

SMARTsig magazine 2.5 - May 1995

In this months issue . . .

2	Upfront	Club news &views
4	General Comments	John Williams
6	Quality Horses - subsequent findings	Jon Wellingham
11	Kelly Criterion & Betting Tax	Zorro
14	Lottery Statistics	Bob Tomlinson
16	National Lottery - Grounds for divorce?	SMARTsig
17	Information Wanted	SMARTsig
18	Narrowing the Field in Handicap races	Trevor Southern
20	Golf Betting	Batman
21	Trainers for Courses - Update	Alan Coldrick
24	How can this Horse System be improved?	Bill Sheen
27	Back the Parallel Runs to End	Tom Wiggans
30	Don't Rush In	SMARTsig
31	Trainer & Jockey Combinations	John Purcell
32	Course Peculiarities	Ray Webster
34	Australian Soccer Fixed Odds	Trevor Southern
37	Customer Intelligence Network	Stefan Perry
40	Greyhounds, Sorting the One Good Bet	Philip Alexander
44	J Ryder Staking Plan	Peter Jacobs
49	Computer Challenge	April update
53	Free Software Offer	More free progs
54	2.2 draws update	April update
54	Books & Publications	What's available
55	Help offered	A helping hand
56	SMART Swap Shop	Recycleyour books
59	SMART Merit Table	Current standings

SMART

Up Front

This months magazine was put together a little earlier than usual because of other commitments. Consequently, the monthly figures I publish to keep you informed of progress with the Computer Challenge and 2.2 correct scores are not fully up to date, but things will be back into line again for the May edition. The computer challenge figures are worth a look though, a couple of the programs are beginning to show their paces now, and both have 100% success so far this month.

Commiserations to Adrian Maguire who's broken arm effectively puts him out of the NH jockeys championship. Looking at the new flat season as it begins to blossom, will *Celtic Swing* live up to all the hype surrounding him? We've now seen the turn of foot shown by Andre Fabre's *Diffident* in Newmarket's European Free Handicap. Seems little doubt about the potential there.

PARANOIA

More "bookie wiggling" over the last few weeks with an investigation over Greyhound betting at Mildenhall and the alleged snooker "coup" for Jimmy White to win 10-2. I often wonder just how much of this is paranoia and how much is truth.

The most bizarre decision of the month though surely was when betting was suspended for the Formula One drivers Championship, because of an enquiry by the FIA into a breach of fuel regulations during the seasons first Grand Prix. The bookies were saying that bets could not be accepted until the outcome of the enquiry was known in case it affected the overall points awarded in the drivers championship.

Am I hearing this correctly?? The bookies will not take bets until they know the outcome?? But I thought bookies were there to take bets on events where the outcome was *not known*. Is something happening here that I've missed?

"No bets taken on today's race until tomorrow please!"

RACE OR PROCESSION?

Talking of F1, it would appear that the new rules have done little to improve the fact that nowadays each event would be more aptly named a Formula One procession, not a race! The three quarter of an hour highlights shown on BBC TV did not show any overtaking manoeuvres at all, I don't suppose there were any worth showing, the only overtaking that takes place is the usual front runners lapping the tail enders. Watching paint dry springs to mind!

THE OWL HAS LANDED (and finding it difficult to take off again)

Whilst on the subject of paint drying, Sheffield Wednesday are still available at 12/1 to be relegated - they have to be the worst in the division at present. I heard tell that one Owls fan, so sickened following his sides home drubbing by Forest nailed his season ticket to a door at the ground and left it there in disgust. He changed his mind when he arrived home, (something to do with Yorkshiremen and "Brass") and rushed back down to the ground. He found his ticket on the floor - someone had stolen the nail!

PRODUCT REVIEWS

Currently we have members looking at various products on our behalf and I hope to report on their findings in due course. The products under the spotlight are;

The Racing Sword - by Alan Knight

Bet Better - Robin Lloyd

Genesis - J MacDonald

Racing System Builder - Racedata

With regard to product reviews, this month sees the launch of our *Customer Intelligence Network*. I believe it promises to be the best possible information source any potential customer could ever wish for - a chat with someone who has bought the product themselves.

Meanwhile - We are getting quite an international reputation as time goes on. As well as many members in England, Scotland and Wales, our magazine now goes to Northern Ireland, Eire, Sweden, Germany, France, Italy, Australia. and Peru! We may yet be printing betting strategies submitted for Armadillo racing! Watch this space!

- Stef



One of our newer members writes with . . .

GENERAL COMMENTS

John Williams

Dear Stef,
Thanking you for the back copies of SMARTsig. I found the content very interesting indeed. I'm sure it will fuel many ideas for successful punting. I found your comments on operating a system most informative, whereby you state one should not modify ones original system rules, but operate another system.

A brief introduction about myself. My preference is for horse racing, and I run **Compunder, Combayes, Betting Manager, Tipster 4 Windows and Bet Better** on my PC. I have to admit that I am on a learning curve, and would appreciate contact regarding the above programmes. In my opinion, I think members should be told about sham tipping services, computer programmes and so forth. I realise this might land SMARTsig in trouble legally, but surely this information could be available to members who requested it privately?

(funny you should say that - see the article regarding our NEW Customer Intelligence Network on page 37 - Stef)

It was interesting to read about various comments regarding football systems within the pages of SMARTsig, for according to Luke Johnson and Hugh Osmond in their book **Betting To Win**, they list the approximate percentage of money returned as winnings after tax on various types of gambling as follows:-

Casinos	97.5%
Licensed cash bingo	95.0%
On-course betting	88.0%
Off-course betting	81.0%
Slot machines	70.0%
Public lotteries	50.0% or less
Football pools	30.0%

So what drives you football punters in your pursuit? I realise this might have thrown the cat amongst the pigeons, but is it not fair comment?
(Don't confuse Football pools with fixed odds or spread betting - Stef)

On a few occasions I have had some trouble placing a bet with some of the major bookmakers when stating on my betting slip "Odds-on No bet". I wrote to Jimmy Stevenson of *The Weekender* and he kindly sent me the following reply recently.

"There is nothing wrong with such bets - indeed quite a few regular backers, particularly those using systems, use such conditions - but staff in some shops may find it unusual and query it with managers. Provided your bet is properly staked with the terms clearly written on the slip, such a bet is perfectly in order".

I thought these comments might be of help to other members in the same predicament.

I would like to comment on Rex Towers findings in issue 2.3 page 41. Firstly, what is his Classic system? What are the rules? Whilst on the subject, I think Rex would also profit if he backed the winners of the first four classics for a maximum of two runs, or until they won during the current season.

(Typographical error in that issue, as explained last month. The system was to back the un-named favourite in all of the Classic races - Stef)

Regarding his comments about horses that win first time out, and to back them again. Has he checked those horses that win first time out, but not their second run, and back them to win on their third run? I think he would find that the strike rate would be slightly less, but the odds might be greater owing to the fact that not so many punters would back them. One for the boffins maybe?

In issue 2.1 page 11, I read with interest the system by The Flying Fox. One comment. What does he do now that Diomed and Spotlight are one?

Concerning my own personal findings, I looked at some 80 odd all aged flat handicaps during last season (excluding sellers, amateur and ladies). I noticed that there was quite naturally a definite bias of winners in the top two weighted. This bias increased with distance, although the sample got smaller. I also found that there was a definite bias towards the age of the winners as well. Combine this with other factors, and one could have the makings of a profitable system. Maybe one for Philip Alexander?

Finally, a general question to anyone qualified to answer it, which is the easiest to profit from, Flat or N.H?

 SMARTsig

Following a method given the second issue of SMART, September 1994, by Roy Thornton presents a follow-up assessment.

QUALITY HORSES - SUBSEQUENT FINDINGS

Jonathon Wellingham

In the September issue Roy Thornton detailed the very impressive results for the last two seasons for his *Quality Horses* system. One of the qualifying rules requires horses to have a *Racing Post* speed figure in excess of ninety. As I don't take the Racing Post I decided to check the system using *Raceform Update's* speed figures.

Unfortunately, the Raceform Update figure has a different range to the Racing Post and barely any horses in Raceform have a speed figure in excess of ninety. I don't know how to compare the two, so I decided on a base figure of fifty. (Methodmaker has said on several occasions that a speed figure of fifty plus is a good indication of a future winner).

But, just in case this wasn't high enough, I also produced results for speed figures of sixty plus and for seventy plus.

The full results are listed here, along with a list of the qualifiers. The results are rather disappointing and I wondered whether Roy had similar results in 1994 using the Racing Post's figures?

For new SMARTsig members here is an outline of Roy's method

- 1. Qualifiers in Handicaps worth over £15000 to the winner*
- 2. There must be at least twelve runners*
- 3. List all horses which finish in the first four, provided they have produced a speed rating greater than 90 and this figure is at least as good as its previous race.*
- 4. Back all qualifiers next time they run*

- Stef

Speed figure	runners	winners	points staked	points returned	points loss
50+	115	18	126.5	113.45	13.00
60+	86	15	94.6	91.95	2.60
70+	37	4	40.7	15.75	24.95

All figures include tax. The losses as a percentage of total staking were 10%, 3% and 61% respectively.

