



**HAL**  
open science

# Are Betting Markets Efficient? Evidence from European Football Championships

Alexis Direr

► **To cite this version:**

Alexis Direr. Are Betting Markets Efficient? Evidence from European Football Championships. Applied Economics, 2011, 45 (03), pp.343-356. 10.1080/00036846.2011.602010 . hal-00734531

**HAL Id: hal-00734531**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00734531>**

Submitted on 23 Sep 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



## Are Betting Markets Efficient ? Evidence from European Football Championships

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-2011-0002.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Jun-2011
Complete List of Authors:	Direr, Alexis; Université d'Orléans, Laboratoire d'Economie d'Orléans
JEL Code:	D81 - Criteria for Decision-Making under Risk and Uncertainty < D8 - Information and Uncertainty < D - Microeconomics, G14 - Information and Market Efficiency Event Studies < G1 - General Financial Markets < G - Financial Economics
Keywords:	Decision-Making under Risk, Information and Market Efficiency, Betting markets, Asset allocation

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Are Betting Markets Efficient? Evidence from European Football Championships

Alexis Direr<sup>1</sup>

This article investigates the degree of efficiency of the European Football online betting market by using odds quoted by 12 bookmakers on 21 European championships over 11 years. We show that systematically picking out odds inferior to a threshold delivers a rate of return of 4.45% if best odds are selected across bookmakers and 2.78% if mean odds are used. This amounts to backing overwhelmingly favourites whose probability of winning exceeds 90%. Our results only exploit information contained in odds, are robust to the use of real-time data and different sample periods and hold under risk neutrality and expected utility preferences for realistic degrees of risk aversion. Transaction costs reduce profitability but only for small stake bets.

## I. Introduction

Online betting markets are a flourishing industry that has been gaining in popularity worldwide for the last decade. All sorts of sport events can be bet on, and attractive redistribution rates are offered, sometimes greater than 90 percent. Betting markets also provide an interesting field to scholars who study the working of information markets and implications for participants' risk preferences and degree of rationality. By offering bets whose payoffs are contingent to the occurrence of uncertain sporting events, betting markets produce information about the likelihood of these events in a way similar to how financial markets aggregate information about future and uncertain assets' payoffs. A natural way to investigate the functioning of betting markets is consequently to study their information efficiency.

Markets are efficient if prices reflect information to the point where the marginal benefit of acting on information does not exceed marginal costs (Jensen, 1978). This property can be tested by checking that the use of historical prices does not yield abnormal returns (Fama, 1970). Market efficiency has been originally formulated for financial markets but applies in a natural way to betting markets where asset prices are replaced by betting odds. Weak-form efficiency requires that bettors cannot earn a risk-adjusted better return or undergo a smaller loss by selecting a class of bets on the basis of their odds. Semi-strong-form efficiency tests expand the information set to all types of public information like teams' past performance or whether they benefit from home advantage.

A related and crucial issue is whether the best rules identified deliver a positive return. A mere rate of return differential between alternative betting rules invalidates the information revelation property of betting markets but does not necessarily challenge participants' rationality whose motivation to chase better return is weakened by the absence of profitable opportunities. To the contrary, the presence of profitable rules that are not arbitrated away strongly challenges the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Laboratoire d'Economie d'Orléans (LEO) and Paris School of Economics*  
Email: direr@ens.fr.

1  
2  
3 hypothesis of rational behaviour which is key to the existence of efficient markets. Conditions  
4 under which a profitable betting rule is proved to exist are however stringent. The computed  
5 excess return should be positive with a sufficient level of confidence. It should not depend on  
6 unrealistic assumptions about risk preferences and transaction or information costs. Last, the  
7 betting rule should be based on readily observable information, robust to out-of-sample testing,  
8 and simple enough so that a large number of bettors may be able to detect and exploit it.  
9  
10

11 This article investigates the degree of weak-form efficiency of betting markets by analysing the  
12 statistical relationship between odds and return in the European Football online betting market,  
13 which is the most developed market in Europe. The data cover 21 championships played in 11  
14 European countries over a period of 11 years (2000-2011). Each year, odds of home wins, away  
15 wins and draws posted by 6 to 10 online bookmakers, depending on the years, are recorded.  
16 Overall, the dataset includes 79,446 football matches and around 1,800,000 betting odds. Our  
17 data are an order of magnitude larger than any other dataset previously examined in online  
18 betting markets. We show that systematically picking out betting odds inferior to a threshold  
19 delivers a rate of return of 4.45% if best odds are selected across bookmakers and 2.78% if mean  
20 odds are used. Annualized rates of return are 106% and 52% respectively. This amounts to  
21 backing overwhelmingly favourites whose probability of winning exceeds 90%. These results  
22 only exploit information contained in odds, do not rely on complex econometric models, and are  
23 robust to out-of sample tests and different risk preferences assumptions. Transaction costs are  
24 shown to reduce profitability but only for small stake bets. Overall, the evidence indicates that  
25 profitable opportunities are not exploited away by bettors and that bookmakers do not set odds in  
26 a rational way.  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 The paper is linked to the literature that documents the presence of a favourite-longshot bias in  
32 betting markets (see Sorensen and Ottaviani (2008) for a survey). This bias refers to the  
33 observation that the expected return on longshot bets (or bets on outsiders) tends to be  
34 systematically lower than on favourite bets. It is mostly observed in racetrack betting data  
35 (Snowberg and Wolfers, 2010). Our data reveals the presence of a favourite-longshot bias in the  
36 European Football Championships although the relationship between odds and return is noisier  
37 than in racetrack betting data. Hence the result that backing outcomes with the shortest odds is a  
38 profitable strategy can be seen as the exploitation of a favourite-longshot bias.  
39  
40  
41

42 There are however important differences with previous results found in racetrack betting data.  
43 First, horse racing betting markets are pari-mutuel, that is the money bet on all outcomes is  
44 pooled and then shared proportionally among those who picked the winning outcome. Under this  
45 sharing rule, a favourite-longshot bias means that bettors tend to underbet on favourites and to  
46 overbet on longshots. Hence, deviations from market efficiency could only be attributable to  
47 bettors' behaviour. The European Football betting market is not pari-mutuel but a fixed-odds  
48 market in which bookmakers set odds several days in advance and then rarely change them  
49 during the betting period. Since they do not balance the books, odds do not reflect supply and  
50 demand for each bet. If bettors tend to overbet on longshots, bookmakers may take advantage of  
51 this bias by skewing odds against outsiders.<sup>2</sup> Hence a decreasing function between odds and  
52  
53  
54

