

## **SMARTsig magazine 2.2 - February 1995**

### **In this months issue . . .**

<b>2</b>	<b>Upfront</b>	Club news and views
<b>5</b>	<b>Computer Challenge</b>	A full analysis of the state of play after the first four weeks.
<b>11</b>	<b>Solid Foundations for Success II</b>	Iain W Simpson
<b>18</b>	<b>Book Review</b>	Graham Kendall
<b>22</b>	<b>Sixteen Winners in a Row!</b>	Hugh L Tebbett
<b>24</b>	<b>General Topics I</b>	Ray Webster
<b>26</b>	<b>Starting Price Survey</b>	John Main
<b>31</b>	<b>The VDW Approach</b>	Bill Priest
<b>33</b>	<b>General Topics II</b>	John Wildman
<b>36</b>	<b>Kelly &amp; Oscar Staking</b>	Bernard Rasmussen
<b>39</b>	<b>Calculating the Value</b>	Edward Walker
<b>40</b>	<b>Following Handicappers</b>	Alan Coldrick
<b>44</b>	<b>Comparing Different Systems</b>	John Main
<b>46</b>	<b>Comparing Race Courses</b>	John D Little
<b>47</b>	<b>General Topics III</b>	Graham Kendall
<b>49</b>	<b>Can I Give Up the Day Job Yet?</b>	Robin Faichney
<b>51</b>	<b>Choosing the Right Race</b>	Jim Streek
<b>52</b>	<b>SMARTsig SWAP SHOP</b>	Plenty on offer this month!
<b>54</b>	<b>Help Wanted</b>	Can you help another member?
<b>55</b>	<b>Books, Publications &amp; Computer Data</b>	
<b>56</b>	<b>Helping Hands</b>	Help offered to members
<b>57</b>	<b>SMARTsig Merit Table</b>	
<b>58</b>	<b>2.2 Correct Score System Update</b>	3rd successive winning month!
<b>59</b>	<b>News From Raceform, Form Book on Disk</b>	
<b>59</b>	<b>Brain Teaser</b>	Are you a logical thinker?

# SMART

## Up Front

**A** marvellous atmosphere has been established within the group during our first few months, and it's all thanks to you, the SMARTsig members. The majority of telephone calls and letters I receive have nothing but praise for the way things are going, many of you tell me that it is not like reading a magazine at all, it's more like a friendly and interesting letter from someone you know well and look forward to hearing from. Many tell me of their excitement when it drops through the letter box, or of the disappointment if it arrives a few days later than expected! Of course I also hear from members with suggestions for improvements and each one is given full consideration, in fact a couple of changes have been implemented this issue.

The first of these is that existing members will have noticed that the format of the address label has changed. The old format used to declare  
member    xxxx  
expires    01/01/95 (or whatever is the date of your final magazine)

A SMARTie contact me to say that his postman had offered his condolences to his wife (tongue in cheek, I hope), because by reading the address labels on the SMART envelopes he had learned of her husbands expected demise on the 1st of January!!

The very thing that brings us all together here is the prediction of forthcoming events, - have I unwittingly signed a death warrant for you all? So, if only to keep on the right side of that Lady we call luck, and not to tempt providence, the label has been changed to show  
Member    xxxx    until 01/01/95 (the date of your last magazine)

I can only hope I have acted in time to save you all!

That reminds me of an enquiry for details I received in the early days of SMART, from someone who had been stung on previous occasions with the old "send me your cheque" routine. He asked what assurances I could give on my honesty. I replied to the effect that his money was as safe as it could

be, but it would be difficult for me to guarantee that I wouldn't be hit by a bus, in which case I hoped his sympathy would be with my wife, rather than his monetary loss.

His answer was that he would have every sympathy with her, - as long as she continued sending the magazine! All heart some people.

The size and format of the contents page has been reduced at a members request, and I am reducing the print size and layout of the "classifieds" section at the rear of the mag. The centre tear-out subscription form has also been dropped. All this allows for the maximum amount of letters and articles to be included through the main pages. I hope it meets with your approval.

### **Smart Badges**

Our Smart lapel badge/ tie pin will be available by the middle of February, they will be sent out free to all members who re-subscribe for a second year. If you can't wait and want one earlier than that, the cost is £1.50, it will be included with your next issue of the magazine. It is approximately the size of the sweet with the same name, in orange enamel, with a letter "S" in gold. I know of at least one member who will be wearing his with pride at Cheltenham. He hoped that indulging in "spot the SMARTie" would be preferable to his usual "spot the loony". All I hope is that after "meeting the SMARTie" he will not want to return to his former pastime.

It is a clutch pin fastening (ask a lady), i.e. a 1/4 inch pin with a butterfly push on clip. It will be okay on a lightweight jacket, shirt, tie, or hat etc. but no good for a heavyweights such as tweed. (As a tie pin by the way, the tip of the 1/4 inch pin which protrudes the butterfly actually points toward your chest, so if you do meet a SMARTie don't slap him on the chest as a greeting)

***footnote - It would seem that if I can't get you with the death wish on the address label, I'll do for you all with a spike through the chest.***

Jacques Black very kindly contacted me only days after getting his January magazine, professional commitments will prevent him from giving an immediate reply to the query from The Apothecary in that issue. I'm sure we'll all look forward to Jacques' reply when time permits.

Of all the members who responded to last months "Surfin the 'Net" article, the reaction of most of you was that it was interesting to see what goes on elsewhere. However, you were almost unanimous in declaring - what a load

of rubbish. I remarked at the time that they were “extracts” from almost 1000 postings, what I didn’t tell you was, that they were the very best bits. Use your imagination to get a picture of what the rest of it was like! A fellow SMARTie contacted me by email quite recently and has kindly offered to explore Internet a little more on behalf of the group. I wish him good hunting and will report through these pages, if, and only if, there is anything worth printing.

Delphi Internet, the Internet connection I use, have given me my own electronic forum. It will be known as “Strategic Betting” and run on similar lines to the Gambling forum from last month, although restricted to Delphi subscribers only. It’s rather like a meeting room, where any other Delphi subscribers can drop in (using their computer), read the messages to see what is going on, then leave messages of their own if they wish. Having the editorial control of this forum I hope I can steer it away from the anorak brigade.

Non computer users need not worry, it’s merely a promotional move on my part, I feel it is to the groups benefit as a whole to do all we can to attract new, quality, members. Thus ensuring our future with additional subscriptions and maintaining our high standard of discussion. If the forum proves popular be assured that all interesting material will be relayed through your magazine, non subscribers will miss nothing that is worthwhile. I’ll keep you posted.

The first results of the computer challenge are reported this issue (opposite) following a month of snow, slush and sloppy going. One of the competitors with a program called ‘The Sword’ (just about ready to hit the market) is Alan Knight. In correspondence with Alan it appears that a related paper based system of his, with a similar name has been around for some two years or so, I must admit to not having heard of it before. Alan has offered the system to SMARTsig members at a discounted price of £17.50, however it has always been our principle here to avoid becoming a platform for the sale of commercial systems. Especially where we have little idea of the method employed by such a system. To this end Alan will be sending a copy through to me and I will be using our network of members to have the system appraised independently. More information will be available about the system in our March issue, with the impartial review published as soon as is possible. One of the other computer competitors has asked for a review of his program. Again, an independent and impartial review will be carried out by one of our PC owning members for publication.

- Stef



# SMARTsig COMPUTER CHALLENGE

**M**ore than twenty invitations were sent out to all the horse racing computer names that I could find. Of all those offered the chance to compete, ten have shown their mettle and accepted the challenge. Two contacted me to decline the invitation, but the others did not even have the courtesy to reply. This was despite the fact that most had at least three invitations and a late reminder.

The event, as you will be aware, is Saturdays only. Not a restriction any of us would wish to be shackled with if our intention was to make a profit, especially with what our weather can throw at us at this time of year. This fact I think is important for us all to bear in mind when viewing the results. I, for one, do not strike any horse racing bets when going conditions are at either extreme.

Our competition offers no such luxury to the Computer Challenge players. It does however give all the competitors an even chance with one another on a level playing field. Couple this fact with level stake, win only betting and this must be the most significant appraisal ever conducted with this type of software. I also think we should all give full credit to all the competitors for having the “bottle” to be examined in this way. Late refinement of the competition rules state that monthly awards will only be given if a minimum of six selections have run during that month. The overall award is based on a minimum of twenty selections over the whole competition, and all must give a minimum of one selection per month.

The very first month of our competition has now been completed, all the results are laid out below. Only one competitor managed to make a profit, but failed to give the minimum of six selections, so we have no award winners for month one.

## RESULTS for JAN 1995 SMART Computer Challenge

DATE	SELECTIONS	RESULT	ODDS	STAKES	RETURNS
<b>HORSE SENSE - 0772 745193</b>					
07-Jan-95	Katiniyd	R		£11	£0.00
	Aal El Aal	L		£11	£0.00
14-Jan-95	Martha's Son	W	3 / 1	£11	£40.00
21-Jan-95	Bibendum	W	7 / 2	£11	£45.00
28-Jan-95	Saint Ciel	L		£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£55.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£85.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	55%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	155%

---

**GENESIS - 66 New Lane, Laisterdyke, Bradford, Yorks, BD3 1LR**

07-Jan-95	Captain Dibble	L		£11	£0.00
	Mr Boston	3	9 / 2	£11	£0.00
	Willsford	W	7 / 2	£11	£45.00
	Vicompt De Valmont	2	100 / 30	£11	£0.00
14-Jan-95	Bluff Knoll	3	100 / 30	£11	£0.00
	Masnun	L		£11	£0.00
	Evangelica	L		£11	£0.00
	Encoe En Peu	L		£11	£0.00
	Viking Flagship	L		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Monsieur Le Cure	L		£11	£0.00
	Country Lad	L		£11	£0.00
	Repeat The Dose	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Smiths Band	W	7 / 2	£11	£45.00
	Barnie Rubble	W	5 / 1	£11	£60.00
	The Lorryman	L		£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£165.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£150.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-9%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	91%

---

**MICROSTAR COURSEMASTER- 0257 276800**

07-Jan-95	Around The Horn	W	11 / 8	£11	£23.75
	Anzum	W	4 / 9	£11	£14.44
	Suny Bay	W	11 / 10	£11	£21.00
	Birthplace	2	15 / 8	£11	£0.00
	Positive Action	3	5 / 4	£11	£0.00
14-Jan-95	All of the Aces	W	1 / 1	£11	£20.00
	Morgans Harbour	W	21 / 20	£11	£20.50
	Strong Deel	F		£11	£0.00
	Inchcailloch	2	7 / 4	£11	£0.00
	Marthas Son	W	3 / 1	£11	£40.00
21-Jan-95	Relkeel	W	4 / 6	£11	£16.67
	High Baron	W	1 / 2	£11	£15.00
	Raymylette	L		£11	£0.00

	Scotton Banks	L		£11	£0.00
	Pims Gunner	3	100 / 30	£11	£0.00
	Trying Again	W	4 / 5	£11	£18.00
	Seagull Hollow	2	2 / 1	£11	£0.00
	Spree Cross	2	15 / 8	£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Weaver George	L		£11	£0.00
	Flakey Dove	L		£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£220.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£189.36
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-14%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	86%

---

**THE SWORD - 0253 698843**

07-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
14-Jan-95	Crystal Spirit	W	4 / 1	£11	£50.00
	Viking Flagship	L		£11	£0.00
	Inchcailloch	2	7 / 4	£11	£0.00
	Bluff Knoll	3	100 / 30	£11	£0.00
	Mere Class	L		£11	£0.00
	Encore En Peu	L		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
28-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£66.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£50.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-24%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	76%

---

**BRED - 0932 779393**

07-Jan-95	Surrey Dancer	3	13 / 8	£11	£0.00
	My Rossini	W	4 / 1	£11	£50.00
14-Jan-95	Who Is Equinane	L		£11	£0.00
	Night Wind	L		£11	£0.00
	Durham Sunset	L		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Manetta	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	No Bet			0	

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£66.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£50.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-24%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	76%

---

**BETTING MANAGER - 081 6898875**

07-Jan-95	No Bet			0	
14-Jan-95	Airshot	L		£11	£0.00
	Viking Flagship	L		£11	£0.00
	Morgans Harbour	W	21 / 20	£11	£20.50
	Strong Deel	L		£11	£0.00
	Kingsfold Pet	L		£11	£0.00
	Encore En Peu	L		£11	£0.00
	Don't Tell The Wife	W	3 / 1	£11	£40.00
21-Jan-95	Pims Gunner	3	100 / 30	£11	£0.00
	Seagull Hollow	2	2 / 1	£11	£0.00
	Red Valerian	2	4 / 1	£11	£0.00
	In Truth	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Master Boston	L		£11	£0.00
	Clifton Beat	2	3 / 1	£11	£0.00
	Well Briefed	L		£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£154.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£60.50
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-61%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	39%

