubbs (Champ, SF, 1)</p>
6	Morariu	21 (WTA lists 22)	<p>Gold Coast w/Neiland (III, Win, 4) Australian Open w/Fernandez (Slam, 2R, 1) Indian Wells w/Seles (I, 1R, 0) Lipton w/Huber (I, 2R, 1) Hilton Head w/Farina (I, QF, 2) Japan Open w/Po (III, Win, 4) Bol w/Cristea (IV, 1R, 0) Rome w/Jeyaseelan (I, QF, 2) Roland Garros w/Molik (Slam, 2R, 1) Birmingham w/Neiland (III, Win, 4) Eastbourne w/McQuillan (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Davenport (Slam, Win, 6) Stanford w/Davenport (II, Win, 4) San Diego w/Davenport (II, Win, 4) Canadian Open w/Po (I, QF, 2) U.S. Open w/Davenport (Slam, QF, 3) Princess Cup w/Davenport (II, QF, 1) Zurich w/Coetzer (I, QF, 1) Quebec City w/Coetzer (III, QF, 1) Philadelphia w/Davenport (II, SF [withdrew], 2) Chase w/Davenport (Champ, SF, 1) <i>(One other doubles result, possibly Bratislava, not found in archives)</i></p>

7	Stubbs	18	<p>Sydney w/Raymond (II, 1R, 0) Australian Open w/Raymond (Slam, SF, 5) Pan Pacific w/Raymond (I, QF, 1) Oklahoma City w/Raymond (III, Win, 4) Indian Wells w/Raymond (I, QF, 1) Hilton Head w/Raymond (I, QF, 1) Amelia Island w/Raymond (II, F, 3) Roland Garros w/Raymond (Slam, 1R, 0) Birmingham w/Raymond (III, SF, 2) Wimbledon w/Raymond (Slam, 3R, 2) Los Angeles w/Raymond (II, F, 3) New Haven w/Raymond (II, Win, 4) U.S. Open w/Raymond (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Raymond (II, SF, 2) Zurich w/Raymond (I, Win, 4) Moscow w/Raymond (I, Win, 4) Philadelphia w/Raymond (II, Win, 4) Chase w/Raymond (Champ, SF, 1)</p>
8	Likhovtseva	28	<p>Gold Coast w/Sugiyama (III, 1R, 0) Sydney w/Sugiyama (II, Win, 4) Australian Open w/Sugiyama (Slam, 2R, 1) Pan Pacific w/Sugiyama (I, QF, 1) Hannover w/Sugiyama (II, SF, 2) Paris w/Sugiyama (II, F, 3) Indian Wells w/Sugiyama (I, QF, 3) Lipton w/Kournikova (I, SF, 3) Hilton Head w/Novotna (I, Win, 4) Rome w/Sugiyama (I, 2R, 0) Berlin w/Sugiyama (I, 2R, 0) Strasbourg w/Sugiyama (III, Win, 4) Roland Garros w/Sugiyama (Slam, QF, 3) Eastbourne w/Sugiyama (II, 2R, 1) Wimbledon w/Sugiyama (Slam, 2R, 1) Stanford w/Kournikova (II, F, 3) San Diego w/Sugiyama (II, SF, 2) Los Angeles w/Sugiyama (II, 1R, 0) Canadian Open w/Sugiyama (I, QF, 1) New Haven w/Novotna (II, F, 3) U.S. Open w/Sugiyama (Slam, 1R, 0) Filderstadt w/Srebotnik (II, 2R, 1) Zurich w/Sugiyama (I, 2R, 1) Moscow w/Sugiyama (I, SF, 2) Linz w/Sugiyama (II, SF, 2) Leipzig w/Sugiyama (II, F, 3) Philadelphia w/Coetzer (II, 2R, 1) Chase w/Sugiyama (Champ, 1R, 0)</p>