---

55 <sup>2</sup>Levitt (2004) provides evidence that bookmakers are better at predicting games outcomes than bettors in  
56 the American National Football League gambling market, and exploit this advantage by distorting odds.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 return may come from optimal pricing by bookmakers dealing with bettors characterized by a  
4 favourite-longshot bias.  
5  
6

7 Second, although existing studies generally find that backing favourites yields a better return than  
8 betting on outsiders, they do not document profit opportunities, contrary to our study. This is true  
9 in horse racing (Snowberg and Wolfers, 2010) and in other sports as well. After a comprehensive  
10 review of the literature on sport forecasting in horse racing and several team sports, Stekler et al.  
11 (2010) come to the conclusion that there is no evidence that either statistical systems or experts  
12 consistently outperform the market. Our article reaches a different conclusion by showing that a  
13 simple betting rule is able to beat bookmakers' odds.  
14  
15

16 Many empirical studies dedicated to European Football betting markets have developed  
17 forecasting models that serve as a basis to the elaboration of betting strategies (Pope and Peel,  
18 1989, Cain, Law, and Peel, 2000, Kuypers, 2000, Dixon and Pope, 2004, Asimakopoulos and  
19 Goddard, 2004, Deschamps and Gergaud, 2007). Some of these articles suggest profitable yet  
20 fragile betting opportunities. In particular, they rely on complex statistical models and lack the  
21 kind of robustness tests performed in this study. None of them provide evidence of profitable  
22 rules based solely on odds. The main reason why previous studies have failed to uncover the  
23 availability of odd-based profitable rules is that they focus on one or a few championships  
24 observed during one or a few seasons and consequently dispose of a relatively small database.  
25 Our dataset is on average ten times larger than theirs and allows us to assess the profitability of  
26 betting strategies involving infrequent bets with high accuracy<sup>3</sup>.  
27  
28  
29

30 The result that a simple and profitable price-based betting rule is left unexploited is also of  
31 interest for the efficiency literature in finance. There is an ongoing debate whether return  
32 anomalies are genuine deviations from market efficiency (see e.g. Shleifer (2000) and Schwert  
33 (2003) for two contrasting views). A wealth of empirical studies has failed to bring forth a  
34 consensus about this issue. One major reason is that tests of market efficiency rely on a particular  
35 asset-pricing model. Hence deviations from efficiency can always be rejected on the ground that  
36 the theoretical model at hand is inadequate. Efficiency tests in betting markets face the same  
37 difficulty, but require a much simpler model of asset returns. Bets have only two payoffs  
38 delivered a few days forward so that time is not an issue. The probability of winning is easier to  
39 estimate than the stochastic behaviour of financial assets. If any, betting markets have also a  
40 better chance of being efficient as betting is a repeated activity with immediate feedbacks that  
41 facilitate learning (Thaler and Ziemba, 1988, Erev and Haruvy, 2010). Hence the presence of  
42 unexploited profit opportunities is instructive about the degree of efficiency and participants'  
43 rationality in information markets.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The paper is organized as follows. The next section describes the data, Section 3 presents the  
49 expected return to bets at different odds. Section 4 investigates the profitability of a simple price-  
50 based betting rule. Section 5 analyses to what extent profitability is affected by transaction costs.  
51 Next, Section 6 tests the robustness of the betting rule and Section 7 estimates which fraction of  
52  
53

---

54  
55  
56 <sup>3</sup> As a comparison, Kuypers (2000) exploit 3,382 matches in his study, Dixon and Pope (2004) 6,629  
57 matches and Goddard and Asimakopoulos (2004) 8,144 matches, whereas the present dataset comprises  
58 79,446 matches.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their wealth risk averse bettors would dedicate to wagering. Section 8 concludes.  
4

## 5 6 **II. Description of the dataset**

7  
8 The dataset comprises the results of 79,446 football matches played in national championships of  
9 11 European countries between 2000 and 2011, together with the odds against each possible  
10 outcome (home win, away win, even) and the date of the matches. All data can be freely  
11 downloaded from the website [football.data.co.uk](http://football.data.co.uk). The championships covered by this resource  
12 are the top four leagues of England and Scotland, the top two leagues of Germany, Italy, Spain  
13 and France, and the top leagues of Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Turkey and Greece. All  
14 championships are present in the dataset as soon as 2000.  
15

16  
17 To avoid selection bias and to dispose of the largest dataset, all championships and years  
18 recorded by the website are used in the sequel (except the fifth league of England whose data  
19 only begin in 2005). Betting odds data are quoted by 12 online bookmakers accessible to British  
20 gamblers<sup>4</sup>. Appendix A indicates the number of matches present in the dataset broken down by  
21 seasons and bookmakers. Five online bookmakers are recorded the first season 2000-1. Their  
22 number gradually increases to 10 for more recent seasons. The records of several competing  
23 bookmakers allow us to use two types of odds for every match outcome: the best odds recorded  
24 in the dataset and the mean odd which is the arithmetic mean of all odds quoted for a given  
25 outcome.  
26  
27

## 28 29 **III. The mean return to bets at different odds**

30  
31 This section investigates the expected return to bets placed at various ranges of odd. All seasons,  
32 championships and odds status are pooled. For every match outcome the best odd available in the  
33 market is selected. Figure 1 plots average rates of return of bets with similar odds along with their  
34 95% confidence interval. Appendix B provides detailed information about how the graph is  
35 constructed.  
36  
37