Quality Horses - Results for 1994 flat season;

<i>Race</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Qualifiers</i>	
Euro. Free	17005	No qualifiers	
Ladbroke's	18156	Missed Flight	p 7-1
		Just You Dare	unplaced
		Beauchamp Hero	unplaced
		Philidor	p 12-1
Victoria	21200	Face North	W 25-1
		No Extras	p 33-1
		Ducky Fuzz	p 7-2
		Gymcrack Premiere	unplaced
Jubilee	21397	Caleman	unplaced
		Soviet Line	W 7-2
		Embankment	p 5-1
Chester	29162	No qualifiers	
Wm. Hill	19087	No qualifiers	
Bromhead	15920	Hi Nod	p 9-2
		My Best Valentine	unplaced
		Kayvee	unplaced
Coral	23490	Classic Sky	unplaced
Tote Silver	18156	Dance Turn	W 15-2
		Fawran	unplaced
		Knave's Ash	unplaced
Whitsun	15535	No qualifiers	
Wm Hill	30954	Encore M'Lady	p 7-2
		Hever Golf Rose	p 8-1
		One on One	p 11-8
		Cool Jazz	unplaced

<i>Race</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Qualifiers</i>	
Ascot	25635	Sweet Glow	unplaced
		Bardolph	unplaced
		Doyce	unplaced
		Allmosa	W 6-4
Royal Hunt	52621	Lower Egypt	W 6-4
		Realities	p 7-2
Bessborough	25050	Master Charlie	unplaced
		Hasten to Add	p 3-1
		Darryy	p 7-1
		Chatham Island	unplaced
King George	23490	Midnight Legend	p 2-1
		Red Route	W 11-4
		Durable	W evens
		Mystic Hill	unplaced
Wokingham	52475	Venture Capitalist	unplaced
		Law Commision	unplaced
		No Extras	unplaced
		Rock symphony	unplaced
Britannia	26415	Wizard King	W 7-2
		Winter Coat	unplaced
		Vlaminck	unplaced
		Porphyrios	unplaced
Albermarle	16050	No qualifiers	
Ladbroke	18925	No qualifiers	
Northern Rock	15920	No qualifiers	
Cameron	16310	Duplicity	unplaced
		Saint Express	unplaced
		Double Blue	unplaced
		Lord Olivier	p 20-1
Northumberland Pl	62868	Tioman island	W 10-1
Old Newton	17831	No qualifiers	
Hong Kong	46182	Baron Ferdinand	unplaced
		Cezanne	W 9-2
Duke of Camb.	19900	No qualifiers	
Bunbury	24075	En Entendant	unplaced
		Celestial Key	unplaced
Magnet Cup	36390	Cezanne	p 9-4
		Mr Confusion	unplaced
		Geisway	unplaced
Food Brokers	19267	No qualifiers	
Wm Hill	35500	Young Buster	W 100-30

<i>Race</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Qualifiers</i>	
Tote Gold	36100	Sea of Rocks	unplaced
Golden Mile	48250	Fraam	unplaced
		Face North	unplaced
		Jawaal	unplaced
Eurolink	32460	No qualifiers	
Schroders	28027	No qualifiers	
Stewards	48250	For the Present	p 6-1
		Poker Chip	unplaced
		Lord Olivier	p 14-1
Colmans Nursery	20550	No qualifiers	
Brierly Inv	23962	No qualifiers	
Melrose	16309	No qualifiers	
Eagle Lane	15522	Numbered Account	unplaced
		Double Blue	p 11-2
		Hows Yer Father	unplaced
Tote Ebor	97361	Hasten to Add	unplaced
		Admirals Well	unplaced
		Solartica	unplaced
		Dover Patrol	unplaced
Bradf & Bing	20823	Lap of Luxury	unplaced
		Paonic	unplaced
		Lower Egypt	W 9-4
		Desert Green	unplaced
Knivesmire	15920	Marsoom	unplaced
		Retender	unplaced
		Let's Get Lost	unplaced
Great St Win	20340	Hever Golf Rose	W 4-1
		Amron	unplaced
Multibet Nurs	26190	No qualifiers	
Red Carrie Nurs	19737	No qualifiers	
Harcross	20775	Whitechapel	W 6-1
Tote Portland	17780	Hello Mister	unplaced
		Double Blue	unplaced
		Princess Oberon	unplaced
		Master Planner	unplaced
Rothmans	18910	Celestial Choir	W 7-1
Ladbroke	15460	Halling	W 8-1
		Green Crusader	W 100-30
		Laxford Bridge	unplaced
Wm Hill Diamond	15240	No qualifiers	
Ayrshire	16263	Leif the Lucky	unplaced

<i>Race</i>	<i>Value</i>	<i>Qualifiers</i>	
Ayr Gold Cup	51760	Alzianah	unplaced
		Hard to Figure	unplaced
Courage	15216	No qualifiers	
Tote Autumn	15312	New Reputation	p 9-1
		Golden arrow	p 2-1
Rothmans	18910	Gadge	unplaced
		Indian Fly	unplaced
		Prenonamoss	unplaced
		Star Manager	unplaced
Tote Festival	50200	Mur Taasha	unplaced
		Kayvee	unplaced
		Set The Fashion	unplaced
Ascot	48298	Whitechapel	unplaced
		Royal Seaton	unplaced
		On Air	unplaced
		Burooj	p 3-1
Jersey Nurs	24465	No qualifiers	
Cambridge	51279	Hunters of Brora	unplaced
		Mr Confusion	unplaced
		William Tell	unplaced
Coral Sprint	15790	No qualifiers	
Bovis	18490	Cape Merino	unplaced
Rothmans	28920	Chinour	unplaced
		Mo-Addab	unplaced
		Celestial Choir	unplaced
Cesarewitch	51175	No qualifiers	

Notes:

- If a horse is a non runner, I have included the next race result in which it actually ran
- If a horse qualifies under all the rules but hasn't run again in that season, it is not listed.
- The above list contains all qualifiers with a Raceform speed figure of fifty and above, I haven't identified or separated the sixty plus and seventy plus runners

Following the advice given by members in our last issue, here are a few wore words of wisdom on using the Kelly criterion with horse racing.

KELLY CRITERION & BETTING TAX **Zorro**

There were two articles in SMART 2.4 which addressed the issue of how to apply the Kelly criterion to horse race betting. Unfortunately they each gave a different answer!

The correct application of the Kelly criterion involves a stake which will win a proportion of the current bank equal to the expected monetary value of the bet. The formula given on page 44 gives correct answers although I prefer to use the following formula:-

$$K = \frac{B[W(\varnothing + 1) - 1]}{\varnothing}$$

Where:-
K = Kelly criterion stake
B = Bank
W = Win probability
 \varnothing = Odds available

The quantity above the line between the square brackets is the expected monetary value. The proportion of the bank that should be staked is this amount divided by the available odds.

As an example;

If the bank is £1000, win probability is calculated as .25 (i.e. 25%) and the odds available are 4 (i.e. 4-1), then the Kelly criterion bet is:

$$\begin{aligned} K &= 1000 \left[\frac{.25(5) - 1}{4} \right] \\ &= 1000 \left[\frac{0.25}{4} \right] \\ &= £62.50 \end{aligned}$$

But most people bet off course and must pay betting tax. How does the imposition of tax effect the size of a Kelly criterion bet? The formula below gives the size of stake to use. This is the actual stake assuming that tax is going to be paid on the stake when the bet is struck.

$$K = B \left[\frac{W(\varnothing + 1) - 1 - T}{(\varnothing - T)(1 + T)} \right]$$

Where:- K, B, W and \varnothing are as the first example and
 T = Tax rate (T = 0.1 for 10% tax rate)

Assuming a tax rate of 10% and the same bet as in the previous example the Kelly criterion stake would be:-

$$\begin{aligned} K &= 1000 \left[\frac{.25(5) - 1.1}{(3.9)(1.1)} \right] \\ &= 1000 \left[\frac{0.15}{4.29} \right] \\ &= £34.96 \end{aligned}$$

So the stake would be £34.96 with tax paid on producing a total outlay of £38.45 compared to the tax-free stake of £62.50. Note that although the tax rate is “only” 10% the effect on the Kelly criterion bet is much larger.

What's the catch?

Assuming that the calculated win probability W is correct, the Kelly criterion gives the optimum stake for maximising the bank in the long run with a zero probability of losing the whole bank. These two features are highly desirable so are there any reasons not to use Kelly?

The danger is that the stake is optimum ONLY if the calculated win probability is correct. In the example bet above if we have overestimated the win probability slightly so that W should be 0.2 and not 0.25 then the true Kelly stake is zero or negative (i.e. no bet) whether paying tax or not. So we have made a bet even though, in reality, we should not have.

In less extreme cases if we overestimate the win probability we will simply stake more than we should. This is more dangerous than it seems. If we stake more than double the true Kelly stake on a series of bets then we will lose money **EVEN IF THE BETS SHOW A FLAT STAKE PROFIT.**

However, if we stake LESS than the true Kelly criterion stake on a series of bets then we will not win quite as much but will still show a profit. As an added bonus, computer simulations show that the bank will tend to fluctuate less wildly and the percentage return on stakes is also likely to be higher.

So I join Erasmus and Jacques Black in suggesting that you stake less than the calculated Kelly criterion stake on your selections. It is difficult to say exactly how much less, as this depends entirely on the accuracy of your personal estimate of the horse's winning chance.

Of course, the best way of dealing with the problem is to make a more accurate assessment of the horse's winning chance. In fact, this is true whether you use Kelly criterion staking or not.

Naturally, each individual will have a different personal assessment of this probability, but those who are consistently the most accurate will also, in the long run, be the most successful.



SMART special interest group

We operate on your behalf, for you, and by you, the magazine content is shaped entirely by the contributions from you, the members.

If you want to open up new areas of discussion or make comment on others then drop me a line or send a fax.

The very best way to make full use of your membership is to join in the conversation, or to start the ball rolling on a new topic yourself. You know you've always intended to make a contribution, so go to it!

Remember, we are now read around the world!

Even in SMART there's no getting away from the National Lottery, a member presents his research.

LOTTERY STATISTICS

Bob Tomlinson

Having entered the National Lottery for fifteen consecutive weeks without even a return of the smallest prize of £10.00 - I decided to scrap my "Lucky" numbers and check the results of those first fifteen weeks to see if I could discover some sort of pattern to the results.

At the time of writing there has now been eighteen weeks of the Lottery up to and including March 18th. I soon gave up on whether odd or even numbers predominated - the total number of odd numbers to date are 57; the even numbers totalled 51 over the same eighteen week period! I then decided to arrange the forty nine numbers into seven groups of seven numbers;

i.e. 1 to 7 became group A; group B = 8 to 14; group C = 15 to 21; group D = 22 to 28; group E = 29 to 35; group F = 36 to 42; and group G = 43 to 49.

Here are my findings in week order and you will see there IS some sort of pattern emerging, even though these Lottery numbers are randomly selected.

● = hit

Week No.	groups A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	● ●	●		●	●		●
2	●	●	● ●		●		●
3		●	● ●		● ●	●	
4				●	●	●	● ● ●
5	● ●	● ● ●				●	
6	● ●			●	●	●	●
7		●	●		●	● ●	●
8	● ●		●	● ●	●		
9	●		●	●	●	● ●	
10	●		●		● ●		●

Week No.	groups A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	•		•	••	•		•
12	••					•••	•
13			••		••	•	•
14			•••		•	•	•
15	•	••	•		••		
16		••	•	•		••	
17	•	•		••	•		•
18		•	••	•	•	•	
TOTALS	16	13	18	12	19	16	13

From these statistics I decided that the best three groups were A, C & E; and the worst three groups were B, D & G.