9	Sanchez-Vicario	17	<p>Sydney w/Neiland (II, QF, 1) Australian Open w/Neiland (Slam, QF, 3) Lipton w/Neiland (I, QF, 2) Hilton Head w/Neiland (I, 2R, 0) Cairo w/Courtois (III, Win, 4) Hamburg w/Neiland (II, Win, 4) Rome w/Neiland (I, 2R, 0) Berlin w/Neiland (I, QF, 2) Roland Garros w/Neiland (Slam, QF, 3) Eastbourne w/Neiland (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Neiland (Slam, 3R, 2) San Diego w/Neiland (II, 2R, 1) Los Angeles w/Neiland (II, Win, 4) Canadian Open w/Neiland (I, F, 4) U.S. Open w/Neiland (Slam, SF, 4) Filderstadt w/Neiland (II, F, 3) Chase w/Neiland (Champ, F, 2)</p>
10	Venus or Serena Williams	8	<p>Sydney (II, SF, 2) Australian Open (Slam, SF, 4) Hannover (II, Win, 4) Indian Wells (I, SF, 4) Lipton (I, 3R [withdrew], 1) Roland Garros (Slam, Win, 6) San Diego (II, F, 3) U.S. Open (Slam, Win, 6)</p>
12	Zvereva	17 (WTA says 16, but see list at right...)	<p>Sydney w/Coetzer (II, 1R, 0) Australian Open w/Davenport (Slam, F, 5) Pan Pacific w/Davenport (I, Win, 4) Indian Wells w/Davenport (I, QF, 1) Lipton w/Pierce (I, 3R [withdrew], 1) Hilton Head w/Davenport (I, SF, 2) Rome w/Pierce (I, SF, 3) Berlin w/Pierce (I, 1R, 0) Roland Garros w/Novotna (Slam, QF, 3) Eastbourne w/Novotna (II, F, 3) Wimbledon w/Novotna (Slam, SF, 3 (+1 walkover)) San Diego w/Tauziat (II, SF, 2) Los Angeles w/Pierce (II, 1R, 0) U. S. Open w/Novotna (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Tatarkova (II, 1R, 0) Zurich w/Tauziat (I, F, 3) Moscow w/Tatarkova (I, SF, 2)</p>

13	Fusai	23 (WTA lists 25)	<p>Prostejov w/Tauziat (IV, Win, 3 (+1 walkover)) Hannover w/Tauziat (II, F, 3) Paris w/Tauziat (II, QF, 1) Indian Wells w/Tauziat (I, 2R, 0) Lipton w/Tauziat (I, 2R, 0) Hilton Head w/Sidot (I, SF, 3) Hamburg w/Tauziat (II, SF, 2) Rome w/Tauziat (I, F, 3) Berlin w/Tauziat (I, Win, 4) Strasbourg w/Tauziat (III, F, 3) Roland Garros w/Tauziat (Slam, SF, 4) Birmingham w/Gorrochategui (III, F, 4) Eastbourne w/Tauziat (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Tauziat (Slams, 2R, 1) Palermo w/Ruano Pascual (IV, QF, 1) Los Angeles w/Tauziat (II, 1R, 0) Canadian Open w/Tauziat (I, 2R, 0) U.S. Open w/Tauziat (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Tauziat (II, 1R, 0) Linz w/Tauziat (II, SF, 2) Leipzig w/Tauziat (II, SF, 2) Philadelphia w/Tauziat (II, 1R, 0) Chase w/Tauziat (Champ, 1R, 0) <i>(Two other doubles results not found in archives)</i></p>
14	Tauziat	23	<p>Prostejov w/Fusai (IV, Win, 3 (+1 walkover)) Hannover w/Fusai (II, F, 3) Paris w/Fusai (II, QF, 1) Indian Wells w/Fusai (I, 2R, 0) Lipton w/Fusai (I, 2R, 0) Hamburg w/Fusai (II, SF, 2) Rome w/Fusai (I, F, 3) Berlin w/Fusai (I, Win, 4) Strasbourg w/Fusai (III, F, 3) Roland Garros w/Fusai (Slam, SF, 4) Eastbourne w/Fusai (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Fusai (Slams, 2R, 1) San Diego w/Zvereva (II, SF, 2) Los Angeles w/Fusai (II, 1R, 0) Canadian Open w/Fusai (I, 2R, 0) New Haven w/Sidot (II, 1R, 0) U.S. Open w/Fusai (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Fusai (II, 1R, 0) Zurich w/Zvereva (I, F, 3) Linz w/Fusai (II, SF, 2) Leipzig w/Fusai (II, SF, 2) Philadelphia w/Fusai (II, 1R, 0) Chase w/Fusai (Champ, 1R, 0)</p>