38  
39 <Insert Figure 1>  
40

41 Returns displayed in Fig. 1 are computed with best odds but a similar profile translated  
42 downward would obtain if mean odds were used instead. Two important observations are in  
43 order. First, a favourite longshot bias is observed. Return tends to decrease with odds although  
44 the relationship is somewhat noisy and seem to disappear for odds greater than 3.5. This pattern  
45 is consistent with several theories. If bettors have expected utility preferences, the odd-return  
46 relationship reveals risk loving (Quandt, 1986). A similar pattern would arise if bettors depreciate  
47 small probabilities as in Prospect Theory (e.g. Snowberg and Wolfers, 2010). Last, if a subset of  
48 bettors benefit from private information, bookmakers may attempt to protect themselves by  
49 lowering the return to betting on longshots. Shin (1991, 1992) shows that the presence of insider  
50  
51

---

52  
53 <sup>4</sup>These bookmakers are Bet365, Blue Square, Bwin, Gamebookers, Interwetten, Ladbrokes, Sportingbet,  
54 Sporting Odds, Stan James, Stanleybet, Victor Chandler and William Hill. They are all well-established  
55 online bookmakers except Sporting Odds which has ceased its activity.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

traders generates a favourite-longshot bias in fixed odds markets. Note however that a decreasing relationship between odds and return for the longest odds is not a feature of our data.

Second, the first odds intervals display a positive return. Bets with odds less than 1.21 yield a return of around 4% (see Table B in Appendix B for more details). The confidence interval indicates that the true return is positive with a probability greater than 95%. In addition, Table B in Appendix B shows that the probability is actually greater than 99% for bets whose odds is smaller than 1.17. Hence backing overwhelmingly favourites whose probability of winning is around 90% guarantees a positive and statistically robust rate of return. If mean odds are selected instead of best odds, average returns are still around 2% for odds less than 1.21 but are less statistically robust (Table B in Appendix B). The 95% confidence interval includes strictly positive returns only for odds smaller than 1.17.

The presence of profitable bets casts serious doubt on the ability of the market to aggregate all relevant information about the likelihood of match outcomes. To the contrary, the evidence suggests that profitable opportunities are not exploited away by bettors and that bookmakers do not fix odds in a rational way, contrary to what Levit (2004) shows in the American National Football League gambling market. By severely underpricing bets with the smallest odds, bookmakers expose themselves to potentially large losses. From a bettor's perspective, it is however not straightforward how easy this pricing bias may be exploited. The rest of the article investigates this question by analysing the profitability of a simple betting strategy which consists in backing all results whose odds is smaller than a threshold.

#### IV. A simple betting rule

Table 1 shows the rates of return when bettors back all bets whose odds are less or equal to various thresholds. Statistics are computed for the whole sample. The threshold applies to best odds regardless bettors select the best odd or the mean odd. For mean odds, one may think of bettors who bet upon observing the best odds in the market, yet use their regular bookmaker to place a stake.

<Insert Table 1>

The return profile is hump-shaped both for best odds and mean odds. The rate of return is increasing for odds between 1.14 and 1.19 due to a stable win frequency around 91.5%. Betting all outcomes whose odds are inferior to the cut-off 1.19 yields a maximum return of 4.45% if best odds are chosen and 2.78% if mean odds are selected. This rule implies backing 661 bets over 11 seasons, or on average 60 bets per season. Notice that all strategies based on a price threshold between 1.17 and 1.21 yield a return greater than 4%. Hence bettors may not choose the best cutoff, yet benefit from a rate of return close to the maximum one.

Table 1 also shows that bets with odds smaller than 1.16 deliver a sub-optimal return. A more sophisticated strategy would therefore consist in backing all bets whose odds are between 1.16 and 1.19. This would yield a return of 7.20% with best odds and 5.26% with mean odds. A one-threshold strategy is however maintained in the following in order to keep the betting rule as simple as possible.

Rates of return in Table 1 apply to a very short time period. Bettors typically place a stake

Saturday and can withdraw their money the next week. To ease the comparison with financial investments, annualized rates of return are computed by backtesting the betting rule on historical data. Bettors are assumed to face actual betting opportunities, to stake £1 on every bet whose odd is less or equal to a given threshold and to reinvest the proceeds whenever possible. The gains are withdrawn from the betting account once a year at the end of each season. An annual rate of return is then calculated for every season from summer to next summer.

More formally, let us denote  $s_t$  the amount of money placed in the account balance until the betting period  $t = 1, \dots, T$  and  $g_t$  the account balance which is  $s_t$  plus previous gains and losses from past bets.  $s_t$  and  $g_t$  evolve over a season according to:

$$s_t = s_{t-1} + \min(g_{t-1} - n_t, 0)$$

$$g_t = g_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_t} q_i \times 1_i - n_t$$

with  $1_i$  equal to 1 if bet  $i$  is successful and 0 otherwise.  $n_t$  is the number of simultaneous bets that meet the betting criterion and belong to the same betting period. A betting period includes all bets that happen within three consecutive days during which we assume that gains reinvestment is not possible. Bettors contribute to their account the sum  $s_t - s_{t-1}$  whenever the balance account  $g_{t-1}$  is insufficient to stake the sum  $n_t$ . End-of-season rate of return is  $g_T / s_T - 1$ . Table 2 indicates annualized rates of return for odd threshold varying from 1.15 to 1.26.

<Insert Table 2>

For every threshold, we first compute annual rates of return for the 11 seasons and then take the geometric mean. Backing outcomes whose odds are less or equal to 1.21 maximizes the rate of return both for the strategy involving best odds and the one with mean odds. For this threshold, 1111 bets meet the criterion. Given a unit stake of £1, the average total stake over a season is £4.80 with best odd, and the average end-of-season gain is £9.90. This translates into an average rate of return of 106%. The optimal threshold is slightly different from 1.19 which is the cutoff found with the instant return criterion. Overall, the pattern is similar albeit with a different scale, which comes from the opportunity given to bettors to capitalize instant rates of return by reinvesting the proceeds each week.

## V. Information and transaction costs

Two betting strategies have been distinguished. Bettors may stick with their regular betting website or they may shop around in search of best odds. The profitability of these two options has been evaluated by computing rates of return with mean odds and best odds respectively. Information and transactions costs might however inhibit bettors from exploiting profit opportunities documented in the previous section.