So I took seven numbers from the best three groups and seven numbers from the worst three groups - then I used a hand held gadget which cost me £15.00 plus £1.25 postage & packing, called the Lottery Beater.

This gave me seventeen combinations of my fourteen numbers.

The first week I tried this was week 16 (March 4th). I used the first and second combinations which this gadget labelled games one and two - game one had one number among the results, but game two had three numbers, so I won, if you can call it winning, £10.00!

At the same time games ten and sixteen also would have won £10.00 each, and game 13 had four numbers up so I would have got £72.00 from that combination.

If I'd risked the whole seventeen combinations (or games) costing £17.00 in all I would have won £102.00;

deducting the £17.00 stake = £85.00 clear profit!

However, nothing since then!



National Lottery - Grounds for Divorce?

A major April Fool gag, involving gambling, was reported recently in a national newspaper. I must admit to not seeing the article myself, so the following is not exactly as it happened, but it will give you a flavour and an outline of what transpired. It was a practical joke played by a wife on her husband and the scenario went something like this.

As you may remember, April 1st was on a Saturday this year and the wife in question plotted her deed very carefully by setting things up the previous week. Neither she nor her husband were regular National Lottery players, so there was no one else around when she video recorded the TV Lottery draw on Saturday March 25th., the week prior to April 1st.

After making a careful note of the successful numbers drawn that day she then bought a ticket the following week and used those very same numbers on the new ticket. She did mention on one or two occasions throughout the week to her husband that she had bought a ticket - "For the hell of it!" - Just enough to nudge him into feeling a little of that expectancy, but without making too big a deal out of it for fear of raising his suspicions.

April 1st arrived at last, this was it, the big one! Make sure hubby is out of the way, load the video tape, open a can of his favourite amber liquid, double check, correct time, all systems go - right!

"George darling, are you coming in to join me for a drink, and bring my Lottery ticket, they're just about to make the draw" - Quickly presses the >PLAY button. -- George strolls in the room, and is greeted with -

"Will you check the numbers for me George, I'm busy doing this"

George awaits the draw. "We've got the first number -- Oh! and the second, -- my God AND the third" He's now sitting bolt upright, this is after all, **three out of three** -- "AND THE FOURTH!!"

"Are we doing well dear?"

"Quiet! I'm concentrating, YEEEEES!! - c'mon No. 6
YYYYEEEESSSS!!!!"

From what I gather George was left with this “Millionaire feeling” for about half an hour before she showed him the video.

I’m not sure what the final outcome was. Whether they both had a good laugh and George would have said things like; “*By Jove, what a cracking wheeze my dear, you are a card!*”, or whether it was seen to be the start of divorce proceedings on the grounds of severe mental cruelty.

If the trick had been played on you - how would you have reacted?

Well, well, - can’t you take a joke?



INFORMATION WANTED

**A system known as
THE POINTER
(circa 1970 ish)
by RACEMASTER
(now defunct)**

AND

**Any systems sold under the name of
JACK COPELAND
who is marketing several he chooses to call
WORKABLE RACING SYSTEMS**

**Any information about any aspect of the above two
would be gratefully received. Or contact with anyone
with access to, knowledge of, where to acquire them or
the publisher’s address/telephone no.**

Stefan Perry - SMARTsig

Handicap races are put under the microscope once again by member Trevor Southern, giving food for thought.

NARROWING THE FIELD IN HANDICAP RACES

Trevor Southern

With the flat season now underway I thought I would share some of my thinking on Handicap races. These do not add up to any hard and fast rules, but observations that hopefully will stir others into thinking along similar lines in the hope that some other suggestions may be forthcoming.

Without wanting to state the obvious, the official handicapper's job is to try and get all races to result in a dead heat of all the runners! However this does not happen - because the idea of handicapping cannot be an exact science - it is all down to an individual's judgement and people's opinions.

“. . . handicapping cannot be an exact science - it is all down to an individuals judgement . . .”

The chances of picking winners in each race is very difficult, but it is possible to perhaps narrow the field down to say 30% of the runners who have a good chance of winning (or at least being placed, for the purposes of each-way betting)

When looking at handicap races the following ideas may be of some help in this narrowing down process;

Going

On good ground the horses at the top end of the handicap should be looked at. Conversely, on soft ground the horses at the bottom end of the handicap should be noted. This is due to the extra “pull” of the weights on the horses carrying the greatest “extra baggage” in the softer ground conditions.

Distance

The longer is the distance of the particular race, the more chance that the “top weighted” horses will be disadvantaged by their extra weight. So, for example, if the race under scrutiny is of a minimum distance and on a sound surface, the highest weighted horses should be at their least disadvantaged and therefore “class” should tell.

***“ . . . the top
weighted horses
will be
disadvantaged . . . ”***

Conversely, if looking at a race of a longer distance, especially when the ground is on the softer side, the lower weighted horses should effectively be better off as the extra weight of the heavily handicapped horses would be exaggerated.

Now we have highlighted perhaps 40 - 50% of the field to concentrate on. The next step is to use the -

Betting Forecast

So, look at the horses that remain on your list that are still “in with a chance” and eliminate the horses that are not in the top 40 - 50% of the betting forecast. This will show the horses that are in with a real chance of winning, or at least, being placed.

This stage should narrow our group of horses with “winning prospects” down to perhaps 25% of the field, but now comes the most difficult part.

You may well have four or five horses left out of say a total field of twenty. I would feel most confident if any horse had any, some or all of the following points in its favour;

Draw

Obviously, a good draw rather than a bad one (this depends upon the course in question and the statistics available, but it is a distinct advantage on some courses)

Fitness

Has it run in the last thirty to forty days? more than this time lapse is reason to be sceptical.

Form

Has it won, or at least been placed in its last one, two or three runs?
Remember, most horses never win a race in any specific year!

Even after all this you still may have two or three horses left. However, the bonus of handicap racing is the good prices of the winners. I would not be averse to betting on three or four horses in a handicap if the odds were for example 8/1; 10/1; 10/1; 16/1. If you back all four and include the winner in this group you will still be getting the equivalent of 5/2 or 2/1 winner in a non handicap event.

Any improvements, comments on the above from members would be appreciated.



GOLF BETTING

Last season the following method of golf betting made substantial profits when operated on the European Tour. Using the Racing Post's listing of players as printed to show the betting and form before a tournament, and starting at the top of the list, mark any player who finishing position has improved on each of his previous three results. Ignore the tournaments where the player is marked with a dash (-), this indicates "did not play".

Again, using the Post's strategy of "Three off the tee", your selections are the three highest names which match the criteria.

e.g. from the Catalan Open listed in Racing Post on 13/4/95 the selections were;

B Lane	-/44/8/50/28/4	(16-1)
G Brand Jnr	-/64/-/35/28/-	(33-1)
R McFarlane	-/9/27/59/10/6	(66-1)

Unsuccessful on this occasion, but well worth checking out in future!
Because the US Tour has many more potential match-winners the strategy does not do as well when applied over there.

Batman



Armed with the advice offered after his August '94 piece on "Following Trainers", Alan Coldrick provides the updated figures.

TRAINERS FOR COURSES - UPDATE

Alan Coldrick

In the initial issue of SMART last August I advocated following trainers for courses as an endeavour to obtaining better priced selections. That was, to follow any of the top Trainers at a course where they had a minimum of a 25% strike rate.

The problem it gave was how to reduce the large number of selections without losing too many winners.

Subsequently Ray Webster suggested getting behind the overall strike rate and being more selective. That is by identifying *specific race types* where the Trainer in question is particularly strong.

This seemed to be a logical move so I have reviewed the Trainer statistics again by using my library of Raceform Updates, and this time only noting types of race with a higher than 25% Trainer strike rate. The list, which is updated weekly from my copy of Raceform follows.

***Trainers strike rates in excess of 25%
for Race Type & Course***

Cse	Trainer	STAKES			HANDICAPS		
		2yo	3yo	4yo+	2yo	3yo	4yo+
Asc	H Cecil	✓					
Ayr	B Hills		✓				
	J Ramsden	✓	✓		✓		
	M Stoute	✓	✓				
Bth	G Harwood		✓				
Bev	H Cecil	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Bri							
Car	M Tompkins	✓	✓	✓			
Cat	B Hills	✓	✓				
	H Cecil	✓	✓				

STAKES

HANDICAPS

Cse	Trainer	STAKES			HANDICAPS		
		2yo	3yo	4yo+	2yo	3yo	4yo+
Chep	H Cecil		✓				
	L Cumani		✓				
Ches	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	J Gosden	✓	✓				
Don	H Cecil	✓					
	J Gosden	✓					
Edn	Mark Prescott		✓				
Eps	NIL						
Flk	G Harwood	✓	✓				
Gwo	H Cecil	✓	✓				
Ham	NIL						
Hay	H Cecil	✓					
	J Gosden	✓	✓				
Kem	H Cecil	✓	✓			✓	
Lei	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	J Gosden	✓	✓				
Lin	G Harwood	✓	✓				
	H Cecil	✓	✓				
Nby	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	Chapple-Hyam	✓	✓				
Nwc	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	M Stoute	✓	✓				
	B Hills	✓	✓				
Nmk	NIL						
Not	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	L Cumani	✓					
Pon	ThomsonJones	✓	✓				
	L Cumani		✓				
	H Cecil	✓	✓				
Red	L Cumani		✓				
	ThomsonJones	✓	✓				
	H Cecil	✓	✓				
Rip	H Cecil	✓	✓	✓			
	M Stoute	✓				✓	
	L Cumani	✓					
Sal	G Harwood	✓			✓		

STAKES

HANDICAPS

Cse	Trainer	2yo	3yo	4yo+	2yo	3yo	4yo+
San	NIL						
Swl							
Tsk	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	J Dunlop		✓				
War	H Cecil	✓	✓				
Win	H Cecil		✓			✓	
Wol							
Yar							
Yrk	H Cecil	✓	✓				
	J Gosden	✓	✓	✓			
AW Courses							
Lin	NIL						
Swl	NIL						
Wol	M Johnston		✓			✓	✓
	M Reveley		✓	✓			
	Mark Prescott		✓				

Hopefully, this variation will bring the required improvement. There was a boost to confidence from Henry Cecil at Kempton on Easter Monday:-

3.40	3-y-o Stakes	Alrawda	Lost
4.45	3-y-o Stakes	Main Offering	Lost
		Minds Music	WON 14/1

The list, if nothing else, is quite illuminating in showing the areas where trainers with higher strike rates achieve their best results.