15	Vis	26	<p>Australian Open w/Spirlea (Slam, 2R, 1) Pan Pacific w/Tarabini (I, SF, 2) Hannover w/Bollegraf (II, QF, 1) Paris w/Spirlea (II, Win, 4) Indian Wells w/Spirlea (I, 1R, 0) Lipton w/Spirlea (I, 3R, 1) Hilton Head w/Spirlea (I, 1R, 0) Cairo w/Spirlea (III, F, 3) Hamburg w/Spirlea (II, SF, 1 (+1 walkover)) Rome w/Spirlea (I, SF, 3) Berlin w/Spirlea (I, QF, 2) Roland Garros w/Spirlea (Slam, 1R, 0) Eastbourne w/Spirlea (II, 1R, 0) Wimbledon w/Spirlea (Slam, 3R, 0) Stanford w/Spirlea (II, 1R, 0) San Diego w/Spirlea (II, 1R, 0) Los Angeles w/Spirlea (II, QF, 1) Canadian Open w/Spirlea (I, SF, 3) U.S. Open w/Spirlea (Slam, 1R, 0) Luxembourg w/Spirlea (III, Win, 4) Filderstadt w/Spirlea (II, QF, 1) Zurich w/Spirlea (I, QF, 1) Linz w/Spirlea (II, Win, 4) Leipzig w/Spirlea (II, 1R, 0) Philadelphia w/Spirlea (II, 2R, 0 (+1 walkover)) Chase w/Spirlea (Champ, 1R, 0)</p>
—	Novotna	15	<p>Australian Open w/Seles (Slam, QF, 4) Pan Pacific w/Hingis (I, F, 3) Hannover w/Rittner (II, SF, 2) Indian Wells w/Fernandez (I, F, 4) Lipton w/Hingis (I, W, 4 (+1 walkover)) Hilton Head w/Likhovtseva (I, Win, 4) Hamburg w/Coetzer (II, F, 3) Berlin w/Tarabini (I, F, 3) Roland Garros w/Zvereva (Slam, QF, 3) Eastbourne w/Zvereva (II, F, 3) Wimbledon w/Zvereva (Slam, SF, 3 (+1 walkover)) Canadian Open w/Pierce (I, Win, 4) New Haven w/Likhovtseva (II, F, 3) U. S. Open w/Zvereva (Slam, 3R, 2) Filderstadt w/Coetzer (II, 1R, 0)</p>

Doubles Tournament Winners by Date (High-Tier Events)

Players shown in bold also won the singles at these tournaments

Tournament	Tier	Winner
Sydney	II	Likhovtseva/Sugiyama
Australian Open	Slam	Hingis/Kournikova
Tokyo (Pan Pacific)	I	Davenport/Zvereva
Hannover	II	V. Williams/S. Williams
Paris	II	Spirlea/Vis
Indian Wells	I	Hingis/Kournikova
Lipton (Key Biscayne)	I	Hingis/Novotna
Hilton Head	I	Likhovtseva/Novotna
Amelia Island	II	Martinez/Tarabini
Hamburg	II	Neiland/Sanchez-Vicario
Rome	I	Hingis/Kournikova
Berlin	I	Fusai/Tauziat
Roland Garros	Slam	V. Williams/S. Williams
Eastbourne	II	Hingis/Kournikova
Wimbledon	Slam	Davenport/Morariu
Stanford	II	Davenport/Morariu
San Diego	II	Davenport/Morariu
Los Angeles	II	Neiland/Sanchez-Vicario
Canadian Open	I	Novotna/Pierce
New Haven	II	Raymond/Stubbs
U.S. Open	Slam	V. Williams/ S. Williams
Tokyo (Princess Cup)	II	Martinez/Tarabini
Filderstadt	II	Rubin/Testud
Zurich	I	Raymond/Stubbs
Moscow	I	Raymond/Stubbs
Linz	II	Spirlea/Vis
Leipzig	II	Neiland/Pierce
Philadelphia	II	Raymond/Stubbs
Chase Championships	Champ	Hingis/Kournikova

