# MAFL Funds : Season 2007 

## Where Statistics Meets Leather and Grass

In this Edition of
the newsletter:

- Results of wagers and tips for the Qualifying and Elimination Finals
- The Finals System
- Is the $3^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter crucial in Finals?


## Swans and Crows Bow Out



Sportsbet did a great job in handicapping the first two games of the weekend, with each being ultimately decided by less a goal. All this good work was undone though as, firstly, the underdog Pies beat Sydney by just over 6 goals, then the Cats racked up a cricket score against the Roos, comfortably covering the $24 \frac{1}{2}$ points start they were obliged to give (the $17^{\text {th }}$ time they've done that this season in the 21 games in which they've given start).
Quila and Chi both tipped the Port Adelaide and Pies victories, but erred in tipping the Crows and the Roos. All told then, Chi, Quila and BKB each wound up with 2 tips from 4. On Line Betting, Chi and Quila managed just 1 from 4.

- Six bets on 3
teams for 5 wins and 1
loss


## The Beta Fund Turns Profitable

Only a highly improbable Roos victory over the Cats could've improved the weekend for Investors. But that was clearly not going to happen after the Cats' 7 -goal second quarter blitz took them into the half-time break with a 45-point lead.
In the other games on which we had money riding, Port clung on to beat the Eagles by 3 points, having previously trailed at every change. In contrast, the Pies led at every change, but did suffer a second-quarter revival by the Swans before steadying and going on to win by 38 points.
Here's the detail:


So, small profits to Investors with Strategy A, B, C or E, a healthy 7\% profit for Strategy D Investors, and a small loss for those Investors employing Strategy C+.
Speaking of profitability - the Beta Fund has turned green for the first time this year, having recorded net profit in the last 4 rounds in which it's bet, and just under $261 / 2 \%$ RONF in the last two weeks alone. With the Line Fund also successful this weekend, this makes it the first time we've had all four Funds simultaneously profitable all season.

Here's the detail:


It also means that every Investor is now showing a positive return, as the following chart and table demonstrate:

Round by Round Return of Major Strategies
(all returns are as \% of Notional Initial Funds)


## Overall Fund Performance


*Recommended portfolio weightings

Maybe now the Funds will get a little quieter ...

## The Finals System

This weekend's results leave the Finals situation as shown below (the picture is courtesy of Wikipedia).


In saying farewell to the Swans and the Crows we bid adieu to the teams from positions 7 and 8 on the ladder, something that we've done in Week 1 of the Finals only twice before under the current system - way back in 2001 (when, coincidentally, it was the same two teams bowing out) and then again in 2002.
Looking at all four of the games in Week 1 of the Finals, we see that teams finishing $2^{\text {nd }}$ have beaten those finishing 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ in 7 of the eight years we've been under the current system. Teams finishing $6^{\text {th }}$ have the same record in playing those finishing $7^{\text {th }}$. Teams finishing $8^{\text {th }}$ have won 5 of the eight encounters with teams finishing $5^{\text {th }}$ (though no such luck for the Crows this year) and, finally, teams finishing $1^{\text {st }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ are now 4 -all in their Week 1 encounters.


Next week we have $4^{\text {th }}$ playing $5^{\text {th }}$, a matchup that's occurred only once before under the current Finals method - in 2001 when $4^{\text {th }}$-placed Richmond beat $5^{\text {th }}$-placed Carlton in the first Semi-Final.
In the other Semi-Final, we have $3^{\text {rd }}$ playing $6^{\text {th }}$, a matchup that's occurred three times before, all in the Semi-Finals, firstly when $6^{\text {th }}$-placed Hawthorn beat $3^{\text {rd }}$-placed Port Adelaide in 2001, then when 3rd_placed St Kilda beat $6^{\text {th }}$-placed Sydney in 2004, and finally when 3rd-placed Sydney beat 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$-placed Geelong in 2005 (before going on to win the Flag). We're also now down to just nine possible Grand Finals matchups - the Roos, Hawks or Port versus the Pies, Eagles or Cats. Amongst the Grand Finals that are no longer possible are a surprising number that were short-priced before the weekend started, as evidenced by the number of green crossed-out cells in the table below.