It might be worth following Henry Cecil's 2-y-o and 3-y-o stakes runners on any course



A member is looking for advice on which would be the best way of "fine tuning" his current system, he outlines his methodology below.

HOW CAN THIS HORSE SYSTEM BE IMPROVED?

Bill Sheen

Dear Stef,

I write seeking help to hopefully improve a method or system which I have been working on for some months.

At first it was giving me some very good priced winners but they were too widely spaced out and involved betting on the top two selections. However, with every refinement the prices have got smaller and the choice of races have become fewer, but as a novice to horse racing or any form of gambling I now find myself at the point of not knowing where to go from this point.

Like most punters I despise those long losing runs and then quickly lose heart. Yet I am finding it increasingly frustrating when the system goes sometimes a week without producing a qualifying bet, my ideal would be 'one bet per day'.

However I was most surprised to read how similar it is to the Van der Weil method which has encouraged me to believe I may be on to something.

My criteria for race selection is as follows;

1. Maximum of twelve runners per race.
2. Each horse must have a Racing Post Topspeed and Postmark rating.
3. At least two horses must have achieved at least 51% win/place ratio against the number of races run.

This criteria in itself is frustrating and on many days is putting me in the debit column at seventy five pence, the cost of the Racing Post.

Any way, on to the grading of the individual horses;

- a) Obtain the combined win/place ratio against the number of races run, and deduct the figure from 100.

- b) Divide the total amount of prize money by the number of races won. Award ten points to the highest average figure, twenty points to the next highest, and so on.
- c) Award 10 points to the best Postmark rating, 20 points to the next, etc., etc.
- d) Award 10 points to the best Top speed rating, etc. in the same way as for Postmark.

Each runner should now have four figures which, when added together gives a selection with the lowest score.

This selection must have finished first, second or third in its last run, if not, I have no bet on this race. Furthermore I have added the Peter Jacobs stipulation (issue 2.1, page 27). i.e. Flat, less than 2-1 no bet, NH, less than 6-4 no bet, and avoiding meeting when the going is heavy.

At the time of writing this has given fourteen betting opportunities and six winners, as follows;

Date	Course	Horse	RPost forecast SP		Actual SP
1/2/95	Wolver.	Go Hever Golf	7-4	W	9-4
3/2/95	Southwell	Russian Heroine	4-1	L	
	Kelso	Uranus Collenges	11-4	W	11-4
	Kelso	Leotard	11-4	L	
4/2/95	Lingfield	Press the Bell	7-4	L	
8/2/95	Wolver	Mazilla	7-2	L	
	Wolver	Novfari	4-1	W	4-1
--	--	No bets - on holiday	--	--	
17/2/95	Southwell	Posted Abroad	7-4	W	Evens
18/2/95	Lingfield	Nigels Lad	9-2	L	
23/2/95	Huntindn	Boston Rover	6-1	L	
	Huntindn	Celtic Barle	11-4	W	7-4
	Lingfield	Three Arch Bridge	9-4	L	
1/3/95	Wetherby	Call my Guest	3-1	W	11-8
4/3/95	Lingfield	Perilous Plight	9-2	L	

From this list I notice that I haven't had a winner at Lingfield nor on a Saturday (which is my long standing jinx)

At level stakes, and including tax this is profitable, however, I am currently looking at a staking plan to suit this system bearing in mind that there are no long odds winners.

Bank: £500

Divide bank by fifty to find point value.

Stakes based upon Racing Post forecast starting prices.

6-4	=	2.75 points
13-8	=	2.5 points
7-4	=	2.5 points
15-8	=	2.25 points
2-1	=	2 points
85-40	=	2 points
9-4	=	1.75 points
5-2	=	1.75 points
11-4	=	1.5 points
3-1	=	1.5 points
100-30	=	1.25 points
7-2	=	1.25 points
4-1 +	=	1 point

There could be value in considering further reduced stakes for longer odds, or betting on two selections or each way bets for even longer odds but I do not have the results to qualify any argument for doing so.

I look forward to any responses to my methods and staking plans and have no objection to anyone contacting me direct with the view of keeping the members updated in due course.



(Bill can be contacted direct on 01255 428388)

BACK COPIES of SMARTsig MAGAZINE

Any or all back numbers of the magazine are available now

- cost £4.00 each fully inclusive

Another advocate of pattern recognition writes, not to everyone's liking I know, but as the writer points out it worked well many years ago and still has promise today.

BACK THE PARALLEL RUNS TO END

Tom Wiggins

Before the war (when every shilling counted) a friend and I backed horses most days, and if we had a losing day we couldn't believe it and used to hold an inquest into what had gone wrong.

Suffice to say that our target for each day was a target of say five shillings, which was a handy sum in those days, our wages being under three pounds per week. *(That's about what I currently make running SMARTsig - Stef)*

But we did use a systematic approach even in those days and our secret was figures, not form figures you understand, but numerical figures and spotting the trends.

In those days the now defunct *Sporting Chronicle* was the betting mans daily Bible. Under each meeting was a small box headed *Fate of the Favourites* which gave a table of up to date sequences, something along the following lines;

<i>Fate of the Favourites</i>	Current losing Sequence	L	W	Level Stakes		
				£	s	d
Race 1	4	78	30	-16	0	0
Race 2	0	70	38	+	8	6
Race 3	4	82	30	-	2	0
Race 4	0	92	26	-	1	12
Race 5	1	70	40	-	12	10
Race 6	3	78	28	+	1	17

Now we used to take the view that the figure four in races one and three would not grow much more before a winner would again reduce it to zero.

So we would back the SP favourite in races one and three on a stop-at-a-winner basis. These type of bets had to be sent away by letter post, as the run of the mill back-street bookie would not accept these S.A.A.W. wagers.

And sure enough, just as night follows day, that those figures of four, four would have changed to either zero, five; five, zero; or even zero, zero. Only on rare occasions will it change to five, five.

That was but just one of the methods we used, but the one I commend is better than the favourites system outlined above, as that would require records to be kept for every course, a formidable task!

The following method is much along the same lines, i.e. spotting the numerical trends and betting they will end. Firstly you need a copy of the Racing Post, or access to it (perhaps in your Bookies). Look at the National Press Challenge Table and select the experts who have the same number of current losers or winners, where that figure is greater than one.

Using the re-printed N.P.C. table on the opposite page we look under the column marked CURRENT SEQUENCE. Ignoring all the experts who have a current sequence of one, the first higher figure to be found is 5L next to the Sun's Templegate, telling us he has had a run of five consecutive losing naps.

Now look down the table to find another tipster with a 5L next to his name, there are in fact two.

Sort out all the tipsters with matching sequences and write them down in time order of their naps. e.g.

Selection found using the above criteria from the table opposite (page 29)

Sequ.	Paper	Expert	Nap	Time	Course
5L	The Sun	Templegate	Dark Oak	3.20	Ludlow
5L	Telegraph	T Stafford	Sailormait	3.30	Ripon
5L	D Express	Bendex	Alquarian	4.10	Ascot
4L	Sp Life	Augur	Dark Oak	3.20	Ludlow
4L	D Mail	R Goodfel'w	Wild Illusion	3.50	Ludlow
2L	Diomed	R Post	Star Mover	4.10	Ascot
2L	Postdata	R Post	Star Mover	4.10	Ascot

Reproduced by kind permission of the Racing Post

RACING POST
National Press Challenge
Winner: £2,000 • Runner-up: £500 • plus 12 £100 monthly prizes

RECORD FOR ALL RACES THIS YEAR				NAPS - for information				MONTHLY RECORD	
£1,000 BANK	NEWSPAPER & TIPSTER	WINS-TIPS	FAVS TIPPED	TODAY'S MAP	WINS-NAPS	£1 BET SEQUENCE	CURRENT	WINS-TIPS	£1 BET
£942.96	TODAY <i>Henry Rix</i>	362-1327	27% 48%	Sallormalle	3.30 Ripn	18-69	+£4.07 1W	14-71	-£8.53
£932.94	THE SUN <i>Templegate</i>	364-1320	28% 45%	Dark Oak	3.20 Ludl	17-66	-£8.81 5L	19-68	+£13.98
£911.04	TIMES <i>Thunderer</i>	383-1327	29% 53%	Perfect Pal	5.55 Asct	15-68	-£26.48 1L	19-71	-£4.38
£890.23	TOPSPEED	276-1258	22% 29%	Contrafire	4.30 Ripn	20-71	-£9.48 1L	17-68	+£9.98
£885.18	INDEPENDENT <i>Hyperion</i>	357-1317	27% 48%	Act of Parliament	3.05 Asct	17-65	-£1.80 7L	15-73	-£6.46
£884.36	SP LIFE <i>Augur</i>	394-1329	30% 59%	Dark Oak	3.20 Ludl	28-72	+£2.24 4L	21-72	+£1.83
£871.25	THE GUARDIAN	365-1325	28% 55%	Torrential	4.00 Ripn	19-67	-£3.52 6L	17-71	-£4.99
£868.85	DIOMED/SPOTLIGHT	378-1325	29% 56%	Star Mover	4.10 Asct	19-67	+£6.25 2L	21-72	+£0.88
£868.50	D STAR <i>Tony Lewis</i>	363-1307	28% 53%	Torrential	4.00 Ripn	23-68	+£19.91 1W	20-72	+£11.38
£867.48	D MAIL <i>Robin Goodfellow</i>	354-1323	27% 48%	Wild Illusion	3.50 Ludl	26-68	-£3.91 4L	14-72	-£24.40
£864.34	POSTMARK	365-1307	28% 50%	Isabeau	4.20 Ludl	22-68	-£2.75 1L	17-70	-£5.33
£844.37	TELEGRAPH <i>Tony Stafford</i>	361-1330	27% 52%	Sallormalle	3.30 Ripn	19-65	+£11.51 5L	18-71	-£34.38
£822.49	D EXPRESS <i>Bendex</i>	337-1328	25% 45%	Alqurawaan	4.10 Asct	17-71	-£25.20 5L	12-71	-£27.92
£802.76	POSTDATA	332-1311	25% 48%	Star Mover	4.10 Asct	14-67	-£11.48 2L	17-70	-£2.24
£781.29	D MIRROR <i>Newsboy</i>	341-1325	26% 50%	Nahar	3.35 Asct	12-63	-£9.30 11L	12-71	-£26.48

Competitors begin with a theoretical bank of £1,000, from which £1 is staked at SP on races for which the Racing Post carries a full selection box (usually all meetings except on Bank Holidays). The tipster with the largest bank at the end of the year wins £2,000; the runner-up £500. The tipster with the best record for each individual month receives £100.