Doubles Winning Percentages for the Top Fifteen

Player	WTA Rank	# of Partners	Won/Lost	Winning Percentage	Tournaments Played	Tournaments Won	Tournament Win%
Kournikova	1	6	39-6	86.7%	13	5	38.5%
Hingis	2	3	33-2	94.3%	9	6	66.7%
Neiland	3	10	54-22	71.1%	27	5	18.5%
Davenport	4	4	38-7	84.4%	13	4	30.8%
Raymond	5	3	46-16	74.2%	21	5	23.8%
Morariu	6	12	44-14	75.9%	21	6	28.6%
Stubbs	7	1	43-13	76.8%	18	5	27.8%
Likhovtseva	8	5	49-25	66.2%	28	3	10.7%
Sanchez-Vicario	9	2	39-14	73.6%	17	3	17.6%
V./S. Williams	10	1	30-4	88.2%	8	3	37.5%
Zvereva	12	6	34-15	69.4%	17	1	5.8%
Fusai	13	4	38-21	64.4%	23	2	8.7%
Tauziat	14	3	35-21	62.5%	23	2	8.7%
Vis	15	3	32-23	58.2%	26	3	11.5%
Novotna	—	9	45-12	78.9%	15	3	20%

The effect of these statistics is obvious: Martina Hingis was the best doubles player in the world in 1999, winning two-thirds of the tournaments she entered and experiencing only two losses in the entire year. The Williams Sisters appear to have been equally severely under-ranked. It is ironic that Hingis is the clear #1 in the WTA singles rankings, though Davenport led her in some statistical categories, but is only #2 in doubles, even though the statistics overwhelmingly favour her as a doubles player.

Doubles Winning Percentages for the Top Teams

(Minimum three tournaments, eight matches; sorted in descending order by winning percentage)

Team	Won/Lost	Winning Percentage	Tournaments Played	Tournaments Won	Tournament Win%
Hingis/Kournikova	26-1	96.3%	6	5	83.3%
Williams/Williams	30-4	88.2%	8	3	37.5%
Davenport/Morariu	21-3	87.5%	7	3	42.9%
Davenport/Zvereva	12-3	80%	4	1	25%
Raymond/Stubbs	43-13	75.9%	18	5	27.8%
Novotna/Zvereva	11-4	73.3%	4	0	0%
Neiland/Sanchez-Vicario	35-14	71.4%	16	2	12.5%
Likhovtseva/Sugiyama	34-20	63.0%	22	2	9.1%
Fusai/Tauziat	30-18	62.5%	20	2	10%
Martinez/Tarabini	24-17	58.5%	19	2	10.5%
Spirlea/Vis	29-21	58%	24	3	12.5%

Alternate Doubles Rankings

For explanations of these rankings, see the equivalent section in singles. Because quality points are far less important in doubles (constituting roughly 20% of a player's total, rather than nearly 40% as in singles), only two alternate rankings are calculated for doubles. For reasons outlined above, some of these results are slightly approximate, particularly for players who played more than 18 doubles tournaments.

Rankings under the 1996 Ranking System (Divisor, Minimum 14)

1. Kournikova
2. Hingis
3. Davenport
- (4) Novotna
4. V Williams
S. Williams
6. Stubbs
7. Zvereva
8. Sanchez-Vicario
9. Raymond
10. Neiland
11. Morariu
12. Pierce
13. Likhovtseva
14. Tauziat
15. Fusai
16. Testud
17. Fernandez
18. Sugiyama
19. De Swardt

Points Per Tournament, No Minimum Divisor

1. Hingis
2. V. Williams
S. Williams
4. Kournikova
5. Davenport
- (6) Novotna
6. Stubbs
7. Zvereva
8. Sanchez-Vicario
9. Raymond
10. Neiland
11. Morariu
12. Fernandez
13. Seles
14. Pierce
15. Likhovtseva
16. Tauziat
17. Fusai
18. Testud
19. Sugiyama