|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stat\ID** | **General Info** | **Specific Info** |
| **Name** | No significant correlations found **[Inquiry credit refunded]** | No significant correlations found **[Inquiry credit refunded]** |
| **League Nom de Plume** | No significant correlations found **[Inquiry credit refunded]** | No significant correlations found **[Inquiry credit refunded]** |
| **Position** | Athlete performance estimates derived from comparing athletes of the same position. Correlation estimates not possible **[Inquiry credit refunded]** | Athlete performance estimates derived from comparing athletes of the same position. Correlation estimates not possible **[Inquiry credit refunded]** |
| **Salary** | Salary is generally indicative of performance.  Tangentially, iron-clad athlete contracts prevent changing of athlete salaries. | Salary is derived (backcalculated) from the total estimate of player performance.   The total salary of players can be safely regarded as indicative of the players’ performance +/-3 zillion (most often within +/-2 zillion).  In other words, the most expensive players are more likely to be better than the least expensive players, but the performance:salary ratio is not constant.  Or to phrase it another way, some athletes are undervalued by up to 3 zillion, and others are overvalued by up to 3 zillion.  Since salary is backcalculated from previously estimated performance, no changes to the rules of the sport (on the field) will directly effect athlete salary or directly effect the relationship between athlete salary and athlete performance.  Tangentially, Iron-clad athlete contracts prevent changing of athlete salaries. |
| **Popularity** | Popularity has no significant correlation with performance. Monetary modelling suggests more popular players will intrinsically produce modest profits for the franchise – just through their charisma and established fanbase. | Popularity has the following effects on the franchise income are as followed:   * Superstar (+5 zillion) * Popular (+3 zillion) * Unknown (+1 zillion) * Disliked (+2 zillion)   No sports rule changes will effect the relationship between franchise popularity and post-season franchise income. |
| **Playstyles** | Performance benefit of playstyle dependent on playstyle of opponent. No intrinsic performance benefits derive from playstyle. GMs know more about playstyles **[Inquiry Credit Refunded]** | Performance benefit of playstyle dependent on playstyle of opponent. No intrinsic performance benefits derive from playstyle. GMs know more about playstyles **[Inquiry Credit Refunded]** |
| **Buff-NESS ™** | The Buff-NESS rating (sponsored by Buff-NESS Inc.) appears to only modestly correlate to athlete performance. | Buff-NESS rating comes in three levels:   * Buff (+1 perf) * Swole (+0 perf) * Hella Swole (-1 perf)   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Replacing water boys and girls with Hella-Swole Buff-NESS water models would triple the relationship between Buff-NESS rating and athlete performance. |
| **Theoretical Squat Strength** | **Higher** Theoretical Squat Strength relates to **higher** player performance. | The natural range of T.S.T. ranges from 200 kg to 1500 kg.  A 1500 kg T.S.T. athlete is approximately +3 performance relative to the 200 kg T.S.T. athlete.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** “Livening the ball” will double the relationship between T.S.T. and athlete performance (from +3 to +6). |
| **Tibia Diameter** | **Thicker** Tibia Diameter relates to **lower** athlete performance. | Tibia Diameter naturally ranges from 1.3 to 5 cm.  A 5 cm Tibia Diameter is indicative of -3 athlete performance relative to a Tibia Diameter of 1.3.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Loosening Time-out time limits will double the relationship between Tibia Diameter and athlete performance. |
| **Juke Torque** | **Higher** Juke Torque relates to **higher** athlete performance. | Juke Torque naturally ranges between 800 and 300 Watts.  A Juke Torque of 3000 Watts is indicative of +4 athlete performance relative to a juke torque of 800 Watts.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Mandating normalized machine-assisted pre-game stretching would double the relationship between juke torque and athlete performance (from +4 to +8). |
| **%Robot** | **Higher** %Robot **relates significantly to increased** athletic performance.  Nerfing %Robot stat or lowering %Robot stat of athletes recommended. | %Robot stat ranges from 0% to 100%, with a 100% %Robot athlete having a performance bonus of +19 relative to 0% %Robot athlete.  Nerfing %Robot stat or lowering %Robot stat of athletes recommended.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Any steps taken towards robotizing the referees (mandating cyborg implants for example) will increase the relationship between %Robot and athlete performance. |
| **Chakra** | Chakras **higher up on the body** relate to **higher** athlete performance. | There are seven Chakra stats, with the Chakra locations higher on the body relating to higher player performance:   * Crown (+3 perf) * Third Eye (+2 perf) * Throat (+2 perf) * Heart (+2 perf) * Solar Plexus (+1 perf) * Sacral (+1 perf) * Root (+0 perf)   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Elongating the “Triple Score Zone” would reverse the relationship between chakra and performance. For example, Crown would go from +3 performance to -3 performance. |
| **Doctor's Notes** | Doctor’s Notes detail multiple phenomenon. The aggregate effect on performance ranges from -2 performance to +3 performance. | Keyword analysis proves relation between specific biological phenomena and athlete performance. The presence of the following keyword indicates +3 performance:   * cultivated * correlated * agents * ectopic * fatty-acid   The presence of the following keywords indicates -2 performance:   * ubiquitous * epigenetic * triplex * nerotropic * circuitry   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Making Buff-NESSthe solesupplier of protein for the League would double the effect of these keywords on athlete performance (+6 perf. and -4 perf. respectively). |