The results from selections were;

Group 1 (5L) Won 13/8, Lost, Won 6/1

Group 2 (4L) Won 13/8, Won 6/5

Group 3 (2L) Lost, Lost

Using our plan of stop-at-a-winner, the balance sheet shows;

	Stake	Tax	Result	Win	Profit	Loss	%
Group 1	1 point	0.1	W 13/8	1.625	1.525		+152%
	STOPPED WITH WINNER						
Group 2	1 point	0.1	W 13/8	1.625	1.525		+152%
	STOPPED WITH WINNER						
Group 3	NO BET						

Bearing in mind that the wager is that the sequences will change, the two bets in Group 3 were both for the same horse in the same race. The sequence here cannot possibly change, therefore we have no bet.

This day has not been hand picked as a good example, try it yourself!



DON'T RUSH IN!

A report in *Odds On magazine* recently suggested following football teams to improve their form following the installation of a new Manager, at least in the short term.

DON'T DO IT!!!

It may seem on the surface to be a worthwhile idea to follow, but it's mainly the "high profile" managers (Ron Atkinson, Howard Kendall, etc.) who tend to make a difference. Ask Leigh Treymaine, a SMART member who follows Darlington, what a difference their new manager has had!

The statistics show that overall this strategy **does not work**, so tread very carefully!

Stef

A member asking for help with an approach he remembers as being a good one to follow.

TRAINER & JOCKEY COMBINATIONS

John Purcell

Dear Stefan
I write with something which has always interested me but unfortunately have never kept any records on the subject. It is concerned with the strike rates when certain jockeys are booked by particular trainers.

Some years ago I remember making some nice profits by backing Michael Hills when riding for Ben Hanbury. I also notice that Pat Eddery has an excellent strike rate when riding for some of the smaller trainers.

Maybe some members could enlarge on this subject, or inform us of any publications that might shed a little more light on this potentially profitable area.



An interesting concept which has been looked at before, although not in these pages, I await members feedback with interest.

One of the important rules this highlights I hope, is the trap many a would be system builders fall into - that is the folly of placing too much emphasis on the importance of the individual elements in a systematic approach. What the shrewd student should be aware of, as John points out, is the data derived from the combination of those elements. Instances that illustrate this point well are very easy to find and by way of an example I will refer to the current National Hunt Trainer and Jockey tables from the Racing Post (14/4/95).

R Dunwoody (21% winner/runner ratio) riding for MC Pipe (22%) and J Osborne (21%) riding for O Sherwood (21%). If this information was all we had to go on, one could be forgiven for taking the view from these statistics, that the Dunwoody/Pipe pairing would have the slightest of edges in a close contest. However, if we use statistics based on the results of each pairing, the Osborne/Sherwood team show a 30% strike against their opponents 28%, a role reversal. Such examples are not difficult to find, and of course, the more you combine the statistical elements, the more reliable should be the predicted outcome.

- Stef

Ray Webster is still sure that there is an abundance of specialist course knowledge within SMARTsig's membership.

COURSE PECULIARITIES

Ray Webster

Although I welcome the contribution from Trevor Southern concerning courses, my original idea was aimed at "testing out" the less publicised course details in order to assist in the overall task of winner finding.

There will be I feel certain, many members of SMART who have local course knowledge that would be of immense value to the membership as a whole. Especially if the sum of this knowledge was pooled and then printed in the magazine for the use of us all.

For instance, there are a number of tracks which seem to throw up course specialists and I believe these are;

Ascot
Beverley
Brighton
Catterick
Folkstone
Hamilton
Pontefract
Sandown

The best Flat courses for winning favourites are as follows;

Ayr
Catterick
Chester
Edinburgh
Folkstone
Hamilton
Newbury
Nottingham
Redcar
York

Because of track conformation some courses definitely favour top weights and I believe these are;

Brighton
Edinburgh
Epsom
Goodwood
Kempton
Lingfield

The race tracks with a stiff uphill finish tend to produce the most reliable form and I am always happy to take form from the following courses;

Ascot
Beverley
Carlisle
Haydock
Leicester
Newcastle
Newmarket
Salisbury
Sandown

Come on Smarties! There must be someone out there who has some similar insights into the peculiarities of a course they know well.

It doesn't have to be a full-blown article, a snippet of information or a single fact about a single course will do. A regular feature in the magazine, perhaps called "Course Watch - Update" could feature these items as, if and when they arrive at the SMART newsdesk.

SMARTsig members - It's over to YOU!



**SMARTsig
refreshes the parts other magazines
cannot reach**

SCHHHHHHHSSSSSMART you know who!

With the domestic football season nearing its close, we bring you a statistical analysis drawn from last years Australian fixed odds coupons.

AUSTRALIAN SOCCER FIXED ODDS

Trevor Southern

A while ago I did some work on the results from the Australian 1994 soccer season with the fixed odds on offer. I checked the results against the Home odds offered on our coupons.

This is on the same basis as the table I had published in the December 1994 SMART (1.5), although it is based on far less data than that previous offering, just the summer of 1994 in fact. But I think the information it provides should be a useful reference to members who wish to try the Summertime Aussie fixed odds coupon.

For those who may not be used to Australian soccer, a couple of pieces of advice;

Because there is often a vast difference in the ability of the two teams involved, with results such as 10-0, 12-0, 7-3, etc. not uncommon, and away wins throwing up similar score-lines, 3-8, 0-10, etc.,

This results in;

- A much bigger spread of prices for games, odds of 1/8, 1/7, 10/1, 12/1, etc. will often be found.
- No betting on Correct Scores.

Table 1 illustrates the frequency and percentages of actual results against the summer coupons fixed odds.

Conclusions:

Much of the information given in my table in the December issue show that the bookmakers tend to know what they're doing (surprise, surprise!) and get the results correct - IN THE LONG RUN!

**Table 1 - Results against Aussie fixed odds coupon
Home odds (for season 1994)**

Home Odds	Homes	Draws	Aways	Totals	H%	D%	A%
<= 1/7	4	0	0	4	100	0	0
1/6	1	1	0	2	50	50	0
1/5	6	1	0	7	86	14	0
2/9	1	1	1	3	33	33	33
1/4	5	2	0	7	71	19	0
2/7	4	0	2	6	67	0	33
1/3	8	4	4	16	50	25	25
4/11	9	1	0	10	90	10	0
2/5	14	5	2	21	67	24	8
4/9	15	2	1	18	83	11	6
1/2	13	4	3	20	65	20	15
8/15	5	2	1	8	63	25	12
4/7	13	2	0	15	87	13	0
8/13	12	3	6	21	57	14	29
4/6	13	6	6	25	52	24	24
8/11	6	6	4	16	38	38	24
4/5	7	7	6	20	35	35	30
5/6	7	4	4	15	46	27	27
10/11	8	2	8	18	44	12	44
Evens	7	6	7	20	35	30	35
11/10	7	8	10	25	28	32	40
6/5	10	3	8	21	48	14	38
5/4	3	7	8	18	17	39	44
11/8	13	5	10	28	46	18	36
6/4	8	4	12	24	33	17	50
13/8	3	5	9	17	18	29	53
7/4	3	6	19	28	11	22	67
15/8	4	2	5	11	36	18	46
2/1	3	0	3	6	50	0	50
9/4	2	0	7	9	22	0	78
12/5	2	2	9	13	15	15	70
5/2	1	4	8	13	8	32	60
11/4	10	4	9	23	43	17	40
3/1	2	3	10	15	13	20	67
7/2	5	4	8	17	29	24	47
4/1	5	2	9	16	31	13	56
>=9/2	9	5	23	37	24	14	62

Two distinctive types of game can be expected in Australian soccer;

- **The Un-competitive game** - where one side looks almost certain to win (e.g. odds of 1/6 against 6/1, etc., etc.)
- **The Competitive game** - the difference in ability between the two sides is much closer and will give a far more balanced game.

Systems

Having looked at last years results closely, two ideas quickly spring to mind;

Concentrating on the un-competitive games - The results show that freak results often occur, e.g. a Home Banker, with odds of say 2/7 does not always win! - and if you can select a draw (@ perhaps 4/1) or an away win (@ perhaps 8/1) there is clearly a chance for the occasional profit.

The trouble is, as with the UK football coupons, there is no betting on single games, so a wider, permed cover of the possible results is needed.

With the competitive games - try and concentrate on finding drawn games - it is possible by concentrating on some of the middle prices, e.g. 8/11 to 11/8 for the home teams odds. But most importantly, the odds offered for drawn games on the Aussie coupons are far better than the odds offered on the winter UK season coupons. e.g. 5/2, 11/4, 3/1, 7/2 are often available. Remember that three 3/1 draws make a nice juicy 63/1 winner!

If anyone has any other ideas on using the statistics given in Table 1 I'm sure many would be happy to hear their ideas.



Any thoughts from other members will be welcomed. It is often the case that when someone else's views the same figures it can give rise to alternative approach. My own first glance quickly drew my attention toward the high percentage of home wins where the home odds were at there highest (the bottom of the table). The figures given for the home odds of 11/4 and over show a breakdown of Home wins = 31, Draws = 18 and Aways = 59.

31 Homes in 108 games shows a 28.7% strike, an odds equivalent of around 5/2, but of course all these homes were offered at OVER 5/2. Even when tax is pre paid the odds equivalent works out at 2.83/1, still showing a potential profit at very close to the minimum 11/4 quoted! Stef

Work has already begun on the setting up of a register of members willing to give product advice.

CUSTOMER INTELLIGENCE NETWORK

You CAN Help !!

By now you should be aware that SMART is always looking for ways in which it can be of service to the membership. My filing cabinet is full of letters from disappointed members who have had fingers badly burned by buying products which did not turn out to be worth the cost.

Quite recently a member telephoned who wanted to write a piece for the magazine warning other members of a disappointment he'd had with a product on which he had just blown £150! Unfortunately I had to decline his offer, the reasons for which I have gone into in previous issues.

Simply put, whatever I put into print in the pages of SMART, regardless of who actually wrote it, and despite the fact I print a disclaimer in every issue, the responsibility is mine, as editor and publisher of the magazine. I would leave myself open to law suits and the possible closure of our publication. And the sad fact is, that I had previous knowledge of this product from other members, I could have at least made our member cautious, or at best saved the caller a tidy sum had he contacted me first.