A casual internet search uncovers many websites specialized in free odds comparisons. Hence shopping around for best odds do not entail significant search costs. Transaction costs depend on the payment mode. Bettors may deposit money into their betting account using a bank card, bank transfer or a money transfer site. A card deposit is credited instantly into the account. Some



online betting sites do not charge anything for card deposits, while others charge a fee of a few per cent on the amount deposited, which is detrimental to the return to betting.

Bank transfers are free of charge both in cases of deposit and withdrawal. Transferring funds may take from 3 to 5 business days<sup>5</sup>. This is a good solution for bettors who choose to place bets in their regular bookmaker. It is less convenient if they want to shop around for best odds. As odds are typically posted Wednesday for next weekend matches, delays of transfer may be too long to take advantage of the best odds proposed by bookmakers. The use of a money transfer site is more appropriate in this case.

Money transfer sites (MTS) are third party intermediaries that make easy and cost effective for bettors to manage their online betting payments. Bettors make a single deposit into their account and then allocate the money to different bookmakers. Deposits into the MTS account by bank transfer is free. Payments to bookmakers are made instantly. Table 3 presents the fee structure of two commonly used MTS, Moneybookers and Neteller.

**Table 3. The cost of using two money transfer sites**

	Moneybookers	Neteller
Deposits by bank transfer	free	free
Withdrawal by bank transfers	£1.48	£5
Transfers of money to bookmakers	1%, up to £0.41	free
Receiving money from bookmakers	free	free

Assuming that bettors commit to their betting strategy over a complete season, Table 4 shows how annualized rates of return similar to the ones computed in Table 2 for a threshold of 1.21 vary when transaction costs are taken into account.

**Table 4. Annualized rates of return for £10 and £100 unit stakes (whole sample)**

	No transaction costs	Moneybookers		Neteller	
Unit stake	irrelevant	£10	£100	£10	£100
Return (%)	106.11	75.06	94.74	93.01	104.81

Bettors are assumed to switch to a different bookmaker and pay the transfer fee every time a bet meeting the criterion appears. In practice several bets appearing in a row may be proposed by the same bookmaker, lowering the payment costs. Hence Table 4 provides an upper bound for the impact of transaction costs to return when bettors use Moneybookers. Flat fees make a significant dent in rates of return for small stakes. They are less visible for a £100 unit stake and would become negligible for higher stakes. They stay in all cases above the annualized rate of return of 52.54% obtained by using mean odds (Table 2). Over a typical season, bettors face 102 bets whose odd is less or equal to 1.21. With a £100 unit stake and profit reinvestment, they place a

<sup>5</sup>If the money is transferred to a foreign bank, delays may be longer and transfers not free of charge.

total of £440. At the end of the season their gains are up to £819 with Moneybookers and £857 with Neteller. The impact of transaction costs on profitability depends on the size of stakes. We will see in Section 7 that even risk averse bettors stake a significant fraction of their wealth, so that transaction costs are no more an issue.

## VI. Robustness tests

Previous rates of return are computed for the whole period which includes 11 seasons. It is possible that profitability were high during the first seasons and then gradually disappears as more and more gamblers bet on shortest odds. Bookmakers may also have realized by themselves their risk exposure and adjusted downward their smallest odds before incurring significant losses. In both cases, a declining profitability should be observed the latest seasons. Alternatively, positive returns could be for some reasons concentrated in the latest years so that bettors and bookmakers have lacked hindsight to notice and exploit the pattern. Table 5 shows that none of these scenarios are observed.

<Insert Table 5>

Rates of return are not decreasing over time. To the contrary, returns follow a slightly increasing trend with the last three seasons among the best ones. The pattern is however visible as soon as the first season. Instant rates of return are positive 10 seasons over 11 with best odds and 9 seasons over 10 with mean odds. Hence nearly 11 years of high profitability have not been consistently exploited by bettors.

High rates of return have been obtained by using a price threshold computed over the 11 seasons. One may ask whether high returns persist if the price threshold is computed by using price information available at the beginning of each season. For a given season, it amounts to finding the threshold that maximizes the return between the beginning of the first season recorded in the sample and the end of the previous season, and then to applying this threshold to next seasons. Table 6 shows for each season the optimal threshold computed over past seasons (third column), the corresponding rate of return for the in-sample period (fourth column), the rate of return if this threshold is used the next season (fifth column) and the rate of return if it is used for the rest of the seasons (sixth column).

<Insert Table 6>

Optimal thresholds do not vary much when the in-sample period is extended forward, except when the season 2006-7 is added with a threshold falling from 1.24 to 1.19. Instant rates of return are equal to 4.33% on average with one year of negative return. Interestingly, updating the threshold each year is dominated on average by the strategy which uses the same threshold for the rest of the seasons with a mean return of 5.04%. This result suggests that fully updating the odd threshold after every season is not optimal. As expected, using real-time data instead of ex post data to compute the optimal threshold reduces the instant rate of return but only from 5.01% (average return in Table 5) to 4.33%.

Appendix C presents the same statistics with mean odds instead of best odds. The next-season average rate of returns is still 2.90% instead of 4.33% with best odds. Keeping the same threshold

for the rest of the seasons yields an instant mean return of 3.29% compared to 3.34% when the entire sample is used to compute the odd threshold (Table 5).

## VII. Optimal staking

Selecting the shortest odds is highly profitable but also highly risky. For the class of bets under consideration, bettors may lose their entire stake with a probability of around 10%. Risk might therefore deter bettors from taking advantage of these return opportunities. To check this possibility, we assume that bettors have expected utility (EU) preferences and concave utility. We do not claim that such preferences apply to the majority of active bettors. To the contrary, the average bettor may be risk loving and fall prey to the same behavioural biases that are observed in financial markets, like overconfidence (Barber and Odean, 2001) or the hindsight bias (Biais and Weber, 2009). Yet the operation of a minority of rational bettors who detect and exploit return deviations may suffice to guarantee market efficiency. If any, these arbitragers should treat probabilities in a rational manner and consequently be EU decision-makers. Note that assuming risk averse EU bettors minimizes the risk to reject incorrectly the efficient market hypothesis. High-risk-high-return bets would obviously fit risk loving bettors' preferences.

