

Strategy Evaluation Checklist

Criterion	Status	Notes
Believable Core Logic	✗	Base statistical criteria (low draw % & low 0-0 %) lost money outright; relies on laying high odds without a probabilistic edge model.
Out-of-Sample Sustainability	✗	Zero separation of training data from unseen holdout validation; optimized repeatedly on the full historical dataset.
Mathematically Likely to Succeed (+EV Focus)	✗	Confuses high win strike rates with positive expected value (+EV); heavily penalised by high liability and exchange commission.
Robustness Against Overfitting / Data Mining	✗	Textbook \$p\$-hacking: restricts odds strictly to 8.0–15.99 because it worked historically, then retroactively deletes the month of May and underperforming leagues (Ecuador, Canada).
Sound Risk/Reward & Staking Model	✗	Laying at average odds of ~9.66 with a £50 liability cap yields tiny profits per winning trade (~£5.80); a short sequence of draws wipes out accumulated gains.
Practical Market Execution	⚠	Shows standard pre-match automated execution settings, but the analytical framework guarantees live performance decay.

BS Factor Rating: 28 / 100

(100 = Sound, mathematically robust, and achievable; 0 = Totally unbelievable, unsustainable, and guaranteed to fail)

Summary & Score Justification

The strategy presented in this video demonstrates textbook **data overfitting (snooping bias)** and **high-liability risk masking** rather than a genuine quantitative market edge.

1. Systematic Curve-Fitting (\$p\$-Hacking):

- The base strategy (filtering by historical draw percentage, head-to-head draw history, and nil-nil frequency) lost money across the historical sample.
- To manufacture a positive return, the presenter isolates an arbitrary odds bracket (**8.0 to 15.99**) purely because it showed past profit.
- He then inspects the calendar breakdown, notices that May had negative returns, and deletes May from the backtest with ad-hoc rationalizations ("end of season matches"). He further suggests removing leagues like Ecuador and Canada based on single-trade losses. Pruning past losers from the exact dataset under evaluation fits historical noise and guarantees out-of-sample breakdown.

2. Illusion of High Strike Rates vs. Negative Expected Value:

- Laying draws at odds between 8.0 and 16.0 means the market already assesses the probability of a draw to be very low (~6% to 12%).
- Capping liability at £50 produces a deceptive 40+ win streak, but each win yields tiny net gains (~£5.80). Because the underlying edge is negative (-EV), a small cluster of naturally occurring draws completely wipes out months of micro-profits.

3. Absence of Quantitative Validation:

- The workflow lacks train/test data splitting (e.g. 70/30 split), rolling walk-forward stress testing, and Monte Carlo significance testing to calculate \$p\$-values against randomness.

4. Marketing & Subscription Retention Funnel:

- The video functions primarily as a promotional lead magnet ("comment *lay the draw* in the comments to get the template") to onboard users into recurring software subscriptions.