He had read the advertisers blurb and even contacted the paper carrying the ad., to validate the claims made and was told;

“We would not carry any advertisers claims knowing them to be false”

This is a totally worthless answer, what it actually means is, that if it is false, we didn't know, so we can't be held responsible. Of course it can also mean

' We would not carry any advertising knowing that it makes false claims.'

“We don’t try too hard to find out if it’s true or not, we enjoy the advertising revenue it brings in too much”

SMARTsig now has several hundred members, who between them, must have spent many thousands of pounds on commercial betting products, from

“Which? magazine does not review betting products and services, so we’ll do our own thing”

form books to systems, and from computer software to tipsters. We should tap into and make full use of this wealth of knowledge and experience we have, for the benefit of us all.

As things stand currently, any prospective purchaser/investor has little choice other than the advertising literature available, or perhaps a magazine review, to assess whether a product will meet his/her needs. A problem with commercial reviews is that a journalist is *paid* to do that job, while our members have *paid for* the product with their own money. A small but vital difference.

One trick used by advertisers, which according to my sources is probably more common than you realise, is for the vendor to ask friends and relatives in far flung corners of the UK to write thank you letters. These are then printed in the firm’s brochure as examples of the many satisfied customers who have written in praise of the product. They are of course from *real* people and so therefore are *genuine* letters!

Wouldn’t it be better though, if you could speak with a *real, independent* person, who had given his/her own money and had experience of *really using* the product?

So, as a service to all SMARTies, I have started to compile a register of members who have bought and experienced commercial products, and who would be willing to give advice to other members as and when necessary. This may be simply to warn of a poor product or service, or to give credit where credit is due. It may be to say that it is suitable for one specific purpose, but not for another. Strengths and weaknesses can be discussed with a far greater honesty than may be found by reading the advertising literature.

Which? magazine does not review betting products and services, so we’ll do our own thing. A word from the right person at the right time could have helped my recent caller to avoid wasting £150.00, just think then, how many

others, including yourself, we may be able to help as time goes by and our register of previous users grows.

So, what would be your commitment if you agreed to help?

Your details will not be published in the magazine for all to see. Your name and telephone number would only be passed on to a member expressing an interest in a product you have a knowledge of. You are unlikely to be swamped with enquiries, merely a fellow member, from time to time, asking you for your opinion of a product.

ACCESS TO THE SERVICE WILL BE RESTRICTED TO MEMBERS WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE SCHEME

(i.e. they are themselves willing to help others with advice).

There was a suggestion at one point that I should keep all the opinions of members on a central record here, and answer queries right away. Another member offered his services as club librarian, or information source. But, there are a couple of very good reasons why I should not choose either of these options.

1. Advice is better to come from the actual user of the product, relaying of information would be likely to be incomplete and/or misleading.
2. AND any centrally held information would leave itself wide open to corruption or the suspicion of shady practices. (witness the recent allegations aimed at other centralised proofing services.)



CUSTOMER INTELLIGENCE NETWORK

- **Have you used a betting service, bought a book, a system, a computer program or any other betting related product?**
- **Do you have an opinion you feel may be helpful to others thinking of buying that same product?**
- **Would you like to speak with a fellow member who has used the product or service you are thinking of buying?**

THEN JOIN THE SMARTsig CUSTOMER INTELLIGENCE NETWORK

To join, free of charge, simply send a list of the products you have experienced to me, here at SMARTsig. and you will be enrolled as a C.I.N. member.

n.b. It is not intended to be a platform for backdoor advertising, neither is it a charter for computer and/or photocopying pirates.

Remember, good products are worth buying just as poor ones are worth avoiding.

MEMBERS FOUND ABUSING COPYRIGHTS WILL BE REMOVED FROM THE REGISTER

Many members have asked for more on dog racing, but unfortunately few have offered any real words of wisdom in this area. Philip Alexander offers to start the ball rolling

GREYHOUNDS - SORTING THE ONE GOOD BET

Philip Alexander

Looking through the card for just one real good bet is a pastime in which all betting men have indulged at some time or another. Of course the regular track attender has an obvious advantage, for he is familiar with the entire scene. But for the man who can seldom visit the track, the betting forecast in one of the day's sporting nationals may constitute his only guide to assessing relative chances.

If time is short, one of the easiest ways of choosing which runner appears to have the best chances on the entire card is to settle for the forecast favourite quoted at the shortest odds. Certainly the idea is almost as old as racing itself, but it is not without logic.

Assuming the dog in question will be returned at the shortest starting price, then it is only reasonable to believe that it has the best chance of winning. Over emphasis of this single factor does, however, often lead to disappointment, for the method is far from perfect. The reason for this shortcoming is that it fails completely to take into account the strength of the opposition.

Like must always be compared with like, and if the forecast betting is to be used so far as establishing the chances of the possible favourite is concerned, then exactly the same procedure should be adopted in relation to the second forecast favourite. Only then will it be possible to carry out any direct comparison involving more than one race.

Here is an actual betting forecast for a BAGS meeting at Crayford last year, taken from the pages of the Racing Post. From it we will be able to see precisely how a more comprehensive comparison can be established.

Race Time	Forecast favourite	Forecast 2nd favourite
11.07	7-2	7-2
11.23	3-1	7-2
11.38	3-1	7-2
11.53	3-1	7-2
12.08	3-1	4-1
12.24	11-4	3-1
12.40	5-2	7-2
12.55	7-2	7-2

The lowest priced forecast favourite was 11-4, in the 12.24 race, and under the ruling given earlier this would automatically qualify as the favourite with the best chance of success. Actually, in this particular instance it finished in fifth place after starting at 9-4, but the result is immaterial in this case. What is questionable is the validity of the assessment itself.

Another way in which relative estimation of chances can be affected between the leading favourites from any race is by converting the forecast prices into fractions, and then subtracting the smaller from the larger, or the first quotation from the second.

In the Crayford example above, the 12.08 race and the 12.40 race would each produce the same answer i.e.

$$4 - 3 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 3.5 - 2.5 = 1$$

Therefore, there would not be a “best favourite” on this occasion.

This process, uncomplicated though it may seem to be, will not appeal to everyone because juggling with fractions, or calculating in decimal points is something which for some ended with schooldays! So the suggestion in order to simplify matters considerably is a method of rating forecast prices along the lines shown overleaf, in Table 1.

It is now an easy matter to read off the appropriate values and deduct the rating of the first named dog from that of the second.

In order to see if the rating produced any favourable results the forecast favourites of the three BAGS meetings of the day were rated in accordance with this modest plan of action.

Table 1 - Converting Forecast SPs to nominal values

Forecast	Prices	Rating
Less than	1-3	1
4-11	- 2-5	2
4-9	- 1-2	3
8-15	- 4-6	4
8-11	- Evens	5
11-10	- 6-4	6
13-8	- 2-1	7
9-4	- 5-2	8
11-4	- 3-1	9
100-30	- 4-1	11
9-2	- 5-1	13
11-2	- and above	15

Below are the results listed from the three meetings of Hackney, Crayford and Monmore on 29/1/94;

Time	Forecast First	Prices Second	Rating Second	Process First	Result
------	-------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------

HACKNEY

11.00	15-8	3-1	9	- 7	2
11.16	2-1	4-1	11	- 7	4
11.31	9-4	3-1	9	- 8	1
11.46	11-4	3-1	9	- 9	0
12.01	7-2	7-2	11	- 11	0
12.17	2-1	11-4	9	- 7	2
12.33	5-4	3-1	9	- 6	3
12.48	3-1	3-1	9	- 9	0

CRAYFORD

11.07	7-2	7-2	11	- 11	0
11.23	3-1	7-2	11	- 9	2
11.38	3-1	7-2	11	- 9	2
11.53	3-1	7-2	11	- 9	2
12.08	3-1	4-1	11	- 9	2
12.24	11-4	3-1	9	- 9	0
12.40	5-2	7-2	11	- 8	3
12.55	7-2	7-2	11	- 11	0

Time	Forecast	Prices	Rating	Process	Result
	First	Second	Second	First	

MONMORE

3.23	5-1	5-1	13 -	13	0
3.36	7-2	7-2	11 -	11	0
3.48	3-1	3-1	9 -	9	0
3.59	9-2	5-1	13 -	13	0
4.11	7-2	7-2	11 -	11	0
4.22	3-1	4-1	11 -	9	2
4.34	3-1	3-1	9 -	9	0
4.46	7-2	7-2	11 -	11	0

At Hackney the bet was in the second race and it was Kilmeery Blue, which only managed to finish in fourth place. At Crayford the bet was in the 12.40 race and it was Roses Town which won at 2-1., whilst at Monmore the dog which stuck out like the proverbial sore thumb was Song Girl, won at 2-1.

Only one aspect of the proposal now remains to be discussed. On very rare occasions it is possible that you may be asked to compare the chances of dogs in races with a different number of possible starters. Usually this will entail races of five and six runners, and can be carried out without including more trouble just by multiplying the difference between the second and first forecast prices by the number of dogs that are due to contest the race. To save you from even this mundane calculation, here is a pre determined table of values:-

Difference in rating	Five runners	Six runners
14	70	84
12	60	72
10	50	60
8	40	48
7	35	42
6	30	36
5	25	30
4	20	24
3	15	18
2	10	12
1	5	6

A member who pointed out the error with a recent brain teaser solution now shows me that staking plans really do work.

THE J. RYDER STAKING PLAN

Peter Jacobs

Dear Stef,
With regard to staking plans I cannot agree with you views on this subject. A staking plan WILL produce enhanced profits from the same outlay. If it does not I would suggest that the method of selection needs discarding.

You say that staking plans don't give an advantage over level stakes, Tut - Tut, try a run without the blinkers Stef - It sometimes works with horses.

I enclose some examples using the Computer Challenge results as a base, it includes one which has not worked, the answer here is to bin Microstar. ***(Too late Peter - Microstar Coursemaster has effectively "binned" itself by opting out of our competition last month, showing a loss of 3% - Stef)***

This is the J Ryder staking plan which I purchased in the mid sixties and which was sold in conjunction with his system. J Ryder was Westminster Relay (but I won't go into that) T.B.A. were going to operate this system for clients but it was so successful that they didn't in the end as the volume of money sent to them would have ruined the SP (to answer the question someone asked)

J Ryder Staking Plan

- Starting and minimum bet 2 points
- After a loser increase by 1 point
- After a winner at odds on remain with the same stake
- After a winner of evens to 11-8 reduce by 1 point
- After a winner at 6-4 or more reduce by two points

This is one of four staking plans I use, which one depends upon likely prices and percentage of winners. I wouldn't consider any of the computer competitors good enough advisors to follow.