EU investors put a strictly positive fraction of their wealth in an asset as soon as its rate of return exceeds the safe interest rate (e.g. Haliassos and Bertaut, 1995). As a result, we do not test whether risk averse bettors participate to the betting market but rather what fraction of their wealth they should invest in a given bet. A fraction invested close to zero would support the efficient market argument according to which risk prevents arbitragers from eliminating return anomalies.

A simple asset allocation problem is solved and calibrated using empirical values. Betting opportunities are modelled as follows. Let us consider a bet which odd is  $q$  and probability of success  $p$ . Several classes of bets with similar odds are distinguished. Their probabilities of winning are identified to win frequencies. Table 7 displays statistics on  $p$  and  $q$  for different bet classes.

<Insert Table 7>

There are eight classes of odds which range from 1.13 to 1.21 for best odds and 1.11 to 1.21 for mean odds. All classes are profitable with average instant rates of return between 0.31% and 9.97%. The last column indicates the theoretical rate of return if bets were perfectly homogenous in each class. They are not very different from average returns, suggesting that bet classes are close to be homogenous despite different odd values included in each class.

Bets are evaluated by EU bettors with isoelastic utility function:  $u(c) = c^{1-\sigma} / (1-\sigma)$ , where  $\sigma$  is the relative risk aversion coefficient (RRAC). Bettor's wealth before gambling is denoted  $w$ . The amount of money placed on a single bet is denoted  $\alpha$ . Given the very short period over which a bet is pending, money is the sole alternative investment considered, which interest rate is zero. In such an environment with a zero risk-free interest rate, no serial correlation of rates of return<sup>6</sup> and

---

<sup>6</sup>The correlation coefficient between the rate of return and the previous period one is not significantly

an isoelastic utility function, it is rational to bet at each period as if the current betting period were the last one (Mossin, 1968). This property greatly simplifies the investment problem. The amount  $\alpha$  maximizes bettor's expected utility:

$$\alpha^* = \arg \max p u(w - \alpha + \alpha q) + (1 - p) u(w - \alpha)$$

The optimal stake in proportion to wealth  $\alpha^* / w$  is derived with  $p$  and  $q$  replaced by their empirical counterparts documented in Table 7. The problem at hand is however only valid for a single bet. 60 bets meeting the betting criterion in a typical season, many bets are actually placed during the same weekend. Over the 11 seasons, only 190 bets, or 29% of total bets, come in isolation during a betting period, 186 bets come in pair, 147 by three, 76 by four, 50 by five and 12 by six. Backing several bets at once is a natural way to diversify risk. This is why optimal stakes are also calculated when more than one bet are taken at the same time. The corresponding maximization programs are presented in Appendix D.

Table 8 displays optimal stakes in proportion to wealth  $\alpha^* / w$  for various degrees of risk aversion. Four odd classes taken from Table 7 are compared which differ in their instant rate of return. Three different values for the RRAC are considered. Although most calibrated studies, notably in the equity premium literature, take a RRAC between 1 and 5, we also consider a value of 10 to test results' robustness. Such a value implies that bettors would be ready to pay as much as 4.42% to escape the risk of gaining or losing 10% of their wealth. For simplicity, it is also assumed that when several bets come together, they share the same characteristics in terms of probability and odd.

<Insert Table 8>

As expected, the fraction of wealth dedicated to betting is decreasing with the degree of risk aversion and increasing with the expected rate of return and the number of simultaneous bets. The presence of concomitant bets goes a long way toward mitigating risk. Betting on two bets instead of one roughly doubles the fraction invested in wagering. The fraction of wealth gambled is not trivial. In the worst case scenario, a single bet with an expected return of 0.44% and a RRAC of 10, bettors still commit 0.5% of their wealth to gambling. With more than one bet, a smaller RRAC or better rates of return, this fraction rapidly reaches high fractions of wealth for realistic betting opportunities. We conclude from these results that risk should not deter most EU bettors from investing a significant proportion of their wealth in the betting market.

### VIII. Conclusion

Online betting markets are becoming a global industry which attracts an increasing number of firms and bettors around the world. Gamblers can choose between many bookmakers and easily shop around for best odds. Yet, despite a highly competitive market, this article provides evidence of large deviations from weak-form efficiency. It is shown that systematically picking

---

different from zero at a 10% confidence level.

1  
2  
3 out the shortest odds delivers an instant rate of return of 4.45% or an annualized rate of return of  
4 106%. Such a betting rule does not require a complex forecasting model. The return is robust to  
5 out-of-sample tests and to the use of real-time data. Bettors with realistic degrees of risk aversion  
6 are still willing to devote a significant fraction of their wealth to wagering. Transaction costs take  
7 the form of small flat fees which can be recouped by stakes large enough.  
8  
9

10 Our data confirm the presence of a favourite-longshot bias found in other betting markets. Rates  
11 of return to betting fall as the odds rise. The bias is large enough to produce a positive return rate  
12 when overwhelmingly favourites are backed. This deviation from efficiency involves both sides  
13 of the market. Bettors have failed so far to respond to the presence of profitable bets and  
14 bookmakers have put their business at risk by underpricing bets with the smallest odds.  
15  
16

17 By focusing on simple strategies, these results do not make full use of all available information.  
18 We have already noticed that discarding the odds below 1.16 would enhance the return rate. In  
19 addition, the odd threshold could be adapted for each country or league. It could also depend on  
20 whether the odds hold for the home team or the away team. Other improvements would consist in  
21 exploiting possible serial correlations of wins or adopting a betting strategy where the size of the  
22 stakes are derived from the optimal staking model developed in Section 7.  
23  
24  
25  
26

