

Tennis Channel

Tuesday, May 17, 2022
Culver City, California, USA

Pam Shriver

Media Conference



ERIC ABNER: Thanks to everybody for joining us today. I wanted to note something that's a little different about our French Open this year. In March Tennis Channel and Samsung TV Plus launched an entirely new television network called T2. It has different programming than Tennis Channel, different matches. It's a completely separate event. But we're very excited about it because it's free to anybody who has a Samsung TV that was made in 2017 or later.

What that means is this year we're going to have matches on T2 all but two days of the tournament. From first Sunday through second Friday there will be matches on T2. I think the first week it's about a seven-hour block of matches, and the second week I want to say about four hours.

These are live matches that you won't see on Tennis Channel. I'm sure on Tennis Channel we will have live look-ins and keep people apprised of what's happening.

But for people who have a Samsung TV Plus, they will be able to flip back and forth between Tennis Channel and T2 and choose the match they want to watch.

It also means that there's going to be more live, free French Open available on American television this year. We're excited about it. I encourage those of you who have a Samsung TV that's 2017 or more recent to check it out.

Otherwise, standard coverage. We're going to basically turn into a 24-hour Roland Garros channel starting on Sunday.

We have our on-air talent back, our Hall of Famers, Navratilova, Courier, Davenport, other great champions in our analyst team, award-winning sportscasters.

What we're also excited about is two new team members with us in Paris. One is 2018 Australian Open winner Caroline Wozniacki. The other is our guest today, Hall of Famer Pam Shriver. Both have appeared on Tennis Channel before but it's the first time in Paris with us for each, and we're really happy they're joining us.

We don't have time for me to list everything that Pam accomplished in an unparalleled career. I know you guys are all more than aware. But I do want to point out she won the French Open doubles crown four times she claimed her major mixed doubles title in Paris.

I want to thank her, too, for taking the time to talk with us today as she runs around and gets ready to head over to Paris. We're going to do about 30, 40 minutes of Q & A, and then we'll make the transcript available later today. Thanks again.

Really appreciate all you guys turning out. Please find me if you need anything today or throughout the tournament, and I think we can go from there.

Q. Who can stop Swiatek and when was the last time you saw someone this dominant entering Roland Garros?

PAM SHRIVER: Well, first off, Eric, thanks for asking me to do today's call, and I can tell you I'm thrilled to be on the Tennis Channel team and return to Roland Garros for the first time in quite a few years, at a time when tennis history is being written at every major we play.

Fascinating time in women's tennis, Swiatek assuming the No. 1 ranking when Barty retired, and I don't think we would have imagined that the No. 1 player on the women's side would basically have an unbeaten streak since US Open round of 16. Obviously it's shared between two players.

Who can stop Swiatek on her best surface, clay, at the major where she's already won? I think right now given her form, given her confidence, I think the only thing that can really stop her is if she shows up below par, below what we've seen in the 28 matches in a row on average.

Obviously she had some battles during that streak, the Samsonova match in Stuttgart, the first set against Andreescu last week. There have been moments where she hasn't been at her best, but her record in second sets or her record in even tight first sets has been tremendous.

So I think she goes in as the biggest favorite since I'd say the last person that's had a dominant streak like this, 2014



when Serena Williams was the dominant player.

I was thinking about this yesterday. Okay, who has been this dominant, and you could say Ash Barty has some of these qualities, but I would say to win this many tournaments in a row, beating virtually all of your fellow top 10ers and beating a few of them a couple of times, it's really Serena-like.

Back in my day, it would have been Monica- or Steffi- or Martina-like the way she's done it. But I will tell you, in order to make a streak like this truly memorable, you have to win at least one major during the streak. And if the pressure starts to build, the combination of the streak plus trying to win Roland Garros, then we can sort of think back to what happened to Novak Djokovic almost 10 years ago when he had an even a longer streak.

Between the streak and trying to win Roland Garros of course he had somebody like Rafa Nadal in the draw, which Swiatek doesn't have.

But it's a fascinating thing that's happened; very unpredictable out of the Australian Open where Barty looked like the dominant No. 1. Now we have a new dominant No. 1, and who can stop her in this era of women's tennis?

I'll say one last thing. We've seen in recent years unpredictable things can still happen in women's tennis, especially at the majors, so keep that pattern in mind as we go into this Roland Garros that seems to be so heavily favored towards one player.

But just remember the unpredictability.