Someone may tell me that this is not exactly the J Ryder plan, which I accept, but it was the basis behind it.

Figures given are the above Staking Plan used on the Computer Challenge competitors results up to the end of March (month 3)

HORSE SENSE

Date	Result	Stake unit	Loss	Win
7/1/95	R	2	-2	
	L	3	-3	
14/1/95	W 3-1	4		+12.0
21/1/95	W 7-2	2		+7.0
28/1/95	L	2	-2	
4/2/95	W 5-2	3		+7.5
18/2/95	L	2	-2	
	W 9-2	3		+ 13.5
25/2/95	2	2	-2	
4/3/95	2	3	-3	
11/3/95	L	4	-4	
18/3/95	L	5	-5	
	12 sels.	35	-23	+40.0

overall 17 pts PROFIT Ave stake 2.92 points
 3.5 tax
 WIN 13.5 points

(I'm not printing the full listings sent by Peter to conserve space, but here are the bottom line figures submitted by Peter, after operating the staking plan. - Stef)

MICROSTAR COURSEMASTER

	21 sels	68	-54	+31.33
--	---------	----	-----	--------

overall 22.67 points LOSS Ave stake 3.24 points
 6.8 tax
 LOSS 29.47

GENESIS

	41 sels	422	-342	+443.75
--	---------	-----	------	---------

overall 101.75 points PROFIT Ave stake 10.29 points
 42.2 tax
 WIN 59.55

PUNTERS REVENGE (revenge on punters?)

	26 sels	270	-206	+137.64
--	---------	-----	------	---------

overall 68.36 points LOSS Ave stake 10.38 points
 27 tax
 LOSS 95.36

ESP ORACLE

	17 sels	187	-150	+170
--	---------	-----	------	------

overall 20 points PROFIT Ave stake 11 points
 18.7 tax
 WIN 1.3

(Note from Peter - Really excellent example of the staking plan.
 Eureka ! Done it again, Another losing system wins!!!)

(Note from Stef - To save readers from back checking on Oracle's performance to the end of March it was LLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLLW(10-1)L)

THE SWORD

	15 sels	102	-92	+59.04
--	---------	-----	-----	--------

overall 32.96 points LOSS Ave stake 3.24 points
 10.2 tax
 LOSS 43.16

(Note from Peter - The first selection won (and was the best winner) one of the few occasions when the next winner does not carry a greater stake than the last loser)

BETTING MANAGER

	36 sels	322	-214	+204.97
--	---------	-----	------	---------

overall 9.03 points LOSS Ave stake 8.94 points
 32.2 tax
 LOSS 41.23

BRED

	15 sels	103	-88	+42
--	---------	-----	-----	-----

overall 46 points LOSS Ave stake 6.87 points
 10.3 tax
 LOSS 56.3

TIPSTER 4 WINDOWS

	8 sels	28	-19	+15.5
--	--------	----	-----	-------

overall 3.5 points LOSS Ave stake 3.5 points
 2.8 tax
 LOSS 6.3

DGA PRO PUNTER

	18 sels	77	-52	+68.5
--	---------	----	-----	-------

overall 16.5 points PROFIT Ave stake 4.28 points
 7.7 tax
 WIN 8.8

(Note from Peter - Eureka ! Done it again, Another losing system wins!!!)

TWO MOST POPULAR NEWSPAPER SELECTIONS

	27 sels	191	-79	+82.01
--	---------	-----	-----	--------

overall 3.01 points PROFIT Ave stake 7.07 points
 19.1 tax
 LOSS 16.09

PRICEWISE

	31 sels	285	-218	+435
--	---------	-----	------	------

overall 217 points PROFIT Ave stake 9.19 points
 28.5 tax
 WIN 188.5

PS

NO MORE V.D.W. !!

He ruined the Handicap Book for years and it's all been done, let's go forward with our ideas.

Anyone wants him - Buy the book!



As a quick overall check on Peters application of the J Ryder plan, the cumulative figures on all the above are;

Stake (inc tax): 2299 Return: 2282.74 LOSS:16.26

0.71% loss

At level stakes up to March, as printed in our April issue;

Stake (inc tax): 293.7 Return: 251.68 LOSS:42.02

14.3% loss

Stef

SMARTsig Computer Challenge

INTERIM RESULTS for April (month 4)

Technical reasons have prevented me from printing the full results for the five week month of April - Both April and May winners will be announced in our June issue (2.6).

For the benefit of new members, I'll explain briefly what the SMARTsig computer challenge is all about;

- A head to head competition for computer horse race selection programs over the first six months of 1995.
- Each program will be operated by its author/vendor.
- Over 20 were invited to compete, but less than half accepted.
- All selections are for Saturdays only and proofed in advance both to me and to our adjudicator Raceform Ltd, Newbury.
- All bets are £10 win singles, settled at starting prices.
- Each competitor may select between 0 and 10 bets on any one Saturday
- Each monthly award winner is the competitor with the best percentage profit figure for the specific month, provided a minimum of six selections have run in that month.
- The overall competition winner is the competitor with the best percentage profit figure for the whole six month, January to June period, provided that at least one selection has run during each month, and a minimum of twenty selections over the full period.

The shaded section at the bottom of each table gives the account for the current month, and the ongoing account since the January start

DATE	SELECTIONS	RESULT	ODDS	STAKES	RETURNS
BETTING MANAGER - 081 6898875					
01/04/95	Major Summit	L		£11	£0.00
	Son of Iris	2	6/4	£11	£0.00
	Cache Fleur	2	6/4	£11	£0.00
08/04/95	Clay County	2	9/1	£11	£0.00
	Large Action	L		£11	£0.00
	Dubacilla	4	9/1	£11	£0.00
15/04/95	no bet				
	STAKES		RETURNS	% PROFIT	
APR '95	£66		£0.00	-100%	
TO DATE	£473		£286.69	-39%	

BRED - 0932 779393

01/04/95no bet
08/04/95no bet
15/04/95no bet

	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£0	£0.00	0
TO DATE	£165	£85.00	-48%

MICROSTAR COURSEMASTER

PULLED UP (FEBRUARY)

	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT
	£176	£171.36	-3%

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

01/04/95Komreyev Dancer	L		£11	£0.00
Un Parfum de	L		£11	£0.00
Femme				
Absalom's Pillar	L		£11	£0.00
08/04/95Dreams End	L		£11	£0.00
Oh So Grumpy	3	11/2	£11	£0.00
15/04/95No Pattern	4	12/1	£11	£0.00
Denbrae	2	7/1	£11	£0.00
Chatham Island	4	8/1	£11	£0.00

	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£88	£0.00	-100%
TO DATE	£550	£462.50	-16%

HORSE SENSE - 0772 745193

01/04/95Raba Riba	L		£11	£0.00
08/04/95no bet				
15/04/95no bet				

	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£11	£0.00	-100%
TO DATE	£143	£175.00	22%

ORACLE(ESP) - 0702 600557						
01/04/95	no bet					
08/04/95	Coulton	W	6/ 1	£11		£70.00
	Large Action	L		£11		£0.00
15/04/95	no bet					
	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT			
APR '95	£22	£70.00	218%			
TO DATE	£220	£180.00	-18%			

PRO PUNTER (DGA) - 061 3300184						
01/04/95	Arabian Bold	W	6/ 4	£11		£25.00
08/04/95	no bet					
15/04/95	Mind Games	W	1/ 1	£11		£20.00
	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT			
APR '95	£22	£45.00	105%			
TO DATE	£220	£230.00	5%			

PUNTERS REVENGE v2 - Unit 11, Oakfield Ave, Hitchin. SG4 9JB						
01/04/95	no bet					
08/04/95	Minnhoma	L		£11		£0.00
15/04/95	no bet					
	STAKES	RETURNS	% PROFIT			
APR '95	£11	£0.00	-100%			
TO DATE	£297	£144.86	-51%			

THE SWORD - 0253 698843

01/04/95	Cab On Target	W	11/ 8	£11	£23.75
08/04/95	no bet				
15/04/95	Further Flight	W	100/ 30	£11	£43.33
	Mind Games	W	1/ 1	£11	£20.00
	Pretending	W	5/ 4	£11	£22.50

	STAKES		RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£44		£109.58	149%
TO DATE	£209		£252.17	21%

TIPSTER 4 WINDOWS - 0395 567073

01/04/95	no bet				
08/04/95	no bet				
15/04/95	no bet				

	STAKES		RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£0		£0.00	0
TO DATE	£88		£53.75	-39%

PRICEWISE - RACING POST

01/04/95	SevenofDiamnds	W	3/ 1	£11	£40.00
	Gale Again	2	15/8	£11	£0.00
08/04/95	Master Oats	L		£11	£0.00
	Party Politics	2	16/1	£11	£0.00
	Young Hustler	L		£11	£0.00
	Gaelic Myth	L		£11	£0.00
	Coulton	W	6/ 1	£11	£70.00
15/04/95	Benzoe	L		£11	£0.00
	Wishing	W	3/ 1	£11	£40.00
	Statajack	L		£11	£0.00

	STAKES		RETURNS	% PROFIT
APR '95	£110		£150.00	36%
TO DATE	£462		£600.00	30%

TOP TWO NEWSPAPER SELECTIONS of the Day

01/04/95	Spuffington (13)	2	8/11	£11	£0.00
	Big Strand (13)	NR		£11	£0.00
08/04/95	Red Blazer (15)	L		£11	£0.00
	Large Action (10)	L		£11	£0.00
	Master Charlie (10)	W	5/ 6	£11	£18.33
	Coolree (10)	L		£11	£0.00
15/04/95	Sanoosea (14)	W	1/ 2	£11	£15.00
	Zeb (13)	W	13/ 8	£11	£26.25
	Mountain Reach (13)	W	1/ 2	£11	£15.00
	Far Senior (13)	2	11/8	£11	£0.00
STAKES		RETURNS		% PROFIT	
APR '95	£110	£74.58		-32%	
TO DATE	£418	£324.58		-22%	



COMPUTER USERS - FREE SOFTWARE

Horse Sense is still available at **no charge** to FULL SMARTsig members, with a PC computer. Simply send a stout, stamped, self addressed envelope to me, here at SMART together with a formatted disk.