## 27 References

- 28  
29 Asimakopoulos, I. and J. Goddard (2004) Forecasting football results and the efficiency of fixed-  
30 odds betting. *Journal of Forecasting*, **23**, 51-66.  
31 Barber, B. M., and T. Odean (2001) Boys Will Be Boys: Gender, Overconfidence, and Common  
32 Stock Investment, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **116**, 261--92.  
33 Biais, B. and M. Weber (2009) Hindsight bias, risk perception, and investment performance,  
34 *Management Science*, **55**, 1018-1030.  
35 Cain, M., D. Law and D. Peel. (2000) The favourite-longshot bias and market efficiency in UK  
36 football betting. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, **47**, 25--36.  
37 Deschamps, B. and O. Gergaud (2007) Efficiency in Betting Markets: Evidence from English  
38 Football, *Journal of Prediction Markets*, **1**, 61-73.  
39 Dixon, M. J. and P. F. Pope (2004) The value of statistical forecasts in the UK association  
40 football betting market, *International Journal of Forecasting*, **20**, 697-711.  
41 Fama, E. F. (1991) Efficient Capital Markets: A review of Theory and Empirical Work, *Journal*  
42 *of finance*, **25** 383-417.  
43 Bertaut, C. and M. Haliassos (1995) Why Do So Few Hold Stocks?, *Economic Journal*, **105**  
44 1110-1129.  
45 Jensen, M. C. (1978) Some anomalous evidence regarding market efficiency, *Journal of*  
46 *Financial Economics*, **6**, 95-101.  
47 Kuypers, T. (2000) Information and Efficiency: An Empirical Study of a Fixed Odds Betting  
48 Market, *Applied Economics*, **32**, 1353-1363.  
49 Levitt S. (2004) How Do Markets Function? An Empirical Analysis of Gambling on the National  
50 Football League, *Economic Journal*, **114**, 2043-2066.  
51 Mossin, J. (1968) Optimal Multiperiod Portfolio Policies, *Journal of Business*, **41**, 215-219.  
52 Sorensen, P. Norman and M. Ottaviani (2008) The Favorite-Longshot Bias: An Overview of the  
53 Main Explanations, Published in Handbook of Sports and Lottery Markets, edited by D. B.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hausch and W. T. Ziemba, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 83-101.  
4 Pope, P. F. and D. A. Peel (1989) Information, Prices and efficiency in a fixed-odds betting  
5 Market, *Economica*, **56**, 323-341.  
6 Quandt, R. E. (1986) Betting and Equilibrium, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **101**, 201-207.  
7 Schwert, G. W. (2003) Anomalies and Market Efficiency, Handbook of the Economics of  
8 Finance, in G.M. Constantinides, M. Harris and R. M. Stulz (ed.), volume 1, chapter 15, 939-974  
9 Elsevier.  
10 Shin, H. S. (1991) Optimal Odds Against Insider Traders, *Economic Journal*, **101**, 1179-1185.  
11 Shin, H. S. (1992) Prices of State-Contingent Claims with Insider Traders, and the Favorite-  
12 Longshot Bias, *Economic Journal*, **102**, 426-435.  
13 Shleifer, A. (2000) Clarendon Lectures: Inefficient Markets, Oxford University Press.  
14 Snowberg, E. and Justin Wolfers (2010) Explaining the Favorite-Longshot Bias: Is it Risk-Love  
15 or Misperceptions?, *Journal of Political Economy*, **118**, 723-746.  
16 Stekler, H. O., D.Sendor and R. Verlander (2010) Issues in Sports Forecasting. *International*  
17 *Journal of Forecasting* **26**, 606-21.  
18 Thaler, R. and W. Ziemba (1988) Parimutual Betting Markets: Racetracks and Lotteries, *Journal*  
19 *of Economic Perspectives* **2**, 161-174.  
20 Erev I. and E. Haruvy (2010) Learning and the Economics of Small Decisions, forthcoming in  
21 the Handbook of Experimental Economics edited by John H. Kagel and A. E. Roth.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Appendix A: Sample summary statistics**

29  
30 Table A presents summary statistics about the number of odds present in the data broken down  
31 by seasons and bookmakers.  
32

33  
34 <Insert Table A>  
35

36 Table reads as follows. The results of 7,095 football matches have been recorded during the  
37 season 2000-1, among which 5,542 have odds from the bookmaker Gamebookers. The same  
38 year, we dispose of 25,557 triplets of odds (one for each possible match outcome) quoted by five  
39 bookmakers. The total number of odds recorded in 2000-1 is therefore 76,671.  
40  
41  
42

## 43 **Appendix B: Computation of Figure 1**

44  
45 The sample includes 79,446 football matches from 21 national championships played in 12  
46 European countries over the period 2000-2011. Our dataset has a quasi-continuum of odds  
47 generally quoted with a two-digit accuracy, except for longer odds. We group together results  
48 with similar odds to produce reliable estimates of return. Our grouping algorithm starts from the  
49 smallest odds and add bets with identical or increasing odds in each bracket until the number of  
50 bets is greater than a threshold  $x$ . The threshold is a balance between statistical significance and  
51 keeping groups homogenous. Bets with the shortest odds being less frequent, a smaller  $x$  is  
52 required to make apparent their profitability.  $x$  is equal to 2000 for the whole sample, except in  
53 the left-hand part of the spectrum where bets are less numerous:  $x$  equals 500 for odds strictly  
54 smaller than 1.30. Table B summarises relevant statistics for the computation of returns and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

confidence intervals. It only indicates the first three bins, or the first three points in the figure, which are the most important for the purpose of our study. The size of groups is not constant so that bets with identical odds are not split between adjacent groups.

<Insert Table B>

Average return is  $\sum_{j=1}^m q_j \times 1_{WIN} - 1$  with  $m$  the number of bets in a class,  $q_j$  the odd of bet  $j$ , and  $1_{WIN}$  an index equal to one if the bet is successful. Confidence interval around average return is given by  $\psi \times \bar{q} \sqrt{f_n(1-f_n)} / \sqrt{n}$  with  $\bar{q}$  the mean odd of the class,  $f_n$  the win frequency, and  $\psi = 1.65$  for a 90% confidence level, 1.96 for a 95% confidence level and 2.57 for a 99% confidence level. The confidence interval is the same for best odds and mean odds due to the assumption that a bet is triggered as soon as a best odd is inferior to the threshold regardless bettors earn the best odd or the mean odd. For mean odds, we can think of bettors who compare odds of different bookmakers but keep their regular bookmaker to place a bet. Different grouping methods or different thresholds would produce slightly different results without altering the main properties in Figure 1.

### Appendix C: Out-of-sample instant rates of return with mean odds

<Insert Table C>

Table C indicates the annual rate of return of backing all bets whose odds are less or equal to a threshold by using real-time data and mean odds.