---

**PUNTERS REVENGE v2 - Unit 11, Oakfield Ave, Hitchin, SG4 9JB**

07-Jan-95	Dubacilla	L		£11	£0.00
	Positive Action	3	5 / 4	£11	£0.00
	Aal El Aal	L		£11	£0.00
14-Jan-95	Fuzzy Logic	L		£11	£0.00
	Viking Flagship	L		£11	£0.00
	Rodeo Star	L		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Trying Again	W	4 / 5	£11	£18.00
	Lady Pui	L		£11	£0.00
	Merrie Le Bow	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Ninfa	3	2 / 1	£11	£0.00
	Soldiers Leap	L		£11	£0.00
	Hebridean	L		£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£132.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£18.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-86%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	14%



---

**TIPSTER 4 WINDOWS - 0395 567073**

07-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
14-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
21-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Awesome Power	3	8 / 13	£11	£0.00
	Eastern Oasis	L		£11	£0.00
<b>TO DATE</b>		<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>		£22.00	
		<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>		£0.00	
		<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>		-100%	
		<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>		0%	

---

**DGA PRO-PUNTER - 061 3300184**

07-Jan-95	No Bet			0	
14-Jan-95	Egypt Mill Prince	2	10 / 1	£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Scotton Banks	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Dubacilla	2	4 / 1	£11	£0.00
	Flakey Dove	L		£11	£0.00
	Beech Road	3	9 / 2	£11	£0.00
<b>TO DATE</b>		<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>		£55.00	
		<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>		£0.00	
		<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>		-100%	
		<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>		0%	

---

**ESP ORACLE - 0702 600557**

07-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
14-Jan-95	No Bet			0	£0.00
21-Jan-95	In Truth	L		£11	£0.00
	Pims Gunner	3		£11	£0.00
	Scotton Banks	L		£11	£0.00
	Givus A Call	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Master Boston	L		£11	£0.00
	Hebridean	L		£11	£0.00
	Weaver George	L		£11	£0.00
	Ninfa	3	2 / 1	£11	£0.00
	No Pattern	2	7 / 2	£11	£0.00
<b>TO DATE</b>		<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>		£99.00	
		<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>		£0.00	
		<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>		-100%	
		<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>		0%	

**PRICEWISE - RACING POST**

07-Jan-95	Khatir	L		£11	£0.00
	Vicompt De Valmon	2		£11	£0.00
14-Jan-95	Diplomatic	L		£11	£0.00
	Deep Sensation	L		£11	£0.00
	Mere Class	L		£11	£0.00
	Nick The Beak	L		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Monsieur Le Cure	L		£11	£0.00
28-Jan-95	Beachy Head	L		£11	£0.00
	Barney Rubble	W	5 / 1	£11	£60.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£99.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£60.00
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-39%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	61%

**TWO MOST POPULAR NEWSPAPER SELECTIONS of the Day**

07-Jan-95	Anzum	W	4 / 9	£11	£14.44
	Suny Bay	W	11 / 10	£11	£21.00
14-Jan-95	Brownhall	L		£11	£0.00
	Oatis Regrets	3		£11	£0.00
21-Jan-95	Givus A Call	L		£11	£0.00
	High Baron	W	1 / 2	£11	£15.00
28-Jan-95	Ultra Beet	W	4 / 6	£11	£16.67
	Awesome Power	3	8 / 13	£11	£0.00
	Ebullient Equiname	3	5 / 4	£11	£0.00

<b>TO DATE</b>	<b>TOTAL STAKES:</b>	£99.00
	<b>TOTAL RETURNS:</b>	£67.11
	<b>%PROFIT or LOSS:</b>	-32%
	<b>RETURN AS % OF STAKE:</b>	68%

At the suggestion of Ion Mills, the final two entries of Pricewise and most popular newspaper selections were added as “control” elements. These particular two were chosen for convenience rather than any other reason.

They do allow a comparison to be made on how the more traditional tipsters fared over the same period. If the conditions or circumstances of a particular month are not conclusive to accurate selection, then the “control” elements should echo the fact.

***In this the second part of his article, one member gives us the benefit of his own experience in moving up from gambler to investor***

## **SOLID FOUNDATIONS FOR SUCCESS (part I)**

***Iain W Simpson***

**L**ast month I gave you the first seven of my own personal rules to follow, as a strategy to help others to profit from their betting. The first six were discussed in detail and to recap, they were;

- ***1) learn about the real mechanics of betting.***
- ***2) Read as much as you can about all aspects of betting.***
- ***3) Don't jump straight in to reality.....be patient.***
- ***4) Set aside a betting bank and keep accurate detailed records of all bets made.***
- ***5) Apply for a Switch or Delta card from your Bank or Building Society.***
- ***6) Build a library of information and statistics on your chosen areas of betting.***

Rule seven was mentioned as food for thought, without my thoughts as to how it is used. To continue therefore.

- ***7) Draw up your own personal odds line (P.O.L.)***

This need not mean devising some magical formula, which after gathering together a few figures ( speed figures, handicap ratings, etc.), will enable you to jiggle those numbers around and produce an astoundingly accurate odds line ( although this would be the ideal solution ).

The method I use involves taking two runners at a time from a race, and deciding how the figure of 100 should be split between them in order to reflect what you consider to be their relative chances of winning a theoretical race in which only the two runners in question take part. After assessing the first pair of horses it does get a bit more complicated. Let's

look at a fictitious four horse race by way of an example. The runners are as follows,

1. Godfather
2. Unforgiven
3. Philadelphia
4. Lion King

After studying the form and any statistics you consider to be relevant for all four runners, you decide that in your estimation (given today's race conditions) Godfather is the best horse in the race, with Unforgiven coming a close second (this in no way reflects any personal preference for the real life films!).

Next you have to consider the probable outcomes of 100 theoretical races run between Godfather and Unforgiven (based on your own personal assessment of each horse's ability). Each one of these races will occur under conditions identical to those of today's race. The trick is to initially consider only ten races, so let's say that after careful deliberation, you think that Godfather will win between 5 and 6 of the ten races. It is at this point that you should swap to thinking in terms of 100 races, in order to increase the accuracy of your estimate. You decided on between 5 and 6 races, so now you can think in terms of between 50 and 60. Finally you settle for 54 races won out of a possible 100, this leaves 46 to be won by Unforgiven.

Many of you will be thinking, how on earth could you possibly arrive at a figure like 54? Well after thinking in terms of percentages for a long period of time, you'd be amazed just how accurate you are able to access your own personal views. The key is initially to think in terms of winners out of ten (5, 6, 7, etc), then quickly convert to tens (50, 60, 70, etc), then in terms of half-way between the lower and the higher (55, 65, etc),(this is probably as accurate as you should attempt to get in the first couple of weeks), when you gain confidence you can start to think in terms of half-way between those halves (i.e. half way between 55 and 60, which is 57.5).

The ability to decide on such a figure may be enhanced by thinking in terms of splits. This means that instead of just trying to think how many races Godfather will win, you should be considering both Godfather and Unforgiven at the same time (if you're not confused now, you never will be). This is achieved by initially thinking in terms of Godfather and Unforgiven being "fifty, fifty" ( i.e. equal ), but remember, you think Godfather is superior, so try "sixty, forty" (in favour of Godfather), but you think that is a

bit too much, so you try "fifty-five, forty-five" (in favour of Godfather). This level of accuracy would be more than enough to start off with, but when you have been practising the method for a short period of time, you will find yourself attempting to achieve more and more accurate representations of your true feelings regarding the relative merits of each runner. In our present example we eventually settled for a split of "fifty-four, forty-six" (in favour of Godfather).

You should now understand how it is possible to arrive at a figure like 57.5 races. It is actually a case of being unable to decide between "fifty-five, forty-five" and "sixty, forty", thus you move to the next degree of accuracy between 55 and 60, i.e. 57.5.

So far we have rated two of the four runners in our example race,

Godfather	54
Unforgiven	46

Now we move on to rate Lion King. After our study of the form we know that Unforgiven beat Lion King by 3.5 lengths over today's distance 23 days ago. Using this information, we decide on a rating of between "sixty-five, thirty-five" (in favour of Unforgiven) and "seventy, thirty" (in favour of Unforgiven), and we eventually settle for a rating of 67.5 for Unforgiven (leaving Lion King with a rating of  $100 - 67.5 = 32.5$ ). This is where a problem arises, because Unforgiven already has a rating of 46, but now we want to 'tag' him with a rating of 67.5. Clearly we cannot do this, without ruining the relative assessment of Unforgiven and Godfather.

In order to sort out this problem, you must first understand exactly what we presently have. We have two sets of ratings,

- |                             |                         |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Godfather/Unforgiven and | 2. Unforgiven/Lion King |
| 54/46                       | 67.5/32.5               |

To solve the problem, take the Unforgiven rating from 1. (46) and divide it by the Unforgiven rating from 2. (67.5), this gives the answer 0.681481482 (this figure is the number by which we must multiply Unforgiven's 2nd rating in order to bring it into line with his master rating of 46, thus if we also multiply Lion Kings rating of 32.5 by this same number we will also be bringing him to the same base as both Unforgiven and Godfather).

Take this answer and multiply it by the rating given to Lion King in 2. (32.5), thus  $0.681481482 * 32.5$ , this will give you 22.148. Thus Lion King's rating is 22.15. So we now have,

Godfather	54
Unforgiven	46
Lion King	22.15

Lastly we have to rate Philadelphia. Lion King seems to have similar levels of form to Philadelphia but you consider that Philadelphia is not likely to be suited by today's prevailing ground conditions, so you give Lion King the slight edge. After consideration you decide on a split of 52/48 in favour of Lion King. To bring this last set of ratings into line with the base ratings, divide 22.15 (Lion King's base rating) by 52 (Lion King's rating relative to Philadelphia), this gives an answer of 0.425961539, then multiply Philadelphia's rating of 48 by this figure, making  $0.425961539 * 48 = 20.446$ . Every runner in the race has now been rated.

Once you have settled on a 'split' for a particular pair of horses, you can double check this split, to see if it really does accurately represent your feelings about the relative levels of ability of the two animals. This is achieved by thinking about the same problem in a slightly different manner. There are two ways of doing this.

Firstly by considering how many races you think the inferior horse will have won by the time the superior horse of the pair has recorded ten wins. If we resort back to the first pair in our earlier example, say we think that in the time it takes Godfather to win ten races, unforgiven will have managed to record 9 wins. The total number of races that have been run=19, thus we divide Godfather's 10 by 19 and get a 'double check' rating of 0.5263. Multiply this figure by 100 to get a percentage, and as you can see it compares favourably with our original rating of 54.

The second method involves taking a number of race wins (it's best to use an odd number), like 17, 19, 21, or 23 and splitting the wins between the two horses until you are satisfied that the split approximately represents your thoughts on the two horses abilities. Let's this time take Godfather and Philadelphia (who were not previously compared directly as a pair). We will try a split of 19 races, and after a bit of thought settle for 14.5/4.5 in favour of Godfather. In order to get the rating we divide 14.5 by 19 (the total number of races considered) to get a split of 76.3% (Godfather) and thus 23.7% (Philadelphia). In the final set of ratings Godfather was rated 54 and Philadelphia 20.45. That represented a split of 72.53% for Godfather, which compares fairly closely with our 'double check' rating. Only when a set of 'double check' ratings differ by a fairly large margin should you consider changing your set of master ratings. They are only there to force you to think

about the same problem in a slightly different way and check that you reach approximately the same conclusions.

Returning to our example, we must now re-calculate our ratings to represent a 100% betting book. To achieve this, add together the ratings of each runner, then divide each rating by the total.

Godfather	54	54/142.6	= 0.37868	1.64-1
Unforgiven	46	46/142.6	= 0.32258	2.10-1
Lion King	22.15	22.15/142.6	= 0.15533	5.44-1
Philadelphia	20.45	20.45/142.6	= 0.14341	5.97-1
142.60		1.00000		

It is very important to recognise that the odds shown on the right hand side do not represent the odds at which you should bet, they merely reflect your assessment of the win chances of each horse. If for instance you are betting off-course, then the probabilities (the second column of numbers in from the right hand side) should be divided by 1.1 to account for tax, before converting them to odds. But most important of all is that the odds (even after taking tax into account) do not allow for any profit margin.