Q. What makes her so good? And would you want to throw out a dark horse or two that might make a deep run?

PAM SHRIVER: Well, I think most dominant No. 1s have that one shot that can truly intimidate, and for Swiatek it is her forehand. Her game is built around the forehand, just being able to punish you to both corners.

And while most big forehands, like Steffi Graf's, they are a little bit better when they are running around it and hitting it inside out or inside in.

But Swiatek moves great. Her open stance slide forehand out wide is darn good, too. Her backhand I feel like during the streak has been better than we thought. And her serve is improving.

She's still young and to me getting stronger. She's also

been one of the first in during this era of working on the mindset.

All of the package makes her that good.

I think taking Barty out made her realize, like when she looked at herself with Barty out of the equation, she realized she was ready to step up.

As far as dark horses, going back to the unpredictable nature of women's tennis, given the fact that Krejčíková is our defending champion and then two majors later Raducanu came out of qualifying winning 20 straight sets. I guess if you talk about a dark horse, I could probably list 40 players, literally 40 players if Swiatek doesn't win it.

But I guess if you're looking for top players who haven't won majors yet, you think about can Sakkari not buckle under pressure and really play her best tennis when it matters.

There's question marks for a lot of people. Can Ons Jabeur raise her level a little bit more. That's all she needs. Or Swiatek lower her level, because what Ons Jabeur did to have a double-digit win streak over the same time period was pretty outstanding.

Those are an example of two players that come to mind. I don't have the confidence in Sabalenka on a clay court with her service woes this year to be of the quality to win at Roland Garros.

But literally Halep -- you have to respect anybody that's won it before that's had any form recently, and I think you always have to keep an eye on someone like Simona Halep.

Q. I just want to do a quick lightning round. A few others have been women's tennis observers for a good while, and I want to briefly name the different strokes and just off the top of your head who is foremost at those strokes or attributes. Obviously the first one would be first serve.

PAM SHRIVER: Serena.

Q. Second serve?

PAM SHRIVER: Serena.

Q. The forehand?

PAM SHRIVER: Graf.

Q. The return?

PAM SHRIVER: Seles.

Q. And net play?

PAM SHRIVER: Navratilova.

Q. And speed or anticipation?

PAM SHRIVER: Graf.

Q. Mental toughness?

PAM SHRIVER: Chris Evert.

Q. And then to do a pretty substantial pivot, you of course spoke out so poignantly in the piece that was published a little while ago, very interesting and important piece. What has been the reaction or the most surprising reaction since that came out and you spoke out?

PAM SHRIVER: Yeah. It's been a few weeks now. First off, I want to thank my two employers, Tennis Channel and ESPN, for being so supportive in the workplace and helping me on their platforms tell my story and push the story further.

Obviously I did it with two things in mind. One was a bit of a personal situation, feeling like for me to kind of come full circle with it and deal with some things that I hadn't dealt with over decades, I really felt strongly that I wanted to tell the story first person, which I did verbally on the tennis podcast.

I thought Catherine Whitaker did a great job with her questions. I wanted to tell it for the first time from start to finish to a female. I wanted to do it in person. We did it in Indian Wells.

Simon Briggs of the Telegraph, he had gotten wind that I was getting closer to wanting to tell my story. He reached out to me in January, and he helped me write a first-person account.

But basically I've felt a lot of support from everybody, from my three teenage kids to my family of origin to fellow players that I competed with, other coaches I had in the game; the WTA, the ITF are two organizations specifically that have reached out.

In fact, the ITF reached out in a serious enough way where there's a meeting planned coming up to sort of discuss their current safeguarding measures and where they may have some loopholes and things for them to consider,

because basically the second part of why I told my story of why it is -- should no longer happen in the future where coaches or any team members of elite athletes should ever cross over the boundary of having just a professional relationship -- to try and make the tennis player to be as good a tennis player should never cross over into romantic or sexual relationship, because it's a position of trust and power over the young developing player or even someone who's of consent.

It doesn't matter. It's a position of trust and of power, just like a teacher and a student, just like a therapist and a -- not a client, but a therapist and a patient. It should never happen.

I want to see workplace protocols put into place between training, credentialing, make there be independent phone numbers that players can call if they start to feel uncomfortable about a developing situation. So it's going to take some time.

I think the WTA was already going to improve some things starting in 2023, but I think by stepping up and sharing very detailed accounts of what's happened and what's happened since and how it affected my life in a negative way, hopefully the sport will realize it needs to follow suit of like swimming and gymnastics who had really terrible things happen in their sport, and we do need better safeguarding.