### Appendix D: Money allocation problems with multiple bets

This appendix shows money allocation problems when bettors have expected utility preferences and place more than one bet during a betting period. Let  $p$  be the probability of winning the bet,  $q$  the odd,  $w$  bettor's wealth and  $\alpha$  the amount of money wagered. The bettor's problem with two simultaneous and independent bets is:

$$\alpha^* = \arg \max p^2 u(w - 2\alpha + 2\alpha q) + 2p(1-p)u(w - 2\alpha + \alpha q) + (1-p)^2 u(w - 2\alpha).$$

Bettors face a probability  $p^2$  of winning the two bets, a probability  $2p(1-p)$  of winning only one bet and  $(1-p)^2$  of losing their entire stake. The money allocation problem with three bets is:

$$\alpha^* = \arg \max p^3 u(w - 3\alpha + 3\alpha q) + 3p^2(1-p)u(w - 3\alpha + 2\alpha q) + 3p(1-p)^2 u(w - 3\alpha + \alpha q) + (1-p)^3 u(w - 3\alpha),$$


and with four bets :

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^* = \arg \max & p^4 u(w - 4\alpha + 4\alpha q) + 4p^3(1-p)u(w - 4\alpha + 3\alpha q) \\ & + 6p^2(1-p)^2 u(w - 4\alpha + 2\alpha q) + 4p(1-p)^3 u(w - 4\alpha + \alpha q) + (1-p)^4 u(w - 4\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

For Peer Review



Figure 1. Rate of return at different odds



Note: Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011. A 95 % confidence interval is added between each estimate.

**Table 1. Odd threshold and return**

Odd threshold	Number of bets	Number of wins	Win frequency	Return with best odds (%)	Return with mean odds (%)
1.13	204	185	90.69	0.14	-1.09
1.14	241	220	91.29	1.32	0.00
1.15	409	373	91.20	2.71	1.21
1.16	444	407	91.67	3.50	1.94
1.17	614	562	91.53	4.37	2.72
1.18	659	602	91.35	4.40	2.73
1.19	661	604	91.38	4.45	2.78
1.20	1111	993	89.38	4.16	2.32
1.21	1118	999	89.36	4.15	2.33
1.22	1417	1243	87.72	3.19	1.31
1.23	1452	1277	87.95	3.47	1.58
1.24	1455	1280	87.97	3.61	1.72
1.25	2107	1791	85.00	1.86	-0.16
1.26	2115	1798	85.01	1.90	-0.12
1.27	2179	1845	84.67	1.64	-0.39

*Note:* Table indicates various statistics for betting rules consisting in backing all bets whose odds are less or equal to a threshold. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

**Table 2. Odd threshold and annualized rates of return**

Odd threshold	Return with best odds (%)	Return with mean odds (%)
1.15	33.71	15.94
1.16	45.79	23.50
1.17	71.96	39.42
1.18	78.73	43.94
1.19	77.47	43.18
1.20	103.54	51.79
1.21	106.11	52.54
1.22	63.11	22.96
1.23	76.66	33.50
1.24	79.91	35.68
1.25	33.78	-4.03
1.26	35.34	-3.19

*Note:* Table shows the rates of return with best and mean odds for betting rules consisting in backing all bets whose odds are less or equal to a threshold. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

**Table 5. Instant rates of return by seasons (betting threshold of 1.19, no transaction costs)**

Seasons	Number of bets	Number of wins	Win frequency	Instant return with best odds	Instant return with mean odds
2000:1	50	45	90.00	3.24	2.01
2001:2	42	39	92.86	5.53	4.22
2002:3	76	68	89.47	1.66	0.30
2003:4	91	84	92.31	4.49	2.93
2004:5	79	68	86.08	-2.05	-3.56
2005:6	64	60	93.75	8.27	6.07
2006:7	74	67	90.54	3.61	1.70
2007:8	42	37	88.10	1.36	-0.38
2008:9	31	30	96.77	12.39	10.55
2009:0	62	59	95.16	8.79	6.81
2010:1	50	47	94.00	7.8	6.08
Mean	60.10	54.91	91.73	5.01	3.34

*Note:* Table indicates various statistics broken down by season for betting rules consisting in backing all bets whose odds are less or equal to 1.19. Mean is unweighted arithmetic mean. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

**Table 6. Out-of-sample instant rates of return with best odds, no transaction costs**

In-sample seasons	t	Optimal threshold over [2000:t]	In-sample rates of return over [2000:t]	Out-of-sample rates of return over [t:t+1]	Out-of-sample rates of return over [t:2011]
2000:1	2001	1.21	5.84	7.50	4.00
2000:2	2002	1.21	6.64	2.54	3.68
2000:3	2003	1.24	5.76	4.14	2.93
2000:4	2004	1.24	5.22	0.57	2.70
2000:5	2005	1.24	4.14	3.60	3.14
2000:6	2006	1.24	4.04	-1.95	3.03
2000:7	2007	1.19	3.28	1.36	7.44
2000:8	2008	1.21	3.22	8.98	7.32
2000:9	2009	1.19	3.65	8.79	8.35
2000:10	2010	1.19	4.17	7.80	7.80
Mean		1.21	4.60	4.33	5.04

*Note:* Table shows instant rates of return under various scenarios. Column 1 indicates period over which optimal threshold is computed; column 2 last year of in-sample seasons, column 3 optimal threshold over the specified period; column 4 in-sample average instant rate of return; column 5 average instant rate of return obtained by applying the threshold over the next season; column 6 average instant rate of return by using the same threshold until the last season. Mean is unweighted arithmetic mean. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

**Table 7. Summary statistics for various classes of bets grouped by odd similarity**

Odd type	Range of odds	Mean odd (q)	Sample size	Win frequency (p)	Average return (%)	100*(pq-1)
best	[1.13 – 1.15[	1.137	61	0.9672	9.975	9.985
best	[1.15 – 1.17[	1.153	214	0.9159	5.592	5.588
best	[1.17 – 1.18[	1.170	154	0.9156	7.123	7.123
best	[1.18 – 1.21[	1.198	497	0.8672	3.896	3.901
mean	[1.11 – 1.13[	1.120	135	0.9333	4.531	4.508
mean	[1.13 – 1.15[	1.140	222	0.9144	4.253	4.264
mean	[1.15 – 1.17]	1.159	275	0.8655	0.311	0.307
mean	[1.17 – 1.18[	1.174	155	0.8774	3.040	3.045
mean	[1.18 – 1.21[	1.195	589	0.8404	0.440	0.445