For example, say you accurately assess a certain type of bet to have a win probability of 0.35, and that bet consequently wins 35 of it's next 100 occurrences. If you had bet 100 \* 1.1 units (1 unit + 10% tax) at odds of 2.142857-1 (the odds indicated by your assessed probability divided by 1.1), then you would only win 110 units, which represents zero profit.

Therefore as well as taking any tax you may be liable to pay on your bets into account, you must also decide on a minimum acceptable profit margin and build this into your probabilities, prior to converting them to odds. Paying 10% tax and aiming for a minimum 20% profit on turnover \*\*\*, the calculation for minimum acceptable odds on Godfather would be:

$$0.37868 / ((1*1.1)+(2*1.1)) = 0.37868/1.32 = 0.2868788 = 2.4858-1$$

[win prob.] [tax] [profit]

\*\*\* 20% profit on total outlay (remember tax is part of outlay)

A betting book totalling 100% (or 1.000), should always be calculated even though you will not directly use it to ascertain whether a bet represents value

at the available odds (the prices in the 100% book represent your assessment of the win probabilities, however these probabilities have to be changed to represent prices which will in the long term, assuming your probabilities are correct, provide you with your required profit level).

Since it is the probabilities in this 100% book which represent your assessments of the 'true' winning chances of each runner, it is those probabilities that should be recorded for every runner in every race you analyse, along with the finishing position of the first three home (or you could record the finishing position for every 'in the money' finisher, as the jockeys on these runners should still be trying their hardest to achieve the best possible finishing position). This data can later be used to assess the average accuracy of your probability assessments.

***“Do not judge your form-study skills by the number of winners you pick, instead rate them on you ability to accurately assess true win probabilities”***

In order to carry out any accurate research, it will be necessary to accumulate large amounts of this 'price' data (there is no use in trying to assess your accuracy in spotting 'true' 5-1 chances if you have only ever rated 30 or 40 runners as having win probabilities of .1666, there simply is not enough data to reach an accurate conclusion).

However if only 12 of the 80 runners you have rated as having win probabilities of 0.4 (6- 4) have won, then you can be pretty sure that you are over-estimating the win probabilities of you 'favoured contenders'. In the early stages when data is scarce you may like to try bunching several of you contenders together (starting with your most favoured runner and working towards the lowest probability), until you have a group of runners which together represent as close to a total win probability of 0.5 (50%) as you can get. If using this method, you find that after recording the statistics for say 20 races, that your '50% groups' have only contained the winner on 6 occasions, you should go back and study these races again, questioning your reasoning.

Do not judge your form-study skills by the number of winners you pick, instead rate them on you ability to accurately assess true win probabilities. When using the above method to rate a race, you need only rate the runners you consider to have a fairly good chance of winning, the remainder of the runners can be grouped together to represent the 'field'. It is then necessary



to estimate how many races out of 100, will be won by your selected 'contenders'. If in our example race, the four runners actually represented our four 'contenders' from a total field of seven runners, we may have estimated that our contenders would win about 8 races out of 10. Thus we would have to re-calculate our prices as follows,

Godfather	54	54/178.25	= 0.30295	2.30-1
Unforgiven	46	46/178.25	= 0.25806	2.88-1
Lion King	22.15	22.15/178.25	= 0.12426	7.05-1
<u>Philadelphia</u>	<u>20.45</u>	<u>20.45/178.25</u>	<u>= 0.11473</u>	<u>7.72-1</u>
	142.60		0.80000	

$$(142.6 / 80[\text{the \% that our contenders represent}]) * 100 = 178.25$$

*the above calculation gives us the figure which we must divide each of our ratings by to get a 'book' representing 80% of the total 1.00. Remember we now think that our contenders will account for the winner of the race only 8 times out of 10, the remaining 2 being won by one of the 3 'field' horses.*

The field can be assessed more accurately by giving each 'field runner' a very approximate percentage chance. Say you think a particular race would have to be run about 15 or 20 times in order for the horse you are considering to be able to record one win. You would give this horse a figure of 5.7 (this is derived from  $100 / ((15+20)/2)$ ). When you have rated all the 'field' horses in this way, add all the ratings together and round down to the nearest 5 (e.g. a total 'field figure' of 23.85, would be rounded down to 20, which is exactly the same as the example given for the simpler method. That is field=20% and contenders=80%). Then re-calculate the ratings as shown in the previous example, so that your contenders now represent 80% of the 100% betting book.

- **8) Buy yourself a basic scientific calculator**

Unless you have a computer for a brain, you'll need one. The reasons should be quite apparent by now. You will not need a scientific one initially, but when you get into some areas of betting it becomes an essential tool.

***(Regarding this very subject, I recently bought a scientific, programmable calculator from Index. The Sharp EL-5020 @ £14.99, extremely good value. Easy to program too, even for a beginner, and can be a real time saver if there's a particular calculation you perform regularly - Stef)***

(A) = American book

(contact Gamblers Book Services on 0582 712244 for a copy of their current 64 page catalogue)

OR write to: Gamblers Book Club  
630 South 11th Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101

asking for a copy of their free catalogue.

**HORSE RACING:**

Thoroughbred Cycles (A)	<i>Mark Cramer</i>	£22.95
Money Secrets At The Racetrack (A)	<i>Barry Meadow</i>	£29.95
Winning Thoroughbred Strategies (A)	<i>Dick Mitchell</i>	£22.95
Dr Z's Beat The Racetrack (A)	<i>Ziamba &amp; Hausch</i>	£24.95
The Odds On Your Side (A)	<i>Mark Cramer</i>	
Thoroughbred Handicapping: State Of The Art (A)	<i>W. Quirin</i>	
Be A Successful Punter	<i>Clive Holt</i>	
Winning At The Races: Computer Discoveries in Thoroughbred Handicapping (A)	<i>W. Quirin</i>	£22.95
Value Betting	<i>Mark Coton</i>	£18.00
How to find Value When Betting	<i>Malcolm Howard</i>	£4.95
The Value Factor In Successful Betting	<i>Malcolm Howard</i>	£5.95
Betting For A Living	<i>Nick Mordin</i>	£18.00

**GENERAL:**

The Mathematics Of Gambling (A) *Dr Ed. Thorp* £6.95  
(good, cheap intro to mathematics behind gambling & money management)

**PROBABILITY/STATISTICS:**

The Architecture Of Chance *Richard Lowry*  
Betting The Timeform Way *Timeform* £9.95  
(good intro. to probability and maths with application to horse racing)

I hope this article has given some food for thought, and who knows, with a bit of luck it might spark off a debate that will teach us all a thing or two we didn't already know.



*(Please not that Iain's calculations are written in computer notation. i.e. the multiplication symbol is \* not x, and division is written as / not ÷ - Stef)*



***From the same source that  
brought you the PRS PF1 review  
last month, Graham Kendall  
turns his sights to a book that  
promises much . . .***

## **BOOK REVIEW**

***by Graham Kendall***

### **FOOTBALL POOLS:**

#### **LARGE FORTUNES FROM SMALL STAKES**

**written by:** Chris Brown

**Published:** Take That Ltd., for Chartsearch Ltd. **Price:** £9.95

**A**s someone who has won a number of minor **dividends** on the football pools (enough to buy a pint and a bag of crisps variety rather than a crate of champagne and a kilo of caviar), I was therefore intrigued when I saw the advertisement for a new book which just might tip the scales in my favour. Being a cautious sort I have not yet ordered a new Ferrari (I've still to decide on the colour) or booked a round-the-world cruise, which is just as well. The advert trumpets ***Revealed: How to win the Pools*** and goes on to exclaim ***A new book reveals how any individual can dramatically increase their chances of a Pools win*** and goes as far as to virtually guarantee success! . Okay, that's the hype. Does reality match the advertisers enthusiasm?

First of all I'm not so sure it would be appropriate to describe this as a new book. The credits page clearly shows that the book was first published in 1992 with subsequent new editions in 1993 and 1994! That aside, this slim A5 sized book, or more appropriately booklet, comprises only forty-odd pages including appendices. I say forty-odd pages because the book has neither a contents page or page numbers. The book comprises twelve sections (with some sections consisting of less than one page) and three appendices. With the exception of the first two sections the book is laid out in a two column format.

The first section is interestingly enough entitled 'Conclusion', comprises three paragraphs (136 words) and imparts the wisdom that '...a good prediction will increase the odds of a big win!' Section 2 'Recommendations' comprises no less than two paragraphs (63 words) and suggests the reader

carefully selects a perm as they can, apparently, increase pay-outs and help you avoid risking your money when the pay-out is likely to be minimal.

The contents of most of the remaining sections continue in a similar vein. At best, only the absolute beginner would find any of the information presented helpful whilst more experienced hands with a modicum of pools betting experience would certainly not find any startling new revelations.

Section 3 'Introduction' gives a brief description of the German 'Lotto', the French 'Pari-Tierc,' and the British Football Pools. Section 4 lists the pools companies (but omits Brittens) explains how to complete a pools coupon, the points scoring system, pools panel results, fixed odds betting and spot-the-ball competitions. Section 5 gives a basic explanation of permutations and combinations and demonstrates how to calculate the number of lines in full 'perms' i.e. 8 from 10 combinations.

Section 6 discusses the pros and cons of using full perms and pools/newspaper plans and perms. Section 7 gives rudimentary advice on match selection taking into account the principles of spatial selection, consecutive numbers and patterns, with the aim of selecting matches that other entrants would be less inclined to choose, hence increasing dividend pay-outs.

Section 8 'Computer Analysis' is the centrepiece of the book. It contains the results of the analysis of A massive 672 sets of data representing the historical results on the British Football pools... . It is not made clear what these data sets are or what period they cover. The results of the analysis comprise five graphs containing the probability curves using Poisson distribution (which is suitable for discontinuous variables) and show the percentage possible outcome for each of the game (fixture) numbers 1-58 for Jackpot, Score and No-Score draws, Home/Away wins and Total Points Available. The most important fact revealed, is that the distribution of draws over the fixture numbers is not entirely even and that there are certain fixture numbers that have a higher percentage of draws than the average values.

The author states that the secret of winning is in how you interpret the data. Surprisingly, and perhaps remarkably, this is precisely where no guidance is forthcoming and the reader is left to his own devices on how the data presented should be interpreted! This peculiar omission is at odds with the advert which confidently extols All this important data was boiled down to simple 'Probability Curves' so even a child could predict 8 score Draws

from 10, or possibility better than that! . Well anything is possible, but is it probable? Maybe the monkeys would do better here! Right Stef?

One possible approach would be to select the fixture numbers which have shown an above average number of draws in previous seasons, in the belief that the pattern will repeat itself in the current season. IF the hypothesis has any validity, then the chance of netting that elusive first dividend this season will be greatly improved. That's the theory. I will be analysing the results of employing this strategy for this current season and will keep SMARTies informed of the outcome. It is also pointed out in the book that statistics derived from the past and used to predict future events have their limitations. SMARTies will be all too well aware of this fact - a system developed with hindsight may well 'work' for the period from which the data is derived, only to spectacularly nosedive when applied in real time.

Section 9 gives general information about the pools companies and offers general advice on which company to choose bearing in mind how much you can afford to stake, how many times you want to win and how much you want to win. Section 10 very briefly describes the different types of entries; postal, collectors, standing forecast and syndicates. Section 11 is a one page summary on how to check the pools results and Section 12 advises the reader to take heed of what the Winners Advisory Service recommends when you are in the lucky situation of having found the end of the rainbow!

At the moment, I cannot recommend this book. The minimal content combined with the self-evident advice could hardly be described as a pools winning strategy and would only be of minimal use to the absolute beginner. Whether the data presented in Section 8 does indeed prove to be the basis of an effective draw finding system remains to be seen. Watch this space...

 **SMARTsig**

*(I well remember some years ago having sight of a booklet entitled something along the lines of “£500 per week for two hours work”. It explained how many a fortune had been made by the writing and selling of books by mail order. Apparently the key to it all, was not so much the content, but the title. If you could hit upon a title which fired the public’s imagination, you had a licence to print money. Many of you may remember “The Lazy Man’s Way to Riches” by Joe Karbo*

*- Stef)*

***An avid VDW fan writes, revamping of an old system based on the Most Popular Newspaper Selection of the day, with remarkable success.***

## **SIXTEEN WINNERS IN A ROW**

***Hugh Tebbett***

**T**his offering is a revised version of a letter I penned to Stefan on 27 December 1994. The original was a discussion on the relative merits or otherwise of an "Old chestnut " of a system which some of you SMARTies will recall was faithfully monitored in the halcyon days of the "Sporting Chronicle", i.e. The Most Popular Selection of the day as collated from most of the national and sporting dailies. I recall that I was always intrigued by this feature - not as a serious betting proposition - but, more as a statistical phenomenon. If my memory serves me right - the strike rate was invariably in the 50% to 60%+ range but, due to the cramped odds, generally showed a level stake loss. However, longest consecutive winning sequences always outweighed corresponding losing ones.