> GF Quinellas - What's Left, What's Gone

|  | Geelong | Port Adelaide | West Coast | Kangaroos | Hawthorn | Collingwood | Sydney | Adelaide |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Geelong |  | S8.50. | 53:80. | 510,00 | sl800 | \$2400. | \$2900 | \$8:00. |
| Port Adelaide | S850 |  | 59,00 | \$30:00 | 540:00. | \$40.00 | 52400 | 528000 |
| West Coast | \$3:80 | \$9.00 |  | \$33.00 | \$45.00 | \$45:00. | \$2700 | 520:00 |
| Kangaroos | \$10.00 | \$30.00 | \$33.00 |  | S350:00 | \$150.00 | \$75:60. | S105:00 |
| Hawthorn | S13, 000 | \$40:00.. | \$45.00 | \$450:00 |  | \$200.00 | S30500 |  |
| Collingwood | \$24.00 | \$40.00 | 545000 | \$150.00 | \$200.00 |  |  | S140:00 |
| Sydney | \$15:00 | \$24.00 | \$17.00. | \$75.00 | S105:00. |  |  | \$4400 |
| Adelaide | \$8:00 | \$28000. | S20000. | 5305:00 |  | 5\%40:00 | 544:00. |  |

(Four of our five 'value' quinellas are still alive - only the Hawthorn v Roos matchup is no longer possible. More about this on Thursday when the new market will be available.)

## Is the $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Quarter Crucial in Finals?

You'll recall how important winning the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter was in terms of winning regular season games. Well, you might ask, is that true of the Finals too?
The following table gives the details:
How Winning Finalists Have Performed in each Quarter
(Finals Series 2000-2006)

|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Outscores opponent in quarter | 68\% | 70\% | 67\% | 78\% |
| Scores the same as opponent in quarter | 5\% | $3 \%$ | 5\% | 2\% |
| Is Outscored by opponent in quarter | 27\% | 27\% | 29\% | 21\% |
| Winning Team ... |  |  |  |  |
|  | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 |  |
| Leads at end of quarter | 68\% | 78\% | 81\% |  |
| Is Tied at end of quarter | 5\% | 2\% | 0\% |  |
| Trails at end of quarter | 27\% | 21\% | 19\% |  |

So, for example, over the 63 Finals games played in the 7 seasons 2000 to 2006, the winning team has outscored its opponents in the $1^{\text {st }}$ quarter $68 \%$ of the time.
It turns out then that leading at the end of any quarter is important, with over two-thirds of eventual winners leading at the quarter-time break, and around four-fifths leading at half time or three-quarter time.
Further, it's the $4^{\text {th }}$ quarter that seems to be the key to victory in the Finals, with almost four-fifths of finals winners winning the final term.
The importance of the $4^{\text {th }}$ quarter was underscored this weekend where the eventual victors all won the final term, despite winning only two of the four $1^{\text {st }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarters and three of four $2^{\text {nd }}$ quarters.

Leading at the major breaks was not quite as important, however, with eventual victors leading in only two of the games at quarter time, two of the games at half-time and two of the games at three-quarter time.

It's interesting to compare the table for the Finals with that for the 2007 regular season


Note that, in the regular season, leading at three-quarter time led to victory almost 9 times in 10; in Finals the figure is just over 8 times in 10. Also, about three-quarters of regular season winners won their 3 rd quarter and only two-thirds won the final term; in finals the figures are, roughly, reversed.
I guess the logic behind this is that teams in Finals tend to be more evenly matched, so games are more likely to be decided in the final term, not the $3^{\text {rd }}$ quarter.
*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*~*
'til Thursday,

Tony
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