Thank you for asking the question.

Q. And you feel better for finally expressing this very difficult situation and bringing it out; you have a good inner feeling about it?

PAM SHRIVER: I do. I do feel better, because basically every decade I've been in the sport, and it's been almost four and a half decades, it's happened every step of the way. And there comes to be a point as I've seen other workplaces develop, under human resources or under safeguarding policies, whether it's schools my kids are involved in or whether it's corporations that I know how they make sure that these things don't happen in the workplace, I don't think we can hide behind any more the fact that -- for example, tennis players aren't employees anywhere; they're independent contractors.

It doesn't matter. It is still a workplace, and there needs to be workplace safety protocols put into place, especially when you're talking about young developing athletes that maybe don't quite understand the full effects of where things can develop when they cross the line.

Q. Thank you for addressing that issue you just did,



both prior and now. I feel this is an awkward pivot back to tennis --

PAM SHRIVER: That's okay.

Q. I wanted to ask about the drop shot. It seems like we're seeing more use of it. Correct me if I'm wrong in any of these statements. Quite a beautiful use of it by Ons Jabeur and maybe Carlos. I'm sure your command is better than mine. But with an eye towards the French Open, can you speak about the drop shot, its merits as a tactic on clay in particular, and whether you like what you're seeing or not or are kind of indifferent to it?

PAM SHRIVER: I love what I'm seeing with the drop shot. I think it is a tactical response to what we sometimes see on both sides, but especially in the men's game, which are the athletes playing further and further back.

You see more and more return positions where literally the linesman at the back of the court -- if there is no electronic line calling, the linesmen also have to move to get out of the way of the backswing.

With that in mind and knowing how big stadium courts are, one of the antidotes to deal with it is to play the drop shot.

Now, Ons Jabeur, I think she has used it, and also during her win streak I felt like -- and in watching her play in Charleston where I was working for Tennis Channel, she actually got a lot more selective.

I felt like her winning percentage on the drop shot overall during her success was fantastic. Even doing it on return -- it's very unusual to see through the years drop shot returns, but if you play against an opponent who hits maybe a weak second serve, a lot of times they're backing up expecting the big power return, and it's just perfect.

I think it's been fascinating to see. In my era I could say Chris Evert had the best drop shot. Like if Bill Simon had asked who had the best drop shot in my era it would have been Chrissie Evert. And while she didn't have the power that pushed people back, she had amazing disguise.

So there's lots -- what I love is to see the spins, see the side spin. More players are playing it on huge points, like when Nadal fought off the two match points when he was playing Goffin in Madrid. And so people are being extraordinarily brave when they play it, because honestly at that point, given where their opponent is in the court, it's the right shot.

I think it's been a blast to see it come back, and it's brought

another dimension more frequently to the game.

Q. You're a player that made a Grand Slam final as a teenager. If you look at Alcaraz specifically, but also Coco Gauff, what's the biggest challenge for someone like him? He had the great run at the US Open. Aside from Novak and Rafa, what's the big challenge? And is there a fearlessness that, just to pick up what you said on the drop shot, the bravery that he has, hitting it in big spots or serve-and-volleying, stuff you wouldn't expect in a tough spot. Is there a fearlessness or a bravery that see in him that you had yourself when you made that run? And the second question is just are we more likely to see Serena or Roger Federer play tournament tennis this year?

PAM SHRIVER: Oh, two great questions. Let's tackle your second one first. What concerns me about Serena is through the years -- she's actually kept us occasionally informed with her workouts and playing tennis on her social media posts. Maybe I missed something, but I haven't seen anything that's really giving away that she's back on the tennis court.

By now, given it was a hamstring strain or slight tear or whatever happened at Wimbledon last year against Sasnovich, she should be back, so I'm really concerned there.

Whereas I feel like Roger is giving us some evidence of his progression towards a comeback. I believe right now we're more likely to see Roger back.

But if you were to say who would we be more likely to see back in a Grand Slam singles, I might pivot to Serena. I don't know about this year, but I think Roger is going to find three out of five sets really a challenge.

But I think he can rehab his knee and certainly go out more on his own terms than what happened at Wimbledon last year.

So I guess I would go with Roger.

As far as the fearlessness of Alcaraz, I think certainly when you are new and you don't have all eyes on you like I did in the '78 US Open when I got to the final at 16, it's easy to kind of sneak through and to play your best tennis.