On 21 November, I had a resurgence of interest in the system and have since kept records using the selection lists of the Racing Post and Page 394 of Ceefax, whichever the greater (there is often a divergence of opinion between the two and I use the Racing Post as the final arbiter). In the rare event of a tie, I select the race with the highest penalty value. By 21 December (27 racing days), whilst conceding that this was a very small sample, a 74% strike rate had emerged which prompted me to write to SMARTsig as a thought-provoking exercise.

Since that time, however, (up to 14 January) - the strike-rate has increased to **80%** with a phenomenal consecutive winning run of **16!**, full sequence shown as follows:-

4/5;L;4/11;L;2/9;2/5;L;4/7;11/10;L;8/13;2/5;4/9;11/10;2/7;1/1;8/11;L;5/6;L;  
1/2;5/6;4/6;1/8;8/15;L;13/8;L;2/5;5/4;1/8;1/6;8/13;2/7;1/3;2/5;7/4;4/6;  
4/9;8/15;2/5; 8/11;1/2;4/7;L;

On the financial side, the sequence would show net profits of:-

(a) £97 to a £10 level stake equating to 19.6% on gross turnover of £495;

(b) £330 to £10 unit stake (using the VDW staking plan) equating to 19% on a gross turnover of £1,775.

Obviously, this is a totally unrepresentative "purple patch" sequence of results taken in context with a much wider sample but, even with a more realistic sequence, could provide the basis of a viable betting proposition with the use of an appropriate staking plan - or, am I being just too naive? Anyway, I would be most interested to read any thoughts that other SMARTies might have on the subject (particularly those of a statistically-minded or pro-staking plan disposition) or, indeed, if anyone out there has access to a more substantial sample than the one I have recorded - I would be more than interested.

Finally, I hope by this offering that I have not either "shot myself in the foot!", so to speak or, worse still, inadvertently infuriated some others who may well have been profiting quietly over the years from the use of an identical or similar method of selection. So be it! It is my contention that, in order for SMARTsig to continue to develop as an extremely valuable forum, members should not be too reticent in sharing their "suggestions" on possible profitable areas - it would be a shame for these to be lost in the mists of time or unearthed by some future generation in a "time capsule"!

**Tip:** Old and redundant "Superform" file covers are an ideal medium for storing your back copies of SMARTsig, and punching the holes in the right place can provide an interesting diversion - Ouch!



*Not wishing to steal Hugh's thunder with this phenomenal sequence I did a little research of my own, to help those who maybe do not have access to Ceefax. The criteria I used, based on Hugh's, was to use the Racing Post's "Tipster Selection Box" only. Back any horse that has all, or all but one of the tipsters in the selection box advising it. The results from December 1 to January 24 were; 3rd;2/5;8/13;4/9;Evs;4/6;8/11;2/11;1/8; 2nd;2/5;1/8;4/6;1/6;8/13;2/9;2/7;1/3;4/9;2/5;2nd;1/2;L;L;8/15;2/5;4/5;L; 1/2*

*29 selections, 23 won, strike rate 79.3% LWR: 10 LLR: 2*

*Level stakes, tax paid betting was: an overall profit of 5.18%*

*The first bet lost, but the sequence was back in profit by bet 4 (the 4/9), then stayed in profit throughout the period, peaking at 27.97% at bet 7 (the 8/11). If you've never had an account closed, but would like to brag to your friends that you have. Follow either of the above with just one bookie, chances are you won't last two months - Stef*

# GENERAL TOPICS I

**Ray Webster**

Dear Stefan,

Happy New Year to you and my thanks for the Christmas edition of our magazine. I like the new cover - gives us a move up market. I didn't like the "Internet" nonsense - seems a complete waste of valuable space which could be used for something more interesting - say horseracing! *(You'll find plenty of interest in this months issue then - Stef)*

## **System "X" for Racing Post readers**

It was good to be reminded of the Jim Streek System "X", and I can certainly vouch for it's effectiveness during my time as a Daily Mail reader. For those who are Racing Post regulars I would suggest it has potential. Substitute Postmark for Formcast and Diomed/Spotlight for the Mail tipsters.

There have been some nice winners recently although I obviously cannot vouch for its long term profitability. Can anyone with back copies of the Racing Post help? *(Or Mel Collier at the Racing Post - how about it Mel? - Stef)*

## **Raceform's Split Second**

You may remember that I asked Alan Coldrick for some help in listing the horse with the highest winning rating from the Raceform Update weekly Split Second feature. My thanks to Alan for his research in this area, and preliminary investigations into these qualifiers do look quite promising. *(To keep all members in the picture - the research produced by Alan was passed on directly to Ray, the bare figures did not, in my opinion, merit publication at that stage.*

*Ray was going to investigate further and then if something worthwhile came from it all we would publish the results for all to see - Stef)*

Ten of the fifty seven horses listed by Alan did not run again during the appropriate Flat/National Hunt season. Simply by backing the forty seven horses that remained on their next run produced thirteen winners (27.7%) at an average SP of 3-1, giving a break even situation after tax. I will carry out



further research looking at a minimum rating (all selections rated below sixty five lost) and also looking at eliminating horses which qualified at some of the lower grade tracks.

The other Split Second feature “Highest Winning Time” has also produced some good winners next time out, so I think both features are worth investigation.

That seems to be all for now, I think the seasonal eating and drinking has dulled my senses. Very best wishes for an interesting New Year .



**WARNING  
NOT EVERYTHING SMART IS SMART!**

**Members may have noticed an advertisement appearing recently for a tipping service who go under the name of SMART Investments.**

**I wish to make it quite clear that SMARTsig, has no connection whatever, either with this company, nor with any other company who operate under the name SMART nor with any organisation who claim any connection with our group.**

**SMARTsig is TOTALLY independent and does not have any arrangements or connections with other commercial operations other than the beneficial links we maintain to offer members discounts and research facilities.**

**ALL SUCH CO-OPERATIONS ARE DISCLOSED THROUGH  
THE PAGES OF OUR MAGAZINE**

**RID tell me that the firm claim to have been around since early 1994, but they have only been aware of their existence since November 1994.**

**I know that confusion has already been experienced because of this situation. If you are in any doubt whatever do not hesitate to contact me.**

***Starting Prices were discussed in our December magazine. Another SMARTie digs a little deeper***

## **STARTING PRICES SURVEY**

***John Main***

**F**ollowing on from December's contributions from Questor and Trevor Southern I present a survey of starting price performance covering seasons 1986 - 1990 Flat and 1985/86 - 1989/90 National Hunt.

First an explanation of each column of the table opposite;

1. SP - The returned starting price.
2. SP converted to a percentage probability. Plotted on the X axis in arriving at our formula.
3. Number of horses winning at this SP
4. Number of horses running at this SP
5. Actual percentage probability of winning at this SP. i.e.  $(3) \div (4) \times 100$ . Plotted on the Y axis for our formula.
6. Percentage return achieved by investing on all runners with this SP. i.e.  $((1) + 1) \times (3) \div (4) \times 100$
7.  $\hat{Y}$ , predicted percentage probability of winning at this SP as calculated using the least squares regression line.
8. Predicted minimum return to break even at this SP (no tax) ie  $100 \div \hat{Y}$
9. As for (8) but with 10% tax paid on i.e.  $110 \div \hat{Y}$

Columns (2) and (5) to (9) were all calculated to several decimal places and have been rounded up or down for ease of presentation. A regression analysis was carried out on the data, column (2) being the X axis and column (5) the Y axis, producing the least squares regression line.

**Table 1 - Starting Price survey**

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
SP	SP	Wins	Runs	Wins/ Runs%	Return %	Pred Prob%	Requ retn I	Requ retn II
	Prob%					$\hat{Y}$		
	X			Y				
1/5	83	43	51	84	101	80	1.25	1.37
1/4	80	74	96	77	96	77	1.30	1.43
1/3	75	104	139	75	100	72	1.39	1.53
2/5	71	159	230	69	97	68	1.46	1.61
1/2	67	221	330	67	100	64	1.57	1.73
4/7	64	266	440	60	95	63	1.60	1.76
4/6	60	356	626	57	95	57	1.75	1.93
4/5	56	412	776	53	96	53	1.90	2.09
1/1	50	547	1185	46	92	47	2.12	2.33
5/4	44	589	1365	43	97	42	2.39	2.63
6/4	40	714	1856	38	96	37	2.67	2.94
7/4	36	834	2616	32	88	34	2.95	3.25
2/1	33	1106	3585	31	93	31	3.24	3.56
5/2	29	1103	4168	26	93	26	3.82	4.20
3/1	25	1282	5778	22	89	23	4.41	4.85
7/2	22	1332	6611	20	91	20	5.02	5.52
4/1	20	1419	8332	17	85	18	5.64	6.20
9/2	18	1140	6945	16	90	16	6.27	6.90
5/1	17	1458	9485	15	92	14	6.92	7.61
6/1	14	1240	10087	12	86	12	8.25	9.08
8/1	11	1162	13356	9	78	9	11.12	12.23
10/1	9	1152	16699	7	76	7	14.28	15.70
12/1	8	963	17990	5	70	6	17.77	19.54
16/1	6	683	19418	4	60	4	26.00	28.59
20/1	5	651	27608	2	50	3	36.44	40.08
25/1	4	404	21364	2	49	2	54.26	59.69
33/1	3	392	40220	1	33	1	105.01	115.51
50/1	2	86	23286	0	19	0		
66/1	1	19	4599	0	28	0		
100/1	1	11	4975	0	22	0		

$$\hat{Y} = 0.984156 X - 1.94226$$

and a coefficient of correlation

$$r = 0.9990058$$

As  $r$  has a maximum value of 1 this means that there is an extremely close relationship between  $X$  and  $Y$ . You should note that this is a straight line formula and produces negative values for  $\hat{Y}$  for the three highest odds. As a negative probability is impossible these have been shown as 0. A curvular line would be needed to overcome this slight imperfection.

Let us go through the columns with an example - SP at 2/5 (1) has a probability of 5/7 or 71% (2). There were 159 (3) horses winning at 2/5 in the survey out of 230 (4) running at 2/5.

$$159 \div 230 \times 100 = 69\% \text{ (5)}$$

$$1.4 \times 159 \div 230 \times 100 = 97\% \text{ (6)}$$

$$(0.984156 \times \frac{5}{7} \times 100) - 1.94226 = 68.354596 \text{ i.e. } 68\% \text{ (7)}$$

$$100 \div 68.354596 = 1.46 \text{ (8)}$$

$$110 \div 68.354596 = 1.61 \text{ (9)}$$

Looking at column (6) is most interesting! The higher the odds the more pathetic the return becomes. It is therefore not surprising that bookies frequently complain about lop-sided books and usually make a sacking when an outsider wins. Clearly there are not enough mugs who are mug enough to back outsiders when the return is so poor.

It is also amazing that all this means bookies do **not** minimise their risk. The conglomerates do make an effort by sending money “on course” on the lower priced horses to reduce the SP and by sometimes offering price concessions e.g. “Back a horse with an SP of 14/1 or more and we’ll pay you five points more than the SP if it wins.” To minimise their risk the bookies need an even book so that no matter which horse wins they end up with the same payout and profit. To achieve this they need to reduce the lower prices and increase the higher prices to varying degrees so that the expected return for each price is roughly the same.

e.g. Those horse previously priced at 20/1 are now priced at 38/1

$$\text{return} = 651 \times 39 \div 27608 \times 100 = 92\%$$

Those previously 5/6 are now 8/13

$$\text{return} = 356 \times \frac{21}{13} \div 626 \times 100 = 92\%$$

By doing this bookies would stand a much better chance of getting an even book as the disadvantage for the punter in backing outsiders is much less than at present.

How can we benefit from the results of the survey? The most obvious way is on course. We can't get the SP until after the "off", but we can use the screen prices from the on course betting shops as a substitute. If this is done as near to the "off" as possible they will frequently be the same as the SP.

***“. . . unfortunately it's  
a drunk who can't  
find his money to  
cover his bet . . .”***

Let's suppose we have our 2/5 favourite. Our formula tells us we have to be offered a return of £1.46 per £1 invested before we can bet. We rush to see what the Tote are offering and find it's £1.60, more than £1.46, so we have a bet!

