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#### Abstract

Whether money line odds from bookmakers are calibrated to future outcomes and underlying betting markets are efficient are fundamental and related questions. In this paper, I examine Ultimate Fighting Championship (UFC) events from 2019 to 2020 and evaluate whether given odds for match win, win method, and winning round outcomes are calibrated. My evaluation consists of a) qualitative and quantitative Hosmer-Lemeshow analyses, and b) quantitative likelihood ratio tests derived from logistic and multinomial models of match outcomes. I find that although money line odds for win wagers are calibrated for outcomes, those for win method and winning round are not.


## Data acquisition and processing:

- Final bookmaker odds and outcomes for 961 UFC matches (28 events), Jan. 01 2019 - Dec. 312020 (bestfightodds.com, ufcstats.com)
- Match data: Winner (favorite / underdog), round of fight end ( $1^{\text {st }}-3^{\text {rd }}$, by decision), method by which fight ends (KO / TKO, Submission, Decision)
- Propositions: Favorite wins, Favorite / Underdog wins by round; Favorite / Underdog wins by method.
- Odds-implied probabilities for propositions determined by averaging across bookmakers and performing basic normalization (Cortis 2015, Strumbelj 2013)

| Fight \# | Fighter | Win | Method | RD | Moneyline odds |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Win | TKO | SUB | DEC | RD 1 | RD 2 | RD 3 |
| 2-190119 | Gillespie | 1 | KO | 2 | -505.74 | 200.86 | 214.09 | 212.26 | 191.07 | 372.16 | 838.7 |
| 2-190119 | Medeiros | 0 | KO | 2 | 374.67 | 822.93 | 1241.25 | 943.28 | 1270.53 | 1563.29 | 2299.77 |
| 3-190119 | Benavidez | 1 | DEC | 3 | -234.65 | 604.17 | 557.83 | -117.29 | 627.83 | 825.65 | 1436.69 |
| 3-190119 | Ortiz | 0 | DEC | 3 | 189.10 | 839.51 | 1537.36 | 300.73 | 1284.61 | 1658.97 | 2348.46 |


| Fight \# | Win | Method | RD | Probabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Win | TKO | SUB | DEC | RD 1 | RD 2 | RD 3 |
| 2-190119 | 1 | KO | 2 | Favorite | 0.7985 | 0.2733 | 0.2618 | 0.2633 | 0.2777 | 0.1712 | 0.0861 |
|  |  |  |  | Underdog | 0.2014 | 0.0783 | 0.0538 | 0.0692 | 0.0552 | 0.0454 | 0.0315 |
| 3-190119 | 1 | DEC | 3 | Favorite | 0.6696 | 0.1140 | 0.1220 | 0.4335 | 0.1044 | 0.0821 | 0.0494 |
|  |  |  |  | Underdog | 0.3303 | 0.0843 | 0.0483 | 0.1976 | 0.0563 | 0.0443 | 0.0318 |

## Qualitative analysis (Hosmer-Lemeshow):

- Focus on propositions in which the favorite wins.
- Group matches by odds-implied probabilities, plot average odds-implied probability vs proportion of matches in which outcome occurred.
- The favorite winning by decision is under-estimated by odds-implied probabilities, in both analyses of round of match end and method of match end.

Figure 1: H-L, Favorite Wins


Figure 2: H-L, Favorite Win by Type


Figure 3: H-L, Favorite Win by Round)


Figures 1-3: Hosmer-Lemeshow plots of predicted vs observed match outcomes
For possible match outcomes (favorite wins, favorite win by type, favorite win by round), by deciles of odds-implied probabilities average odds-implied probabilities are compared to the proportion of matches in which the outcome occurred. Calibration is indicated by points lying on the identity line. Although for most outcomes, odds-implied probabilities appear to be well calibrated, the favorite winning by decision appears to occur systematically more often than predicted - that is, odds-implied probabilities for that event appear to be miscalibrated.

## Quantitative analysis:

- Propositions in which favorite wins
- Hosmer-Lemeshow
- Logistic regression / Likelihood ratio test

$$
\mathrm{H}_{0}: \beta_{0}=0, \beta_{1}=1 ; \operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{n}=1\right)=\operatorname{logit}\left(\beta_{0}+\beta_{1} q_{n}\right), q_{n}=\operatorname{logit}{ }^{-1}\left(p_{n}\right) .
$$

- Joint sets of propositions (favorite + underdog by win method, round)
- Multinomial regression / Likelihood ratio test

$$
\mathrm{H}_{0}: \underline{\beta}_{0}=0, \underline{\beta}=I ; \operatorname{Pr}\left(\underline{Y}_{n}=k\right)=\operatorname{mlogit}\left(\underline{\beta}_{0}+\underline{\beta} q_{n}\right)_{k}, \underline{q}_{n}=\operatorname{mlogit}^{-1}\left(\underline{p}_{n}\right)
$$

| Wager (Favorite) | H-L Test |  | Likelihood Ratio Test (LR-, MR-LRT) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Test Statistic | P-Value | LRT Statistic | P-Value |
| Favorite Wins | 11.8985 | 0.1558 | 1.4966 | 0.4731 |
| Favorite Wins, KO/TKO | 10.0543 | 0.2612 | 2.5168 | 0.2841 |
| Favorite Wins, Submission | 10.4026 | 0.2379 | 3.4011 | 0.1826 |
| Favorite Wins, Decision | 14.9032 | $0.0611^{*}$ | 11.7804 | $0.0028^{* *}$ |
| Favorite Wins, Round 1 | 9.2463 | 0.3219 | 4.8187 | $0.0899^{*}$ |
| Favorite Wins, Round 2 | 6.4371 | 0.5984 | 1.3191 | 0.5171 |
| Favorite Wins, Round 3 | 11.2537 | 0.1877 | 8.4729 | $0.0145^{* *}$ |
| Joint Model, Win Method | NA | NA | 52.6725 | $0.0064^{* *}$ |
| Joint Model, Win by Round | NA | NA | 80.5792 | 0.017 *** $^{\text {** }}$ |

## Table 1: Formal tests of model calibration

Results from formal comparisons of odds-implied probabilities to outcomes marginally (H-L Test and LR-LRT, rows 17) and jointly (MR-LRT, rows 8-9). Marginally, wins by decision appear to be miscalibrated by either measure, with the LR-LRT indicating further miscalibration for favorites winning in rounds 1 and 3 . Joint outcome analysis further confirms these results, showing miscalibration for odds-implied probabilities of either win by method or win by round, both of which include win by decision as a potential outcome.