| **William's Ratio** | A **higher** William’s Ratio is indicative of **lower** athlete performance. | Below is a table detailing the relationship between William’s Ratio and athlete performance.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | William's Ratio | Athlete Performance | | 1/6 | +3 | | 1/5 | +2 | | 1/4 | +2 | | 3/10 | +1 | | 2/5 | +0 | | 1/2 | +0 | | 3/5 | +0 | | 3/4 | -2 | | 4/5 | -2 | | 5/6 | -3 |   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Truncating the “neutral zone” will double the relationship between the William’s Ratio and athlete performance. For example, a William’s Ratio of 1/6 will be +6 while a William’s Ratio of 5/6 will be -6. |
| **Last Season Highlight** | ADVANCED DATA MINING ENGAGED. Categorization approach most successful. Hobbies can be categorized into distinct buckets. Bucket categories are listed below and the effects on player performance is listed in brackets. The total relationship between ‘Last Season Highlights’ and athlete performance ranges from -4 to +1.   * ??? [random effect on performance ranging from -4 to +1] * Explicitly violent highlights [??? performance] * ??? [-2 performance] * Nonviolent highlight not related to sports [??? performance] | ADVANCED DATA MINING ENGAGED. Categorization approach most successful. Hobbies can be categorized into distinct buckets. Bucket categories are:   * Athletes who specifically use the word “winning” in their highlight [random effect on performance ranging from -4 to +1] * Explicitly violent highlights [-4 performance] * Highlights which relate to other sports (but do not use the word “winning”) [-2 performance] * Nonviolent highlight not related to sports [+1 performance]   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Enlarging the “neutral zone” will reserve the relationship between these stats and athlete performance. For example, violent highlights would now be indicate +4 performance. |
| **K Score** | Only the numbers after the “-“ have any significant correlation with athlete performance.  **Higher** K score is related to **higher** athlete performance. | Only the numbers after the “-“ have any significant correlation with athlete performance. K Score (after the dash) naturally ranges from 10 to 95.  A K Score of 95 relates to an increase in athlete performance of +7 relative to a K Score of 10.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Outlawing “Anchoring” would halve the relationship between the K Score and athlete performance (from +7 to +3.5) |
| **RDD.** | **Higher** RDD. relates to **higher** athlete performance | RDD. naturally ranges from 0.7 to 0.78.  An RDD. score of 0.78 indicates an athlete performance increase of +4 relative to an RDD. score of 0.7  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Updating helmet structural designswilldouble the relationship between RDD. performance. (From +4 to +8) |
| **BB** | “Upper” BB stats relate to higher performance when compared to “Upper-Middle” and “Middle” BB stats | BB stat results and their relationships with athlete performances are detailed as follows:   * Upper (+0 perf) * Upper-Middle (-3 perf) * Middle (-6 perf)   **(Un)intended Consequences.** Legalizing the “Backhand Blitz” would add +10 performance to “Middle” BBs (from -6 to +4) |
| **Tackles** | **Higher** tackles relate to **higher** athlete performance | Tackles naturally range from 300 to 800 tackles.  800 tackles indicate +7 athlete performance relative to 300 tackles.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** “Livening the Ball” will nullify the relationship between tackles and athlete performance (+7 to +0). |
| **Strides** | **Higher** strides relate to **higher** athlete performance | Strides naturally ranges between 60 and 200 strides.  200 strides indicate +5 athlete performance relative to 60 strides.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Declare unsportsmanlike the “Charlotte Industrial Dunk” will halve the relationship between strides and athlete performance (from +5 to +2.5). |
| **∑SYN.Act** | **Higher** ∑SYN.Act is relating to **lower** athlete performance | ∑SYN.Act naturally ranges from 4 to 20 synergies.  20 synergies indicate -4 athlete performance relative to 4 synergies.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** Tightening time-out time limits will double the relationship between the ∑SYN.Act stat and relationship (-4 to -8). |
| **YDL** | **Higher** YDL stat is related to **higher** player performance | YDL naturally ranges between 2000 and 9000.  A YDL of 9000 is indicative of +3 athlete performance relative to a YDL of 2000.  **(Un)intended Consequences.** “Penalizing body walls” would double the relationship between YDL and athlete performances. |
| **Union Rank** | **Higher** Union Rank is related to **lower** athlete performance | The relationship between Union Rank and athlete performance are as follows:   * Apprentice (+1 perf) * Journeyman (+0 perf) * Master (-1 perf)   **(Un)intended Consequences.** The League is currently quite hostile to trade unionism. Any rapprochement to union or pro-labor politics would likely make their Masters better athletes. |
| **Franchise Improvements (From Franchise Budget)** | Investing in your franchise budget will give you a performance bonus on the field.  Investing nothing into franchise improvements will cause a -30 team performance penalty.  Minimum amount required as to not receive a negative team performance penalty is somewhere in the range of 7 to 14.  Performance bonus from Franchise Improvements has diminishing returns. In other words, the performance bonus difference between franchises that invest 15 and 16 is less than those that invest 5 and 6. | Below is a table detailing the relationship between performance bonus and the budget for Franchise Improvements.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Franchise Improvements Budget** | **Performance Bonus** | | 0 | -30 | | 1 | -26 | | 2 | -22 | | 3 | -18 | | 4 | -14 | | 5 | -10 | | 6 | -7 | | 7 | -4 | | 8 | -1 | | 9 | +2 | | 10 | +5 | | 11 | +8 | | 12 | +10 | | 13 | +12 | | 14 | +14 | | 15 | +16 | | 16 | +17 | | 17 | +18 | | 18 | +19 | | 19 | +20 | | =>20 | +20 |   No sports rule changes will effect the relationship between franchise improvements and the athlete performance bonus. |