Problems -

1) If your bet is too large in relation to the size of the pool you may well send the Tote quote down to £1.40, which would be less than our required return. Because you are doing this as near to the "off" as possible there is no time to place several smaller bets to see how each affects the quote. You therefore need a formula to calculate the maximum bet possible which will not send the Tote quote below our required return.

2) Someone may place a Tote bet on the same horse after you which may also result in the quote becoming too low.

3) You wait too long before leaving the betting shop and are still checking the Tote quotes when the "off" comes.

4) You see there's a bet, but there's a queue at the Tote window. It gets to just one person in front of you, unfortunately it's a drunk who can't find his money to cover his bet and the "off" arrives to beat you again.

An alternative to the Tote is to find an on course bookmaker whose quote is high enough, but to check even a few of them in the time you have available would be rather difficult.

Below are some other, more feasible suggestions for using the formula substituting the SP with other prices that can be obtained much earlier.

- Forecast SP from one source
- Average of several SP forecasts e.g.  $1/1; 11/10; 5/4$   

$$X = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{10}{21} + \frac{4}{9}\right) \div 3 \times 100$$

$$= 47.4\%$$
- Middle price of several SP forecasts e.g.  $1/1; 11/10; 5/4$   
 We take 11/10 as the middle price  

$$X = 10/21 \times 100$$

$$= 47.6\%$$
- Forecast SP at a particular point in a range of forecasts. e.g. 2nd lowest price out of five forecasts, 3rd highest out of seven.
- Any of the above four ways using Early Odds instead of forecast Sps
- Opening, 2nd, 3rd, etc. screen show prices.

### **Wealth Warning!**

Remember these are only suggestions. If you were actually to do a performance survey based on any of the above, and then a regression analysis, you might find that the line/formula obtained to be used as a predictor differs significantly from the one for SPs.



#### *Footnote for confused readers:*

*If you have no idea what regression analysis is all about, then it's about time you learned! Others have recommended you gain an insight into this area before, make it a new years resolution to do something about it!*

*There are literally hundreds of books around which cover the various techniques involved, often giving examples to help the reader through and several giving test questions to check your learning. Many of these books are "study aids" for Business Studies courses so are designed to meet the needs of the statistics newcomer, No need to buy a new book either, your local library, no matter how small, will have examples for free loan.*

*Another area where you'll find them, although not everyone's cup of tea, is the new craze of "car boot sales" The typical car boot visitor and Statistics books, are poles apart. The kettle without a lid, the 3 legged table and the second hand pair of underpants ("just need a washing dearie!") will sell out far quicker than the Stats book. Yet there are plenty to be found, so many people have retrained in business studies. Haggle around 10p. (One of my recent visits produced a Raceform Flat annual, 10p, I didn't haggle) - Stef*

***SMART has many fans of C Van Der Wheil and in answer to a question posed in our December issue an outline of the Dutchmans method.***

**THE VDW APPROACH**

**D**ear Stefan,

Robert Hattrell in issue 1.5 page 23 requests an article on the VDW approach. As many will be aware, the method was given via a number of articles over several years in the Raceform Handicap Book and it's predecessor, the Sporting Chronicle Handicap Book.

The publication that will serve Robert best is called "VDW - The Golden Years" which attempts to pull together all the salient features of the method from those articles. Whilst no means an authority on the use of the method, I will however endeavour to outline the approach via three races I analysed on Boxing Day. Comments from other enthusiasts would be most welcome.

***2.20 Kempton 3 mile Chase***

Horse	class	Consi stency	Post mark	Top speed	course	dist	going
Algan	☆427	9	-	-	?	Y	?
Barton Bank	21	☆ 3	☆175	☆172	Y	Y	Y
Bradbury Star	106	8	☆175	☆172	Y	Y	Y
Gale Again	52	☆ 5	154	138	?	Y	?
Monsieur Le C	☆122	8	161	157	Y	Y	Y
Second Shedule	107	12	159	152	?	Y	Y
The Fellow	☆388	13	☆175	☆171	Y	Y	Y
Travado	104	☆ 5	168	154	Y	Y	?
Young Hustler	☆119	12	170	160	?	Y	Y

***RESULT:***

Algan W 16-1, Monsieur Le Cure 2nd 6-1, Second Shedule 3rd 20-1

**Notes:**

The class rating is obtained by dividing the total win prize money by the number of wins multiplied by 100

The consistency rating is obtained by adding together the last three placings

Y = known ability to handle course, distance, going.

☆ = of significance

? = unproven ability over course, distance or going.

The basic premise is that the class horse in form which can handle course, distance and going will win. Note that the method selects the two most valuable races at the principal meeting and the most valuable race at other meetings as suitable for evaluation.

It is striking that Algan, the eventual winner, has the highest class rating which derives entirely from wins in France. I do not know whether or not prize money in France is comparable with that in the UK, but feel it must be significant since the rating is greater than that for the other French horse, The Fellow. For Algan there is no supporting evidence available from ratings and the horse is less consistent than others in the field.

In contrast, the favourite Barton Bank, has the lowest class rating of the entire field and should not be backed. The Fellow, Monsieur Le Cure and Young Hustler are currently inconsistent and on balance I feel this is a race to watch and enjoy, with no betting involvement.

**3.15 Kempton 3 mile Novice Chase**

Horse	class	Consi stency	Post mark	Top speed	course	dist	going
Brownhall	27	9	121	116	?	Y	?
Call Home	26	☆ 4	123	116	Y	Y	?
Mad Thyme	31	12	☆ 127	96	?	?	Y
Oatis Regrets	25	8	117	119	?	?	?
Pashto	☆ 48	☆ 6	☆ 129	☆ 131	?	?	?
Sweet Duke	☆ 67	☆ 7	☆ 133	☆ 133	?	?	Y

**RESULT:**

Brownhall W 5-1, Mad Thyme 2nd 9-2, Sweet Duke 3rd 9-2



The two class/form horses, Sweet Duke and Pashto have not shown that they can handle the race conditions. None of the remaining field has sufficient supporting evidence to warrant support.

### **2.30 Wetherby 3 mile 1/2 f Handicap Chase**

Horse	class	Consi stency	Post mark	Top speed	course	dist	going
Jodami	☆ 168	☆ 6	☆ 169	☆ 166	Y	Y	Y
Cogent	95	15	☆ 172	☆ 165	?	Y	Y
One Man	82	11	☆ 173	161	Y	Y	Y

#### **RESULT:**

Cogent W 7-2, Jodami 2nd 11-4 (after falling and being remounted to complete)

Jodami is the class/form horse, has all supporting factors in favour and is a recommended bet. It is interesting that there was absolutely no support for Jodami in the racing press as it is believed the horse needs the run and cannot give 23lb to One Man.



### **Welcome to all new members**

SMART extends a warm welcome to all new members, our s.i.g continues to grow with an ever increasing number of quality members. We look forward to you all contributing to our discussions. Elsewhere in this issue Iain W Simpson recommends the Gamblers Book Services as an excellent source of sporting reference books, which of course includes "The Moneyspinners".

Ion Mills, of Oldcastle Books, who runs GBS is now a SMARTie and so existing members should be able to contact them with confidence. They publish a full catalogue listing all their books, a work which no self respecting betting student should be without. Very kindly Ion is helping to spread the good word of SMARTsig by allotting a page in his next catalogue for the promotion of our group. I'll keep you informed of when their new catalogue is ready, in the meantime, GBS are at

**18 Coleswood Road, Harpendon, Herts. AL5 1EQ**  
**Tel: 0582 712244 Fax: 0582 761264**

## GENERAL TOPICS II

*John Wildman*

Dear Stefan

I hope this letter finds you rested and ready for the demands of 1995, having had an enjoyable Christmas.

My main reason for writing is to send you the enclosed cheque for f 18.50 for the Racing Post form book for the 1994 flat season. Congratulations on negotiating such a good discount.

By way of gossip I would add the following comments: -

a) I have now bought most of the available Raceform data but am yet to use it. I am fairly heavily into some interior decorating I want to do first. It has long been an aim of mine to have access to computer data at reasonable cost to see if I can reason my way through the complexities of horse racing to see if I can become better at understanding the nature of the subject, while improving my PC skills along the way.

b) I have devoured every word of every magazine produced with considerable enjoyment. The cover is a definite improvement.

c) I should like to see your 2-2 draw method prove profitable. So far I have risked one £10.00 note at 22-1 in a game which looked a home banker where the result turned out to be 1-1, unlucky or what? From memory I think you came close a few days ago, at half-time it was 2-2 and became 2-3 in another game where the home team was supposed to be a banker.

*(That's an all too familiar phrase you've used there – "Unlucky or what?" A better phrase to remember in betting is "A miss is as good as a mile".*

*The object of striking a bet or of bets is to win, no grey areas. In your example above, the score may just as well have been 15.0, from an investment point of view it was a loser (100% loss). It is prudent to monitor any betting situation from the latter standpoint, being close to winning can be taken as encouragement to continue, whereas a cold, clinical wim/lose view could indicate at least caution, or perhaps even stopping a particular avenue of thought - Stef)*

d) The results from the computer challenge should also make very interesting reading.

e) One thank you in advance will be for the idea of having access to more experienced computer users to call upon to ease the path of the less experienced. Time will tell whether Chris Patten-Walker enjoys or regrets his generosity.

f) I imagine you take the Racing Post on a daily basis. If you have not already decided to do so you might like to consider a reference to the controversy caused over the question as to the odds being evens or 2-1 about the second child of a pair being a boy when you are told that at least one of the two is a boy. There was another exchange on the subject on today's letters page.

*(For the sake of members who are not regular Post readers, the original question posed [and solution] was:-*

*Mr Smith has two children. At least one of them is a boy. What are the odds that both children are boys?*

*The Racing Post's solution was:-*

*There are four equally likely combinations:- boy-boy, boy-girl, girl-boy and girl-girl. The additional knowledge, that at least one of them is a boy eliminates only the fourth possibility, so boy-boy is one of three remaining and equally likely possibilities. In other words a 2-1 chance.*

*If you'd looked more closely John, at the exchange of views to which you refer, you would have seen my name among them. – Stef)*

g) An area of possible interest for the future would be in relation to modems. It would seem that you are very experienced on the subject. The sorts or question which it might be helpful to cover would be;

- what to consider when buying one/rough costs?
- what data of interest to SMARTies is there available?
- how do bulletin boards work?
- are they expensive or risky to your hardware/software?
- are there areas where members might communicate with each other in future?
- what are the differences between modem/fax/email etc.?

*(Sorry John, but I am no expert in this area, but I'm sure we must know a man who is! So, a plea to all "comms" literate SMARTies, any chance of an answer to the above for publication? - Stef)*

**SMARTsig**

***A few questions were posed following B Rasmussen's reference to named staking plans, he kindly responded very quickly to the requests.***

## **KELLY AND OSCARS STAKING**

***Bernard Rasmussen***

**D**ear Mr Perry  
Thank you for your 'phone call and I enclose herewith details of the two plans.

### ***Kelly Percentage of the Bank Staking***

Extensive computer simulations show that in the long run most staking plans do not change the total gain (or loss), they merely change gains and losses between periods.

This does not apply in the percentage of the bank method which has logic on its side. If you have a winning system and decide that a bank of twenty units is the correct size and your first bet is a loss, you now have a bank of only nineteen units. Since the system has no memory you are now in the same position as someone just starting the system and logically you should stake only  $\frac{19}{20}$  ths of a unit on the next bet.

If of course your first bet wins, you now have a larger bank and a larger stake is appropriate. Since your system is a winning one, stakes, and therefore profits, will increase as time passes. Also this method of staking (a percentage of the current bank) will withstand a much larger losing run and is therefore safer. Opponents of this method will point out that even small sequences will turn small wins or break even into a larger loss, but it is what happens in the long run that matters - and this is increased profits.

The problem with the method is in deciding in the appropriate percentage of the bank to use. Fortunately the way forward was produced by J L Kelly in a technical paper titled "A New Interpretation of Information Rate" and published in the "Bell System Technical Journal - Vol XXXV", in 1956. He postulated that in an even chance game, the bank will grow at its fastest rate if you bet a percentage of the bank which is equal to your percentage advantage.

So, if you are spinning coins with someone who was naive enough to give you 5-4 on the outcome, you would have a 12.5% advantage and your bank will grow at the fastest rate with a stake of 12.5% of that bank. Many gambling ventures do not just involve even chances but fortunately there is an easy way to cope with this.