But as far as Alcaraz, because of his great play the last few months, a lot of people -- before Novak won last weekend, a majority of people favored him to win Roland Garros.

But here is my concern: At 19, is he yet -- I know he's much stronger than he was 12 months ago or even at the

US Open, when he did run out of gas obviously in his run there. Is he yet ready physically and emotionally to play three out of five times seven matches and be the last one standing?

I think talent-wise for sure, but I just think in the men's game, clay courts, three out of five, the weather -- actually he should be playing on -- he'll probably play all his matches on Chatrier with the roof, so if there's bad weather he may not be affected. But until you prove it at a three-out-of-five format, there's still doubts.

But as far as his play this spring, it's been one of the great sights since we saw Nadal burst on to the scene.

If I can just add a couple more thoughts that I have going into this Roland Garros. Obviously at this time in tennis history we're dealing with some numbers that are unprecedented. When you think about 12 months ago, let's say 12 months ago right now, it was several days before Osaka made her announcement that she wasn't going to be going to press conferences because the press conferences were -- she didn't quite develop the thought fully, which was basically her mental health was struggling and the press conferences were contributing to --

Anyway, we've basically had 12 months of on-court and off-court news that's been unprecedented. I've never seen a 12 months like it, whether it was Novak Djokovic developing his run at the calendar year Grand Slam and becoming one match away from doing something that Laver hadn't done since '69.

We're talking about the whole issue of mental health in players and trying to stay healthy not just physically but especially with your mental health. Osaka helped step up that conversation, but it's been continued by Andreescu, it's been continued by some players on the men's side. It's an important topic.

What we saw develop with Raducanu coming out of qualifying, to win a major for the first time in tennis history, unprecedented. Rafa Nadal getting to 21, the Peng Shuai story that is so devastating still, to not know where a WTA player -- and maybe on her own terms she had decided to retire, but it's all to me unacceptable.

So that whole story.

And WTA pulling out of China and now the calendar has come out with tournaments well placed not in China. Good for the WTA.

Everything that went into the Australian Open with Novak's situation and what Australia tried to figure out with the

vaccines, and then that whole mess-up that messed Novak up, the tournament up, Australia up.

It was so unfortunate, yet once the first ball started we had an amazing tournament with Barty winning and Rafa getting to 21 and who could have imagined Barty would retire six weeks later.

It's just been a continual, like, news breaking, and then now with this unfortunate situation in a country that has so many promising players, especially on the women's side, Ukraine, going through just this war and tragic human situations of things that -- trauma that's just uncalled for.

And then Wimbledon stepping up with what they did, and you can come at it either way and whatever. But have we ever had 12 months like this?

I say not, and I think going into this Roland Garros it's just going to be more of the same. It's actually -- Roland Garros is going to be the only major of the first three played that will be at full strength.

Novak wasn't allowed, the No. 1's men player was not allowed to play the Australian Open, and then Wimbledon will be without as of now unless they change based on something significant good happening, like the war or a ceasefire ending, you're not going to have Wimbledon at full strength.

So we go into Roland Garros as the only one of the first three majors at full strength besides your normal injuries.

It's quite a time in tennis, and I look forward to being on the Tennis Channel team.

With that long monologue, did anyone else have a question?

Q. Two questions: The last two Australian Open women's draws had NCAA alums make the finals. This week the NCAA team tournament will conclude. I'm curious if you follow the collegiate game at all, and if you do, whether any specific players that stick out to you that might be able to break through within the next couple of years on tour.

PAM SHRIVER: Great question. First off, what Jen Brady did at the Australian Open almost a year and a half ago and then Danielle Collins five months ago, amazing.

And I hope to see Jen Brady back from her injury soon because it was really fun. Remember, she got to the semis, one of the greatest days of women's tennis, semifinal in majors in probably a decade or two was the

one where she lost to -- I think she lost to Osaka and then Azarenka beat Serena.

Anyway, yes, college tennis is contributing in both the men's and the women's side in a big way. I do not follow it enough. I tend to follow who wins the teams. I don't watch a lot of dual matches, although I know they're covered sometimes on Tennis Channel or some of the streaming services.

It would probably be a good idea for me to follow it more carefully, given the fact it's becoming more of a developmental pipeline for the pro tour.

Q. A lot of the top 100 WTA players on the doubles side come from a lot of different colleges and universities. Because you are a doubles legend, I'm curious on your thoughts on the current state of the WTA doubles and if there are any teams that in your eyes can break through at Roland Garros.

