Marginal validation

For the marginal contributions, we consider only the bets on which a single factor made a difference. If we made a bet but would have not done so without the factor, we charge the opposite of the bet result the factor; if we did not make a bet but would have without the factor, we charge the result of that bet to the factor.

If you add up the marginal contributions of all five factors in all eleven seasons, you get 222, but there were only 108 wins net of losses over the period. The reason is that more than one factor can get credit for a win. If all five factors agree, none made a difference, and none get marginal credit. But if four factors agree and one disagreed; all four of the agreeing factors get marginal credit, because if any of them had switched to neutral, we would have have made the bet. On the other hand, if three agree, one disagrees and one is neutral, both the disagreeing and neutral factors get credit for preventing the bet (meaning we add the result of making the opposite bet to their total).

Looking over the table reveals some interesting things. The disaster of 2007 can be blamed primarily on the power indicator, if we had ignored it we would have had two more wins than losses, although we still would have lost money at full juice. But no indicator helped in that year. While individual factor performance was mediocre, the big problem in 2007 is the indicators were fighting each other.

After 2007, marginal performance was very good or great for four years. But 2012 was another poor year for marginals, with a weak profit of only 2 units and a sub-55% winning percentage. 2013 and 2015 were fine on a performance basis, but the marginals were weak. 2014 was a great year for both marginals and performance, but 2016 saw strong marginals and weak performance. Anyway, a real money bettor would have been all over these marginals starting in 2012.