“Cover to Win” effectively turns any series into an even chance system. Hence the Kelly statement just becomes cover to win a percentage of the bank, equal to your percentage advantage. Thus, for example in horse racing, the percentage of the bank to be used is your percentage advantage divided by the odds offered.

Unfortunately this is not quite the end of the story. It is most unlikely that the advantage on each individual bet will be known and averages will need to be used. Extensive computer simulations here have shown that the Kelly percentage is overstated in this case and a lower figure of between half and three quarters of the Kelly figure is more appropriate.

The exact figure would need to be determined based on computer simulation of past results, but a reasonable compromise would be to use three fifths of the normal Kelly figure.

The Kelly criterion is a powerful tool and can also be used to determine the stake to be used by those who prefer to use level stakes.

### ***Oscars System***

This is fully described in “The casino Gamblers Guide” by Allan N Wilson who says that it was shown to him by a dice player who had used it consistently to win the price of many a weekend trip to Las Vegas over a period of several years.

The system relies upon the fact that a winning sequence of plays makes a net profit of one unit, and it is this willingness to be content with a small profit, where a greedy player may try for more, that is the saving feature of the system.

***“ . . . be content with a small profit, where a greedy player may try for more . . . ”***

The first bet is one unit. Whenever a bet is lost, the next bet is the same as the bet just lost but whenever a winning bet is struck, the next bet is one unit larger - unless winning the bet produces a profit in excess of one unit, whereby the bet is reduced to produce a profit of just one unit. Whenever a profit of one unit is made a new sequence starts.

Obviously, in this form the system is designed for the even chances, but it can easily be adapted by striking a “cover to win” one unit as a commencement and continuing on those lines. i.e. cover to win the same amount as the previous bet after a loss, but cover to win an additional one unit over the previous bet after a win - unless this would produce a profit of more than one unit, when the stake is reduced to “cover to win” an amount which produces a profit of just one point.

The dice player was playing in a negative expectation game, yet survived over a large number of sessions - however, he must have been lucky as the system should only be used in a game with a positive expectation (i.e. a winning system)

A couple of sequences, based on an even money game illustrates the principle.

Stake:	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3
Result:	L	L	L	L	L	W	W	W
bank:	-1	-2	-3	-4	-5	-4	-2	+1
								End of sequence

The sequence ends when one point profit has been achieved

Stake:	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Result:	L	L	L	L	W	W	W
bank:	-1	-2	-3	-4	-3	-1	+1
							End of sequence

In this sequence the final stake is not increased because this would have produced a profit in excess of one point.

Wilson does not suggest a size of bank, but I would suggest that fifty points might well be adequate.



## ***A Members Problem with Value Odds***

# **CALCULATING THE VALUE**

***Edward Walker***

**D**ear Stef,

In the September '94 edition there was an article by Alan Coldrick on calculating odds from form ratings. Below are two very similar races.

In the first example horse C has twenty points out of eighty five (23.5%). In the second example horse C has 20 points out of eighty two (24%). In example two the opposition is slightly weaker yet the odds of horse C are longer.

Horse	Ratings	Value	%
A	5	2	4
B	14	11	20
C	20	17	31
D	11	8	15
E	5	2	4
F	4	1	2
G	11	8	15
H	4	1	2
I	6	3	5
J	5	2	4

Horse	Ratings	Value	%
A	5	3	5
B	13	11	18
C	20	18	29
D	11	9	15
E	4	2	3
F	3	1	2
G	11	9	15
H	4	2	3
I	6	4	6
J	5	3	5

Can Mr Coldrick, or anyone else explain this apparent anomaly?



### **ANSWER TO LAST MONTHS BRAIN TEASER**

If all the mothers in the land were prevented from having any more children after the birth of a boy. But were allowed to continue having as many children as they wished so long as they were girls. This would result in many more boy children than girls.

Similarly, if mothers were allowed unlimited boy children, and made to stop after the first born girl. This would result in an abundance of girls.

***Following up an item from 1982 in the old Sporting Chronicle Handicap Book, Alan Coldrick continues his in depth research.***

## **FOLLOWING HANDICAPPERS**

***Alan Coldrick***

**B**efore going any further I wish to take this opportunity to correct an error in my last article on page 48 of the January issue, under staking systems. The second bullet point should read as follows and not as shown;-

- Future stakes are always increased by one point whilst there is a figure remaining in the due column, except that such stakes will never be more than one point greater than the outstanding figure in the due column.

My apologies to members for that mistake and any confusion it may have caused. *(My sympathy lies with newcomers who may not have seen the January issue, they will not understand its context! - Stef)*

SMARTsig note: The above correction IS IN PLACE in this version of the magazine
---

### ***Listing Handicappers for Future Consideration***

Some time in 1982 a standards chart for listing handicappers on the flat was published in the old Sporting Chronicle Handicap Book. It was based on the handicap grading, weight carried and speed figure attained. I decided to try and carry the idea over to National Hunt racing. The chart I devised and this seasons qualifiers to date (24 January 1995) are listed in the following pages.

- Take the Raceform Update race returns.
- Note the grading and the actual weight carried.
- Refer to the chart overleaf to find the standard split second speed figure required.
- Any horse that has equalled or exceeded the standard SF required is worth noting for future reference.



### **Handicap Rating Bands**

	0 - 90	0 - 95	0 - 100	0 - 105	0 - 110	0 - 115	0 - 120	0 - 125	0 - 130	0 - 135	0 - 140	0 - 145
weight												
10 - 00	1	6	11	16	21	26	31	36	41	46	51	56
10 - 02	3	8	13	18	23	28	33	38	43	48	53	58
10 - 04	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60
10 - 06	7	12	17	22	27	32	37	42	47	52	57	62
10 - 08	9	14	19	24	29	34	39	44	49	54	59	64
10 - 10	11	16	21	26	31	36	41	46	51	56	61	66
10 - 12	13	18	23	28	33	38	43	48	53	58	63	68
11 - 00	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70
11 - 02	17	22	27	32	37	42	47	52	57	62	67	72
11 - 04	19	24	29	34	39	44	49	54	59	64	69	74
11 - 06	21	26	31	36	41	46	51	56	61	66	71	76
11 - 08	23	28	33	38	43	48	53	58	63	68	73	78
11 - 10	25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80
11 - 12	27	32	37	42	47	52	57	62	67	72	77	82
12 - 00	29	34	39	44	49	54	59	64	69	74	79	84
12 - 02	31	36	41	46	51	56	61	66	71	76	81	86
12 - 04	33	38	43	48	53	58	63	68	73	78	83	88
12 - 06	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85	90
12 - 08	37	42	47	52	57	62	67	72	77	82	87	92
12 - 10	39	44	49	54	59	64	69	74	79	84	89	94
12 - 12	41	46	51	56	61	66	71	76	81	86	91	96
13 - 00	43	48	53	58	63	68	73	78	83	88	93	98

### **List of Handicappers for 94/95 National Hunt Season(to 16 Jan '95)**

Race No.	Horse	grade	dist	going	weight	SF standard	SF attained
428	ALAN BALL	0 - 120	2m	G	11-3	48	49 +1
619	BEACHY HEAD	0 - 135	2m 4f	G	11-2	62	73 +11
977	COULTON	0 - 125	2m 1f	G/S	12-0	64	70 +6
1675	DOUALAGO	0 - 100	2m 5f	HV	11-10	35	46 +11
1707	GENERAL WOLFE	0 - 110	3m	G/S	10-9	30	32 +2
504	GLEMOT	0 - 125	2m 1f	G/F	11-1	51	57 +6
975	JUMBEAU	0 - 115	3m	G/S	11-11	51	53 +2
1707	KADI	0 - 110	3m	G/S	11-10	45	46 +1

1747	KIBREET	0 - 125	2m	G	10-11	47	49	+2
428	MEALEAGRIS	0 - 110	3m	G	11-13	48	56	+8
850	MISTER ODDY	0 - 115	2m	HV	10-11	37	41	+4
418	MONDAY CLUB	0 - 110	2m 1f	G/S	11-08	43	44	+1
1747	NEWLANDS GEN.	0 - 125	2m	G	10-09	45	45	=
1542	NICKLE JOE	0 - 125	2m 4f	S	10-09	45	48	+3
1349	POSITIVE ACTION	0 - 100	2m	G/S	11-12	37	41	+4
643	RUSTIC GENT	0 - 105	2m	S/HV	10-01	16	30	+14
181	SQUIRE JIM	0 - 115	3m 2f	G/F	12-00	54	55	+1
228	TINAS LAD	0 - 115	2m	G	10-09	35	38	+3
310	WHATS IN ORBIT	0 - 115	2m	G/S	12-00	54	55	+1

### **Hurdlers**

Race No.	Horse	grade	dist	going	weight	SF standard	SF attained	
371	ASKT' GOVERNOR	0 - 100	2m 6f	G/S	11-00	25	32	+7
22	BADASTAN	0 - 100	2m 6f	G/F	11-04	29	31	+2
323	BEAMMEUPSCOTTY	0 - 115	2m 1f	G	10-00	26	37	+11
333	BORROWED&BLUE	0 - 115	2m 5f	G/F	9-11	23	26	+3
22	COMMANCHERO	0 - 100	2m 6f	G/F	10-09	20	22	+2
1193	CORSTON RACER	0 - 100	2m 1f	G/S	10-00	11	29	+18
743	EUROTWIST	0 - 100	2m 1f	G/S	11-03	28	41	+13
1532	GREENS FAIR	0 - 110	2m 1f	S/HV	10-00	21	29	+8
587	HAWAIIAN YOUTH	0 - 125	2m 2f	G	9-13	35	37	+2
1604	KAYFAAT	0 - 90	2m 2f	HV	10-06	7	17	+10
15	MAJAL	0 - 100	2m 1f	G/F	11-04	29	34	+5
1468	MORSTOCK	0 - 100	2m	G	11-03	28	32	+4
398	NAGOBELIA	0 - 120	2m	G/F	10-04	31	33	+2
1583	NIPPER REED	0 - 100	2m	G/S	11-01	26	39	+13
327	NOTABLE EXCEPT'N	0 - 115	2m 5f	G	11-05	45	48	+3
133	ROXY RIVER	0 - 115	2m 1f	F	10-07	33	38	+5
1055	SAME DIFFERENCE	0 - 100	3m	G	10-10	21	32	+11
1149	SECOND CALL	0 - 140	2m 4f	S	10-06	57	59	+2
1604	STAR MARKET	0 - 90	2m 2f	HV	10-09	10	26	+16
933	SURREY DANCER	0 - 135	2m	G/S	11-00	60	62	+2
1742	TRUMP	0 - 115	3m	G	11-02	42	43	+1
416	VALIANT DASH	0 - 125	2m 4f	G/F	10-00	36	38	+2
1193	WEE RIVER	0 - 100	2m 1f	G/S	11-04	29	40	+11
1462	WHITE WILLOW	0 - 110	2m 1f	G	11-03	38	52	+14
333	WINGSOFFREEDOM	0 - 115	2m 5f	G/F	10-03	28	29	+1

When considering whether to support listed runners:-

Within fourteen days is a positive indicator, up to twenty eight days is acceptable, more than sixty days is very negative.

Racing at more than one grade higher would put me off.

A complete change in distance would make me wary.

More than one change in going either way needs further checking.

An increase of six pounds or more in weight means it is almost certainly deleted.

Chase qualifiers are not considered for hurdle races and visa-versa.

Confidence is increased if the horse is in the Daily Mail Formcast rating within a range 73 - 78.

The market odds available must be judged to be value for money.

The above conditions being my efforts to eliminate losers and as such may be accepted or discarded at the readers choice.

There follows the results of some of the later qualifiers who exceeded the standard by a fair margin:-

1193	Corston Racer	1775	2nd		
1675	Doualago				
743	Eurotwist	1163	Won 6-4,	1262	
1583	Nipper Read	1674	Won 2-1		
1055	Same Difference	1155	3rd	1465	1580
1604	Star Market				
1193	Wee River	1384	2nd	1741	Won 7-4
1462	White Willow				

## **Conclusion**

- I only evaluate winners, seconds and thirds.
- Seconds are only evaluated if within two lengths of the winner.
- Thirds are only evaluated if not more than twice the distance that the second is from the winner (i.e. a maximum of four lengths behind the second)

I only evolved this idea this season and any constructive criticism from fellow members would be most welcome.

***Is your betting bank large enough to cope with the inevitable losing runs? - Jacques Black's comments from December are followed up.***

**COMPARING DIFFERENT SYSTEMS**

***John Main***

**A**fter Jacques Black's article in December and his table on page 33 everyone should now be aware, if they weren't already, that the chances of a sacking change much more dramatically than the change in an event's probability.