PAM SHRIVER: Well, I actually feel that the doubles specialists, the ones who are just really focusing on it, really have better chance at the majors. The Krejčíková situation with Siniakova is really unusual in the modern game, to have her come away last year with both titles.

Most of the time at the majors now, anyone who considers themselves a contender to do well in the singles, they really want to go all in. So any number of those teams that made the recent finals in Rome -- actually, I was really saddened to see the picture.

I didn't realize until I saw the social media posts that the women's doubles final was played at the same time as the men's singles final. That to me is just uncalled for, terrible programming. We could have a whole separate conference call on the scheduling of both Madrid and Rome, not to mention the prize money of Rome, but that's for a different time.

To answer your question, I think the teams that have been together the most who have won recently, come through in finals, look at the ones who have won the most match tiebreaks. Even though at the French Open they're going to play out the final set.

But look at the teams who have won. This is what Martina and I got on a roll with. We just won the pressure situations and we had so much confidence. Obviously we didn't specialize; we were playing both. But it's still the same philosophy. You get to know your teammate so well and you work as one in a way that helps in the pressure situations so that you have a lot of confidence in each other.

I think it could be any number of the teams that have done well recently.

Q. I wanted to ask Pam about bad behavior, broadly. In your era of playing, obviously there was Nastase and Connors and McEnroe kind of leading the fray of the bad behavior. My question was about some of the things we've seen the past year or two, the racquet smashing, the racquet flinging, whether at a net or a linesperson, bashing the umpire stand, the F-you to the fans. Do you view this recent bad behavior as kind of in the same vein as what we saw a couple decades ago, or do you view it differently, any more or less troubling? Any thoughts on the latitude that has been given some of these players?

PAM SHRIVER: Great question. And yes. I grew up in the era -- I guess I started in '78, which was -- that may have been the year -- the night match McEnroe against Nastase where Frank Hammond was taken out of the chair. I saw a lot of poor behavior, but it was also brought a lot of eyes to the sport.

But it was different than -- to me that behavior or the storms that happened during some of those matches was different than like the racquet of Zverev repeatedly hitting the chair umpire's chair within fractions of his leg hard. I'm trying to remember.

Like there was the bad-boy behavior -- McEnroe, we can remember him flinging his racquet and wiping a bunch of cups off a table in Sweden I think it was. Certainly you're the pits of the world. Chalk flew up, screaming at the top of his lungs on old court 1. His consequence was he didn't get a -- he got a consequence; he didn't get his Wimbledon membership for years and years based on his behavior.

Connors kind of knew how to walk a fine line most of the time. Like when he went across the net and wiped out that mark at the US Open in like '75, '76, that's one of the reasons they changed the rule. A player last week had some consequences because of that.

But I think there hasn't been serious enough consequences in some situations. I think swearing to a crowd is totally unacceptable, because that's who's providing your livelihood are the fans. I thought there should have been -- help me if I'm wrong, I hope he was given a code violation, but I wasn't on that match.

I reported on the situation, but it was unclear whether or not he got a code for that. I hope he did. Zverev should have been in my mind -- given other things going on, to me Zverev should have served a suspension. He should not

have been allowed to play Indian Wells or Miami.

To me it's different kinds of antics. It's a little more serious right now, the level of outbursts in it involving like a tennis racquet and yelling at crowds. There were some other ones.

I think we need to look at -- there's a few things our sport needs to look at. I think finding the right note for discipline, obviously safeguarding, looking at some other rule changes would just help the sport evolve in a better direction.

Q. I wanted to ask you, who are your American favorites at Roland Garros? We've had some strong performances on clay over the last few weeks. Pegula, like Anisimova; on the men's side, Opelka, Fritz. But there anyone in this current group that you think could have a good result?

PAM SHRIVER: Yes, I do think there are more Americans that have a better chance, say, to reach the second week of the French this year on the men's and women's combined. Maybe especially on the men's side.

I'm a little bit -- like Taylor Fritz, I feel like he's been dealing with a foot injury and he's trying to get himself ready for Roland Garros. Having an injury to a lower extremity and trying to get ready for the French is rough.

Opelka, maybe. Maybe. If he gets -- if the weather is hot enough and his serve is just jumping, absolutely.

As usual, I think the women still have a better chance to have a deeper run. I want to see -- let me finish on the men's side. I am curious on Korda. To me I felt like he played a tournament or two too much and he didn't look like to me full Seb Korda energy and enthusiasm.