Many members have now received a copy of the program and I know many are conducting research into it's accuracy and suitability. Let us know what your findings are and we'll publish the results. This should enable all our users to use the program to it's fullest potential.

I also have a PC shareware program from USA called Thoroughbred Handicapper. It operates under windows and although I haven't put it through its paces, on screen it is a looks a far more professional job than many UK program. Again available **FREE** from me, on receipt of a formatted disk and a SAE. If you send a High Density (HD) disk I can include another US horse program called Turf (Windows is not required), and a graphical Blackjack program that allows card counting!

SMART SOCCER 2.2 DRAW SYSTEM

Results from 28 March 1995 to 19 April 1995

28/3/95	Ross v Albion	4.1
	Czech Republic v Belarus	4.2
	Bulgaria v Wales	2.1
	Slovakia v Azerbaijan	4.1
	Slovenia v Estonia	3.0
	Austria v Latvia	5.0
	Luxembourg v Norway	2.0
	San Marino v Finland	0.2
1/4/95	Albion v Forfar	0.3
5/4/95	Leeds v Ipswich	3.0
	Albion v E Stirling	3.1
8/4/95	Carlisle v Gillingham	2.0
	Dundee v Ayr	1.1
11/4/95	Birmingham v Shrewsbury	2.0
15/4/95	Birmingham v Cardiff	2.1
	Brentford v Chester	1.1
	Walsall v Rochdale	0.0
19/4/95	Blackburn v C Palace	2.1

Balance Sheet to date:

Bets	Stake (inc Tax)	Returns	Profit or Loss
193	212.3	136	76.3 loss (- 35.9%)



BOOKS & PUBLICATIONS

GENERAL BOOKS

An effective 10% discount and free postage on books for SMARTsig members & book finding service. Jay Cook, The Book shop & Gallery, 40 Earsham Street, Bungay, Suffolk, NR35 1AQ. **Tel: 01986 895164. Fax: 01986 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: 01932 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: 0155 9736086**

FOOTBALL FACTS MONTHLY. ALL the soccer student needs to know in a regular monthly seasonal journal. £1 subscription discount to SMART members @ £17.50 for ten, including first class postage. AFS, 22 Bretons, BASILDON, Essex. SS15 5BY **Phone/Fax 01268 416020**

HORSE RACING

Computer Raceform offer their "form on a disk" at a discount to full members.

FLAT 1994 - Now available! Contact me, Stef, here at SMART for a coupon.

HELP OFFERED

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

Rex Towers

Overseas betting

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 TO SMARTsig

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: Knight's Racing Sword (54p) £10.00 - Build Your Own System (includes Robin Hood system - Geoff Lindsey 72p) £10.00 - Horse Racing, A Scientific Analysis (Prof F George 149p) £10.00 - Sporting Life Flat Results 1988 £5.00 - Chaseform Annual 86/87 £5.00 - Formula 2 (James Ashley 69p) £5.00 - Guide to Racing Computer programs (R Lloyd 64p) £3.00 - Winning Ways to Bet (Methodmaker 44p) £1.00 - Speculation for Gain (Hodgeson 138p) £3.00 - All items add 10% for postage.

Peter Jameson (Dorset) 01202 516525 (Evenings only please)

FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE: clearout of 85 books - need the space!

Title	Author	Year	Orig cost	Cond.
100 Winners for 1989	Raceform	1989	£2.95	VG
A Licence to Print Money	Reid Jreid J	1993	£8.99	VG
A Year in Red Shirts	Berry J	1993	£17.95	VG
Always Back Winners	Simpson S	1994	£9.99	VG
Be a Successful Punter	Holt C	1986		G

Title	Author	Year	Orig cost	Cond.
Bedside Racing	Carson W	1984	£2.50	G
Benson&Hedges Racing Year	Racing Post	1987		VG
Betting for a Living	Mordin N	1992	£18.00	VG
Betting for Profit	Statistician	1980	£0.95	F
Big Races - How to bet&win	Statistician	1993	£3.99	VG
Bigger Profits Hcap Races	Kilgallon P	1994	£5.95	VG
Calling the Horses	O'Sullivan	1989	£6.99	G
Chaseform Annual	Raceform	1992	£21.00	G
Complete Pro System	Davies WJ	1992	£5.99	VG
Computer Racing Form	Racing Research	1993	£49.00	VG
Course Form 1988 Flat	Aesculus Press	1988	£3.95	G
Course Form 1988 NH	Aesculus Press	1988	£3.95	G
Course Form 1990 Flat	Aesculus Press	1990	£4.50	G
Dark Secrets of the Turf	White J	1991	£6.95	VG
Form Horses 1989 Flat	Aesculus Press	1989	£2.95	G
Front Runners	Scott B	1991	£13.99	G
Great Racing Stories	Chancellor Press	1993		VG
Guide to Backing Horses	The Colonel	1987		F
Guide to the Flat	Sporting Life	1987	£1.50	G
H/R Selection & Betting	Braddock P	1987	£12.95	VG
High Rollers of the Turf	Smith R	1992	£7.99	VG
Horse Racing 1982	Hill W	1982	£7.50	VG
Horse Racing - Last 25 yrs	Wright H	1992	£10.99	VG
How to find Value	Howard M	1989	£4.95	G
In Search of Shergar	Turner C	1984	£2.25	F
It's Tougher at the Bottom	Berry J	1992	£4.49	VG
Jockeyform	Sporting Life	1987	£11.95	G
Life & Secrets of a Pro	Bird A	1986	£4.95	G
Make Your Betting Pay	Stafford T	1990	£2.95	VG
NH Results	Sporting Life	'88/9	£12.95	F
Oaksey on Racing	Oaksey J	1992	£5.99	G
One Hundred Hints	Coton M	1994	£11.95	VG
Ossie Dale's G Nat Book	Green R	1992	£12.95	VG
Owning a Racehorse	Harvey D	1989	£6.95	F
Picking Winners	Beyer A	1994	£8.99	VG
Pocket Companion 1992 flat	Aesculus Press	1992	£5.95	G
Pocket Companion 91/2 NH	Aesculus Press	1992	£5.95	G
Pocket Companion 92/3 NH	Aesculus Press	1993	£5.95	G
Profile NH 1990-94	Nomadic Press	1994		VG
Racecourses of G Britain	Gill J	1975	£7.95	VG
Raceform Annual 1993	Raceform	1994	£22.00	G
Races & Racehorses - NH	Superform	'87/8	£12.50	G
Racing Companion	Oaksey / Rodney	1992	£8.99	VG
Racing Digest	Pacemaker	1980	£1.75	G
Racing Quotations	Robinson/Llewell	1988	£7.95	VG
Reflections on Racing	Rimell M	1990	£14.99	VG

Title	Author	Year	Orig cost	Cond.
Ruffs Guide	Odhams	1987	£47.50	G
Scu	Scudamore P	1993	£17.99	VG
Six at the Top	Herbert I	1977		VG
Spot the Winner	Herbert I	1990	£8.99	VG
Systematic Betting	Van der Wheil C	1990	£2.95	VG
Systems - Calculator	White J	1992	£3.99	VG
The Art of Legging	Sidney C	1976		G
The Classic 28	Bouverie	1984	£1.25	G
The Coup	Payne K	1978	£0.90	F
The Druids Lodge Cnfdy	Mathieu P	1991	£6.99	VG
The Punter's Friend	Waterman J	1987	£9.95	VG
The Racey Bits	Siggers/Williams	1987	£3.95	G
The Racing Game	Rodrigo R	1958		P
The Racing World	Wilson J	1991	£19.95	VG
The Turf	Ross A	1982	£3.95	VG
The Winning Trail	Howard M	1993	£6.95	F
Timecheck 1989	Raceform	1989	£8.95	G
Timecheck 1991	Raceform	1991	£7.95	G
Timeform Horses to Follow	Timeform	1989/90		F
Timeform Selections	Timeform	1993	£4.95	VG
Trainer Form 1988 Flat	Asculus Press	1988	£4.95	G
Trainer Form 1988 NH	Asculus Press	1988	£4.95	G
Trainers Review	Sporting Life	1984	£9.50	G
Trainers Review Flat	Sporting Life	1986	£11.95	G
Trainers Review NH	Sporting Life	'86/7	£12.95	VG
Trendsetters Guide NH	Ayres A	1992	£3.95	VG
Turf Account	SmithEccles S	1987	£2.50	VG
Twice Lucky	Francome J	1988		VG
V O'Brien - NH Years	Fuller B	1992	£12.95	VG
Value Betting	Coton M	1990	£17.00	VG
Van der Wheil Tree	Peach T	1993		VG
Who's Who in Flat Racing	Emery D	1984	£4.50	VG
Win at All Weather Racing	Stafford T	1992	£3.25	F
World of Betting	McCririck J	1991	£14.99	VG

Call Gerald Proctor (Avon) 01454 885106

FOR SALE: (All mint condition) Racehorses of 1989 (flat) (Superform) - Chasers & Hurdlers (89/90) - Directory of Flat Horses (90) (both Aesculus Press) - Racehorses of 1990 (flat) (Timeform) - Timeform Perspective (1991) - Racing Post form book (Jumps 93/94) - Raceform Notebook (1993 flat) - The Solidus (Stanza)

John Lawson 01482 353494

SMARTsig

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		
		(+)	()	(-)
Bet to Win	Horse System			1
Challenge, The	Horse System			1
Double Bonus	Horse System			1
Eternity	Horse System			1
Golden Midas	Horse System			1
Law of Averages	Horse System			1 ***
New Ultimate	Horse System			1
Peter Wards 'One a Day'	Horses System			2
Punters Paymaster	Horse System			1
Strudden method	Horse System			1
Value Challenge	Horse System			1
Winning Edge	Horse System	1		
Winning for Life	Horse System		1	
ALL premium line tipsters				off the scale
Winning Line	Tipping service	4	2	5
Bet Better	Horse Computer Prog	1	1	3
Brimardon	Horse Computer Prog	1		2
Combeys	Horse Computer Prog	2	2	3
Computer	Horse Computer Prog	1	2	5
First Post Racing Ltd	Horse Computer Prog			4
Oracle Racing System	Horse Computer Prog			8
ProPunter	Horse Computer Prog	3	1	5
22-1 football method	Football Fixed Odds		1	
James Ashley Formula2	Football Fixed Odds		1	11
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!

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).