By backing 3/1 shots instead of Evens shots, a halving in probability, the chances of getting a particular losing run do not merely double, but rise more than 5 times for a losing run of four, eleven times for a losing run of six, etc.

Let's imagine a number of scenarios in which we have the choice between two different sets of four single bets.

		Win prob	Return for Win	Expected Return		Exp. ret. %
1	A	0.5	2	$4 \times 0.5 \times 2$	= 4	100
	B	0.25	4	$4 \times 0.25 \times 4$	= 4	100
2	A	0.5	2.2	$4 \times 0.5 \times 2.2$	= 4.4	110
	B	0.25	4.4	$4 \times 0.25 \times 4.4$	= 4.4	110
3	A	0.5	2.2	$4 \times 0.5 \times 2.2$	= 4.4	110
	B	0.25	4.6	$4 \times 0.25 \times 4.6$	= 4.6	115
4	A	0.5	2.1	$4 \times 0.5 \times 2.1$	= 4.2	105
	B	0.05	40	$4 \times 0.005 \times 40$	= 8	200
5	A	0.8	1.5	$4 \times 0.8 \times 1.5$	= 4.8	120
	B	0.4	3.75	$4 \times 0.4 \times 3.75$	= 6	150

In the first two scenarios the expected returns are the same but making the A bets gives a much smaller chance of being wiped out. In the other three scenarios though we have problems. In each one the B bets offer a better expected percentage return, but more chance of a nil return. Clearly we need some measure that takes into account both the expected return percentage and the risk involved.

The problem is similar to that facing someone deciding between investing in a building society (low return, low risk) and in shares (high return, high risk) and takes me back to the days when I was an investment bulletin subscriber. The editor Bob Beckman also ran a Unit Trust and was forever claiming that although he showed a lower return than most of the others, on a risk evaluation basis it was almost without equal!

The games the same, so reading investment theory books should perhaps be required reading for us all. Perhaps someone can make some recommendations?



*The first person to recommend Old Moore's Almanac in this context will be introduced to Eric Cantona, and we'll tell him you said something rude about him in French.*



## COMPARING RACE COURSES

*John de Little*

**A** letter in a previous issue of SMARTsig asked for information on racecourses in respect of similarities etc. I have tried to put National Hunt courses into similar groups and type of course but it is a far more involved undertaking than one might first think it is.

Flat race courses are even more involved due to the racing being over the short sprint distances which only use a part of the course which is often totally unrelated to the characteristics met over the longer distances on the same course.

The suitability of a horse to act on a particular course, or type of course is most important and a point overlooked by many people. I would strongly recommend purchasing *The Solidus*, it certainly is an eye opener on this subject.



*It is certainly true that the term "horses for courses" is not simply an old wives tale. I must admit to not being familiar with what The Solidus preaches, but whatever it is has obviously impressed John. Any member fancy sending a more in-depth appraisal of what The Solidus is about? Without breaching copyright!*

*Courses and their similarities is the subject of some research I am currently undertaking myself, at the moment only for flat racing venues. If it does show anything worthy of inclusion, you will all be the first to know.*  
*Stef*

### **The Very Best of SMARTsig The annual**

**Our own annual, The Very Best of SMARTsig will hopefully be appearing towards the end of the year. We hope to have it professionally published and aim to be on sale in book stores as well as direct by mail order. It will contain the very best items from the first full year of the group's magazine. If anyone does not want their work to be considered for inclusion in the book please let me know, otherwise your permission will be assumed.**

# GENERAL TOPICS III

## *Graham Kendall offers a few observations*

### **Newspaper Football Expert Monitoring**

I see in this weeks Racing & Football Outlook (December 10, 1994) that there is a reference to an Xperts table in the Sporting Life. As the context of the reference is clearly football (copy enclosed) I think we might be on a winner. The trouble is I don't get the Sporting Life. Can you, or someone who does get the Sporting Life verify whether this table exists? If it does, when does it appear and what information does it provide?

*I couldn't find anything in the Sporting Lifes in my file, but I'm not a regular reader either - can anyone else help?? - Stef*

### **Future Reviews**

Depending on the success of the forthcoming Computer Challenge for horses it might be worth considering holding a similar challenge for football programs? Perhaps next years British football season?

*A similar competition has been suggested for paper based horse racing systems as well - all worth considering, but are there enough potential programs or systems of a decent quality to make the effort worthwhile? Any other suggestions or strategies would be welcomed - Stef*

### **Where's the Beef?**

With regard to your editorial comment concerning the fact that too many items were not being followed up. This I believe could be remedied by having a section of the magazine which lists the topics currently under discussion, research etc. Other pertinent data listed might include the magazine issue number, date and page number the subject was introduced and the author's name and membership number.

In many cases help is often requested for research data to verify or explore system hypothesis. The trouble with this sort of generic appeal is that Everybody always assumes that Somebody else is going to do the work, and Nobody ever does! To resolve this problem I would suggest that where an appeal is made, fellow SMARTies should be asked to contact yourself to volunteer their services and register the fact that they will be carrying out investigation in a certain topic. You could then publish in the magazine, perhaps in the column suggested above, what topics are currently being

researched. This would have the advantage of keeping everyone informed of what topics have been raised, which are currently being investigated and what topics still need some input.

*The magazines “Feedback” section was an attempt to group together any ongoing threads of discussion, it was often difficult though to decide whether a particular letter was purely a response or giving new ideas. They were often both!*

*If volunteers do come forward it would appear to be a good idea that the magazine should list the current lines of research and/or investigation being undertaken. I think it is important to stress though that we must maintain our “help each other” values. It would not be reasonable if the same name was appearing again and again asking for others to do research, without offering to do any themselves. We of course already have Alan Coldrick who acts as our researcher with Raceform Update and its predecessor, the Handicap Book.*

*We have a member who has offered to be a “librarian” for system comments and reviews, as a service to other SMARTies. The idea would be to pass on the collective opinions and comments between club members regarding methods or services from those who have had first hand experience.*

*- Stef*

## **National Lottery**

I enjoyed the mention you gave to the exploits of my parents syndicate. Well the story gets better and better! The following week which was the second draw the syndicate entry did not win anything. Surprise, surprise I hear you cry! But, my aunt also bought her own ticket. Yes, that's right, she won and another £10 was gleefully waived in my face! Last Saturday (the third draw) produced no winning tickets, thank goodness, and everyone was extremely disappointed but are keeping their fingers crossed for this Saturday's outcome! All I can say is that these monkeys must either be working overtime or they just don't understand probability theory!

Regards,      Graham Kendall

*(A relation of mine has bought, that's right, spent money on, a pen with a little Perspex globe and a small narrow tube attached to its top. You shake it all about, then hold it upright whereupon six of the little numbered balls in the globe filter down into the tube. On the strength of this wizardry he doubled his stake from £2 to £4. A right load of little numbers if you ask me*

*- Stef)*

 SMARTsig



***The Internet connection is bringing in some comments at last, via the email route. The first is from a new member from Scotland***

## **CAN I GIVE UP MY DAY JOB YET?**

**T**hanks for my first copy of SMARTsig magazine (January). I was slightly shocked, though, on skimming through it, to find my own (not too common) name staring up at me! It was in the Internet stuff, unfortunately gracing some comments that could be read as anti systems! I have, however, redeemed myself, I hope, with a more recent article in the same forum (Usenet's rec.gambling) putting the other side of the case. The subject is "Horse racing system".

I've been lucky enough to have Internet access at work for several years, and, perhaps equally important, sufficient flexibility in my work arrangements that I can spend some time taking advantage of that access. (I'm an academic researcher, in environmental economics.) Obviously it is of no benefit to me to see this material printed in the newsletter, but I'm aware of my minority status in this context. The main problem with it I can foresee is the dire signal to noise ratio in most of these online forums. There seems to be something about it that encourages the disengagement of brain from mouth (or fingers)--something from which I'm no more immune than anyone else, unfortunately!

Regarding the proposed computer network, can I strongly advise that it be based on the Internet? If all the members simply signed up with a provider like Demon or Delphi, then assuming the numbers were not too great one could volunteer as a distributor, to copy mail sent to him/her to the rest of the group.

This is known as a "mailing list", and software is available to automate the process when numbers warrant it. Another Internet-based possibility is that a Usenet newsgroup be set up. For a group of people with modems simply to connect to each other on an ad hoc basis would, IMHO (Internet-speak: in my humble opinion), be a recipe for disaster. For one person to set up a bulletin board to which all others could connect would be more sensible, but, again, IMHO, much more trouble than it was worth.

Most Internet providers have PoPs (points of presence: generally telephone numbers) in major conurbations other than the one in which they happen to be located, allowing most people to connect at local call rates. And look at all the other benefits you get from Internet access!

I'm very much a novice in betting systems, but fairly experienced in Internetworking and computing in general--maybe someone will be willing to swap some of their knowledge for some of mine? First question: what system will let me pack in the day job with confidence that I can maintain my present standard of living? Answers, as they say, on a postcard (or preferably by email) to: Robin Faichney, Economics Department, University of Stirling, Stirling. FK9 4LA

**SMARTsig**

*Nick Mordin this week I notice has an article in Weekender trying to convince non computer people that they (computers) are the way to go! He discusses the Internet amongst other items. Unfortunately, if that's the right word, he recommends Compuserve as the way to get your Internet connection. As far as I'm aware, and I'm sure Robin or someone else will correct me if I'm wrong, Compuserve was around doing it's own thing for a good while, and opened a connection to the Internet in order to survive.*

*They charge in US dollars and it works out at around £6 to £7 per month as a membership fee, and then an hourly rate is slapped on for all your connection time. This does make it a comparatively expensive option to get into the Internet. I know we have at least one Smartie who accesses via PC User group, which appears to be one of the cheapest ways in, although mainly for email purposes only, all the Internet facilities are not available to him.*

*Demon are the next step up on a cost scale, charging around £10 to join, then £10 per month, with no time charges and you do have access to all the services. Two snags, from my experience at any rate, they don't have enough 'phone lines to cope, constantly engaged! and the service is not at all user friendly. I have plumped for Delphi, at £10 per month, no signing on fee, and 4 hours free on line time per month. Decent software is supplied, giving a menu system which protects the user from the unfriendly Unix commands that are native to the system. Slightly restricted service, but it suits my needs at the moment.*

*I've asked Robin if he can give us something on the subject of modems for our computer users.*

*- Stef*

***The Daily Mail's "Formcast" ratings appear to be one of the best of the traditional dailies. A look here on where and how to make the best use of them.***

## **CHOOSING THE RIGHT RACE**

***Jim Streek***

**I** have had a couple of days off and delved through my records concerning the best races for ratings using the Daily Mail's Formcast. I do not have records of 1994 flat season, but I do have them for 1993.

My method was to select the top rated in all three year old, non handicaps of one mile, plus any odd yardage. From May 1st to the end of September. In 1993 this produced 50% winners and a profit of 33.78 points. The best months were May and June.

I gave this method to Ray Webster and he said that it could be improved with his following rules:-

Same races etc., but . . .

Seven runners or above only  
Back the forecast favourite provided that  
It is rated 78 (top) or 77 (Joint 77 is included)

1993 results, 54 selections, 34 winners.

I fully realise that checking past results is never a good idea when formulating a selection method and therefore I will check Ray's rules this coming flat season. Perhaps anyone interested would like to do the same.

I will also check the all weather meetings, as a quick look back to December 1st to date shows promising results.

During this period there have been eleven non-handicap, three year old races over five furlongs to a mile.

Seven have been won by the top rated.

**SMARTsig**

## SMART SWAP SHOP

If you have any items for inclusion in SwapShop please send details to SMARTsig. Your telephone number or address will be included unless you say otherwise. Alternatively you may use your membership number as a box number, in this case please include 2 x 1st class stamps to cover any postage.

### **To obtain items from the SwapShop, either;**

- contact the address or telephone number accompanying the ad.  
Or, in the case of a box number;
- send a letter or telephone SMART with;
- your name
- membership number
- preferred contact address/telephone number
- the reference number of the item(s)

### **DO NOT SEND ANY MONEY WITH YOUR REQUEST**

The goods are being offered by our members - not by SMARTsig  
Many items offered through SwapShop will keep their value even when you have finished with them, simply recycle them once again through our SwapShop pages.