It was almost like he was tired. I think he's taking this week off and I hope that serves him well. I want to see a little more spark from him, because I feel like he's somebody that if he's playing at his best can have a really good run at Roland Garros.

Pegula, based on Madrid, and also she followed up an exhausting run to the finals and doing well in doubles -- she played pretty well in Rome -- and Pegula is like no kidding, one tough out on the women's tour right now.

So I think she for sure can be second week.

If Swiatek does falter, she would be in the handful or more than a handful, two, three handfuls of players that might have a chance.

Anisimova, I'm pleased that she's gotten through a difficult March when the situation with Darren developed and she had to figure out again her coaching team. I feel like she's responded pretty well.

I am still concerned about how she is emotionally in the tightest moments. I just want to see a little more maturity and a little more perspective and not kind of the look of anxiety, almost panic sometimes when the going gets tough.

But as far as forehands and backhands and the way she hits the ball, yes. No clear-cut, no obvious ones. I think on grass you bring in people like Tiafoe. You can bring in some other players. Don't forget John Isner, the old veteran. He might be your best run also still on a clay court if he can just handle the three out of five well enough, because he's played really well there in the past.

It's exciting. It's exciting to have that many Americans with chances to win multiple matches at Roland Garros. We didn't have that for a long time.

Q. I wanted to ask you about Nadal. Considering his fitness issues, do you still feel like he's the favorite at Roland Garros? And if not, who are your men's favorites this year?

PAM SHRIVER: Yeah, I don't like what I saw in Rome. Given what happened last year midway -- really starting at Wimbledon and then him getting to D.C. and shutting it down in Washington, D.C., end of July, early August.

But then he played great -- who would have thought he would have won 21 in Melbourne. So I guess especially since he's won 13 of them you can't count him out, but I really didn't like what I saw in that Shapovalov match.

He's bringing his doctor with him to Paris so he's all in. He'll obviously probably do some more preventative pain stuff and manage it a little differently, because a Grand Slam -- three out of five is on the line.

But really it flipped for me when I saw Novak make the progress from Serbia -- from Belgrade to Madrid to Rome and the hunger and the fire he has coming out of what happened in Australia. He's become my slight favorite over Alcaraz until I know that Nadal is healthy.

Believe it or not, he's my slight third favorite, and then you've got probably Tsitsipas is fourth.

Q. I'm joking around here, but I see here there's an official rule that there cannot be a Tennis Channel

phone press conference without asking this question, which relates to the greatest of all time. If the tennis Gods say, okay, Pam, what are your thoughts on the GOAT on the women's side and also on the men's side, what are your thoughts at this point as it unfolds?

PAM SHRIVER: Well, if you're talking singles player since the open era began, it's Serena on the women's side. So in other words, careers that are played all in the open era, it's Serena. And probably I would say Serena in singles throughout history.

If I can do a category of all-around greatest, meaning singles, doubles, mixed, I would put Navratilova's record, singles, doubles, mixed up against anybody, and she would be my greatest all-around player.

On the men's side, because of the way things are currently poised, it's a harder question to answer correctly. But if you want me to dive into what I think is going to play out over the next four years, I think Novak Djokovic will be considered the greatest male singles player of all time.

We don't really have a similar Navratilova category on the men's side unless you go back to John McEnroe's five years. But Johnny Mac just didn't win enough singles majors to be -- when he dominated singles and doubles over that same five-year period, he would be in that all-around category.

But let's say Martina -- let's say Martina covers it for both men and women. (Laughing).

Q. And Djokovic just because of the range of his numbers and his head to heads and all surfaces --

PAM SHRIVER: All of that. All of that. The way he looks at his age now, the fact that he can win on any of the Grand Slam surfaces, his mental approach, his physical training. I think his training with flexibility, I think his mindset training, I think he's just going to end up having two to four more majors than Nadal.

I don't see with his head to heads, let's say -- now, here's the thing that could stop that. Alcaraz becoming the dominant player in the next -- what Nadal is hoping for and Federer is that Alcaraz improves in the next six months the way he's improved in the last six months.

Because if Alcaraz doesn't and it's more of what we've seen the last 10 years -- so I think Alcaraz is your wild card. He can affect tennis history more than anybody else because he can put a pause on a lot of these numbers.

ERIC ABNER: I just want to thank everybody else. Thank

you, Pam, thanks, Doug, thanks all you guys for joining us. Hope you enjoy watching the tournament this year on Tennis Channel.

FastScripts by ASAP Sports