*Note:* Table indicates various statistics for different odd classes. Last column indicates theoretical rate of return if bets were perfectly homogenous in each class. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

**Table 8. Fraction of wealth gambled in percent as a function of the number of simultaneous bets and for different degrees of risk aversion (no transaction costs)**

Odds	Odd type	Instant rate of return	Number of bets	Relative risk aversion coefficient		
				$\sigma = 1.5$	$\sigma = 5$	$\sigma = 10$
[1.13 – 1.15[	Best odds	9.97%	1	54.47	20.54	10.79
			2	90.24	40.56	21.52
			3	99.08	59.88	32.17
			4	99.91	80.14	44.12
[1.15 – 1.17[	Best odds	5.92%	1	25.96	8.51	4.33
			2	50.93	16.99	8.67
			3	74.59	25.45	13.00
			4	96.90	36.58	18.66
[1.17 – 1.18[	Mean odds	3.04%	1	11.97	3.73	1.88
			2	23.86	7.45	3.75
			3	35.67	11.17	5.63
			4	57.72	18.15	9.15
[1.18 – 1.21[	Mean odds	0.44%	1	3.36	1.02	0.51
			2	6.72	2.04	1.02
			3	10.09	3.06	1.53
			4	26.43	8.06	4.04

*Note:* Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011. Table reads as follows. Bettors with a relative risk aversion coefficient of 1.5 invest 54.47% of their wealth in a bet whose odd is 1.137 and probability of winning is 96.72%. Odds and win probabilities are displayed in Table 7 for best odds ranging from 1.13 to 1.15. Likewise, the third column instant rate of return of 9.97% is the mean return computed in Table 7 for the class of bets [1.13 – 1.15[. Faced with two simultaneous bets whose odds are 1.137 and probabilities of winning 96.72%, bettors place 90.24% of their wealth in the two bets or 45.12% in each bet.

**Table A. Number of matches quoted by bookmakers every year**

	Season											Total 2
	2000-1	2001-2	2002-3	2003-4	2004-5	2005-6	2006-7	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11	
Nb M	7095	7039	7137	7340	7329	7324	7258	7258	7258	7117	7191	79446
GB	5542	5245	6988	7209	7302	7305	7252	7247	7243	7087	7169	75589
IW	6153	6297	6378	6797	7172	7189	7193	7121	7195	6980	7113	75588
LB	3169	3694	4597	5044	6784	7000	7020	7146	7183	7077	7152	65866
SB	4883	4327	6871	7073	7256	7278	7230	7228	7229	7038	7104	73517
WH	5810	6047	6466	6959	6980	7257	7235	5166	7211	7061	7183	73375
ST		5565										5565
BE				6844	7135	7303	7250	7251	7250	7093	7180	57306
SO			3147	3603								6750
BW					7274	7301	7252	7252	7238	7054	7170	50541
SJ						7291	7216	7243	7219	7027	7093	43089
VC						7138	7154	7209	7210	7082	7139	42932
BS								7236	7235	7070	7116	28657
Nb B	5	6	6	7	7	9	9	10	10	10	10	12
Total 1	25557	31175	34447	43529	49903	65062	64802	70099	72213	70569	71419	598775

*Legend:* Nb M: number of matches, GB = Gamebookers, IW = Interwetten, LB = Ladbrokes, SB = Sportingbet, WH = William Hill, ST = Stanley bet, BE = bet365, SO = Sporting Odds, BW = Bwin, SJ = Stan James, VC = Victor Chandler, BS = Blue Square; Nb B : number of recorded bookmakers; Total 1: number of match-bookmaker couples by season; Total 2: number of match-bookmaker couples by bookmaker.



**Table B. Summary statistics for the first three odd brackets displayed in Figure 1**

Odd brackets	Number of bets	Win frequency	Instant return (%)		Confidence interval		
			Best odds	Mean odds	90%	95 %	99%
[1 – 1.17[	614	91.53	4.37	2.72	+/- 2.01	+/- 2.39	+/- 3.13
[1.17 – 1.21[	504	86.71	3.90	1.84	+/- 2.97	+/- 3.53	+/- 4.62
[1.21 – 1.25[	989	80.09	-0.73	-2.96	+/- 2.58	+/- 3.06	+/- 4.01

*Note:* Table shows summary statistics for backing all bets whose odds are included in odd brackets. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.

For Peer Review

**Table C. Out-of-Sample instant rates of return with mean odds, no transaction costs**

In-sample seasons	t	Optimal threshold over [2000:t]	In-sample rates of return over [2000:t]	Out-of-sample rates of return over [t:t+1]	Out-of-sample rates of return over [t:2011]
2000:1	2001	1.21	4.32	6.12	2.15
2000:2	2002	1.21	5.19	1.01	1.78
2000:3	2003	1.24	4.21	2.29	0.93
2000:4	2004	1.24	3.57	1.22	0.67
2000:5	2005	1.24	2.45	1.21	1.07
2000:6	2006	1.24	2.24	-3.90	1.04
2000:7	2007	1.17	1.74	-2.14	5.51
2000:8	2008	1.19	1.51	10.54	7.36
2000:9	2009	1.17	2.04	6.54	6.31
2000:10	2010	1.19	2.51	6.10	6.10
mean		1.21	2.98	2.90	3.29

**Notes:** Table shows instant rates of return for various scenarios. Column 1 indicates period over which optimal threshold is computed; column 2 last year of in-sample seasons, column 3 optimal threshold over the specified period; column 4 in-sample average instant rate of return; column 5 average instant rate of return obtained by applying the threshold over the next season; column 6 average instant rate of return by using the same threshold until the last season. Mean is unweighted arithmetic mean. Sample includes odds of 79,446 football matches played in 11 European countries from 2000 to 2011.