---

**FOR SALE:** (All mint condition) Betting Systems that Win (Statistician pp128) £2.50 - Playing Bookie with the Bookie (Richard Rees pp16) £2.50 - The Winning Streak (P Graham pp168) £7.50 - The Value Seeker (P Graham pp44) £2.50 - Formula Two - The Science of Fixed Odds Success (James Ashley pp69) £10 (was £79.99) - A "Job Lot" of approx 80 racing systems (both flat and jumps) approx pp200 £15

***OR £30 for the lot (post free)***

**Trevor Southern 0386 831172**

---

**FOR SALE or EXCHANGE:** Formula Two - Rate & Assess (Midgley) - Sporting Life Guide to Greyhound Racing & Betting - Winners Always Back Winners (Holt) - Computer Racing Form (1987) - Timeform Perspective 1990 - Always Back Winners (Stewart) - Favourites and Placepots (Betts) - Mega Wins from Clever Betting (Betts) - Winning the Placepot of(f) Course (Betts)

**Tickler 0270 820011**

---

**FOR SALE or EXCHANGE:** Make Your Betting Pay (T Stafford) - Races & Race Horses (Flat 1983) - Perman Aussie Soccer Annual 1992 - How to Bet & Win (Consul 1973) - Fineform Selection Guide (Holt) - Winning Ways (G Ennor) - Daily Mirror Companion to Racing - How to Win at Racing (Flint & North) - Trackwise 81 (SCHB) - Bet for Profit the Easy Way (Murrell) - Playfair Racing Annual 1987 - Betting for Profit (G Randall) - Computer Racing Form 1985 - Ladbrokes Pocket Companion 1989/90 NH - The Intelligent Punters Survey no.2 - Be a Successful Punter (Holt) - The Dawson System - Backing Trainers 1992 Flat (Ashford & Carnaby) - Betting to Win (Supernap) - How to Win the Pools by Really Trying (GB Stone) - Alex Bird (A Bird & T Manners) - Puntersense! (Graham publications) - Racehorse Ratings 1982 (D Whitford) - Racing Certainty (T Mirren) - Form Book Analysis (Midgley) - Big Races, How to Bet & Win (Statistician) also . . . .  
**WANTED:** Winners back Winners (Holt) - Any racing system with a profitable record.

**Bill Priest 0203 316331**

---

**FOR SALE or EXCHANGE:** The Complete Professional Horse Racing System (WJ Davies pp192) - Complete Guide to Horse Race Selection & Betting (Braddock pp272) - Lose Less, Win More at Gambling (J Lemon pp204) - Dark Secrets of the Turf (J White pp175) - Racing to Win (Statistician pp79) - Profitable Betting Strategies (Holt pp104) - The Favourites Report (pp32) - The Secret Companion (M Thole pp40)

*Will sell as job lot for £30 inc postage or WHY?*

**Rex Towers 0481 44565**

---

**WANTED:** Pace Makes The Race by Tom Hambleton and any Trainers reviews/statistics for 1989-92 flat seasons.

**Glen Alco 0923 269658**

---

**WANTED:** How to Win at Handicap Racing by Patrick Kilgallon.

**Ray Webster 0472 824931**

---

**WANTED:** Racing Post Form Book (Flat 1993) - Superform Races & Racehorse paperback flat editions 1990, 91, 92 & 94.

**Vic Lee 0623 633371**

---

**WANTED:** Computer Racing Form

**Philip Alexander 0709 377628**

---

## **HELP WANTED**

### ***RID accuracy in question***

I am a subscriber to the Racing Information Database printouts, and there may be discrepancies between the printouts and the actual tipsters results. If anyone subscribes to a tipping service covered by R.I.D. or has any other information could they please contact me. Jonathon Wellingham  
7 Hathway Walk, Easton, BRISTOL, BS5 0UY - Tel: 0117 955 1326

*My first reaction was to wonder just what information you base the “actual tipsters results” on Jonathon?*

*However, I made a couple of enquiries on your behalf. I spoke to Ken Botham, who now runs R.I.D. who assured me that the information provided by his company was exactly that provided by the tipsters themselves, and is all proofed to R.I.D. in advance of the “off”. Where discrepancies can occur apparently, is in the profits made columns. When making their calculations, R.I.D., as would be expected, take into account ALL expenses incurred by obtaining the tipster information in the first place and when placing the bet “off course”, betting tax, cost of service, premium rate ‘phone calls, etc., etc. The end result is that R.I.D. publish the resulting profit AFTER the deduction of ALL expenses incurred.*

*I also cleared it with an independent source, another SMARTie who has subscribed in the past to R.I.D. He informed me that the printouts they issue could be confusing at first sight, but once you become accustomed to their house style, and the expenses incurred element, it was all fairly straight forward. In his experience, he had not witnessed any occasion where R.I.D. were not spot-on, but of course he did not go to the expense of checking every entry! Some things have to be taken on trust.*

*(R.I.D. are at 12 Southwest Centre, Archer Road, SHEFFIELD. S8 0JR)*

---

### **Professional Gambler**

I would like to correspond with any professional within the group, if they are willing. By professional, I mean those who actually make their living from placing bets, as opposed to those working in the industry, such as journalists and tipsters, etc. Any offers? - Brian 041 779 2236

---

## **Commercial Systems**

I would be interested in hearing any members views on any or all of the following commercially available systems;

Logic Indicator

High Class Rating Method

Any Racing Data Publications / Midgley System

TR Fogarthy 58% winners

System 713

The Association System

These at least appear to have some sound logic behind them, though I have not tested them for any length of time. Have any SMART members used these systems and have any results / feedback to share? Through the magazine.

---

## **BOOKS & PUBLICATIONS**

### **GENERAL BOOKS**

An effective 10% discount and free postage on books. Book finding service. Contact Jay Cook, The Bookshop & Gallery, 40 Earsham Street, Bungay, Suffolk, NR35 1AQ. Tel: 0986 895164. Fax: 0986 895748

### **BRED**

Tim Coe the author is able to offer a discount to full members. Contact Tim Coe, 19 Cherry Way, Upper Halliford, Shepperton, Middx. Tel: 0932 779393

### **RACING POST**

Current form books @ £18.50 (all prices are post paid. Contact me here at SMARTsig. Cheques etc. made payable to S. Perry.

### **SOCCER**

Every professional football result is available in book and on computer disk from a member of the Association of Football Statisticians.

Tony Brown, 4 Adrian Close, Beeston, Nottingham. Tel: 0602 736086

### **HORSE RACING**

Computer Raceform offer their "form on a disk" at a discount to full members. FLAT 1994 - Now available!

# THE HELPING HANDS

## Members who have offered help, research, etc.

Write to SMART with any queries, the answers will then be published for everyone's benefit. If any members would care to offer their services to other club members please let me know.

---

### Alan Coldrick

Has a very extensive collection of Raceform Update and Handicap books (Raceform's previous guise). Offers research, all manual, for facts, figures and the like from this collection.

---

### Stefan Perry

Home league and cup soccer on computer from 1987/8 season, can test theories etc. over that period.

---

### Tim Coe

Racehorse breeding and the study of pedigrees

---

### Mel Collier

Help with Racing Post facts and figures, Topspeed, Postmark, Pricewise, Diomed, etc.

---

### Rex Towers

Overseas betting



# SMART

## Merit Table

Our ‘Merit Table’ of all the products and services referred to by members in their correspondence. No quoted comments will be added, simply one mark under the (+) column when I hear a positive comment, or under the (–) if the remarks are not complimentary. A mark under the ( ) column denotes a non committal statement.

Additional marks and/or other products will be added to the list as the months roll on. SMARTsig will leave you to your own individual interpretations.

Product/Service Type		numbers of comments		
		(+)	( )	(–)
Eternity	Horse System			1
Law of Averages***	Horse System			1
New Ultimate	Horse System			1
Peter Wards ‘One a Day’	Horses System			2
Strudden method	Horse System			1
Winning for Life	Horse System			1
ALL premium line tipsters			off the scale (–)	
Winning Line	Tipping service	2	1	2
Brimardon	Horse Computer Prog	1		
Combeys	Horse Computer Prog	1	1	
Computer	Horse Computer Prog			3
Oracle Racing System	Horse Computer Prog			4
ProPunter	Horse Computer Prog	3	1	2
22-1 football method	Football Fixed Odds			1
James Ashley Formula2	Football Fixed Odds		1	3
Perfection	Football correct scores			2

\*\*\* This system makes a profit usually!

However it employs the notorious “double stakes after a loser” method. This technique really is a recipe for DISASTER!

It is not a case of if it goes wrong, but when!

**SMART SOCCER 2.2 DRAW SYSTEM**  
**The THIRD profitable month in succession!**  
**(albeit only just!)**

**Results from 17 December 1994 to 28 January 1995**

17/12/94	Birmingham v Leyton Orient	2.0	
24/12/94	Birmingham v Cambridge	1.1	
28/12/94	Manchester U v Leicester	1.1	
2/1/95	Blackburn v West Ham	4.2	
3/1/95	Manchester U v Coventry	2.0	
7/1/95	Dundee v Stranraer	2.0	
	Stenhousmuir v Arbroath	4.0	
	Aylesbury v QPR	0.4	
	C Palace v Lincoln	5.1	
	Leicester v Enfield	2.0	
	Nottm Forest v Plymouth	2.0	
	Tottenham v Altringham	3.0	
	Wimbledon v Colchester	1.0	
10/1/95	Birmingham v Hereford	3.1	
17/1/95	Leeds v Walsall	2.2	28/1 (Cor/Hills)
	Watford v Scarborough	2.0	
	Morton v Queens Park	2.1	
18/1/95	Liverpool v Birmingham	1.1	
28/1/95	Blackburn v Ipswich	4.1	
	Manchester U v Wrexham	5.2	
	Newcastle v Swansea	3.0	
	Aberdeen v Stranrear	1.0	
	Celtic v St Mirren	2.0	
	Dundee Utd v Clyde	0.0	
	Kilmarnock v Morton	0.0	
	Montrose Hibs	0.2	

**Balance Sheet to date:**

Bets	Stake (inc Tax)	Returns	Profit or Loss
154	169.4	136	33.4 loss (- 19.8%)

FROM RACEFORM  
THE OFFICIAL FORM BOOK ON DISK

Raceform's Peter Howes has informed me that the 1994 flat season is now available, at the same discounted rate of £40.00 (excluding VAT) to SMARTsig members. They now have the last four flat and the last four jumps seasons available in PC disk format.

To allow more space for our articles, the official Raceform application coupon will no longer be printed in the magazine on a regular basis, but existing customers should have no problems ordering direct on 0635 578080.

New members wishing to take advantage of the Raceform offer will need the official coupon, available in back issues or write to me with a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

**REPRINTED BACK COPIES OF SMARTsig MAGAZINE**

**The demand for the magazine has been such that all the first print runs have been sold out. All have now been re-printed (with paper covers) and are available direct from SMARTsig at £4.00 per copy including postage.**

## BRAIN TEASER

To keep your grey-matter ticking over until the next magazine, here's a simple, non-betting related, but very much a logical thinker's puzzle.

What is the next symbol (e) in the sequence below?

Clue, get it right and you'll be able to produce ALL others that follow on thereafter!

(a)   (b)   (c)   (d)            (e)

↑   ♡   8   ♣            ?

*That's All Folks!*

*Back again, this time next month*

*- Stef*

## **Systems, Methodologies And Rational Thinking - Special interest group**

The SMARTsig magazine is published by

Stefan Perry at  
**PO Box 44**  
**HAYLE**  
**TR27 6YH**

**Tel: 01736 754400**  
**Fax 01736 754400**  
**email stef@smartsig.com**

With help from and thanks to:

SMARTsig members (letters, contributions & advice)  
A large letter box and an understanding Postman  
IBM compatible PC (published using Microsoft Word)  
Panasonic laser printer (it's never worked so hard!)  
An understanding family (at the moment)  
A very large work area (I am a messy worker!)  
Turkey & mince pies (to soothe the savage b(r)east)  
Any one else I've forgotten

### **The legal stuff:**

The opinions expressed in this Magazines are not necessarily those of the Editor or publisher, but are taken directly from members contributions. SMARTsig do not accept any liabilities for inaccuracies within the content of this magazine, nor for any consequences thereof. We will always recommend that you do not bet with money you cannot afford to lose.

SMARTsig encourages and welcomes contributions from it's members but are unable to accept any responsibility for loss or any damage of any material, solicited or not. Everything published in done so in good faith, and SMARTsig members are expected to honour our Codes of Conduct. All material printed in this magazine is the copyright of SMARTsig and the contributor, subject to it not having been published elsewhere beforehand.

This Magazine nor any of it's contents must not, in whole or part, be copied, duplicated, loaned or distributed without the written permission of the copyright holder(s).