

MSc in Finance and International Business

Author: Kristian Brinch Hansen

Academic Advisor: Jan Bartholdy

Sports Betting from a Behavioral Finance Point of View

Betting on the National Football League

Aarhus School of Business
April/2006

Table of contents

Abstract	1
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Demarcation	5
2.0 Traditional- and behavioral finance	6
2.1 The Efficient Market Hypothesis	6
2.2 Capital Asset Pricing Model	8
2.3 Expected Utility Theory	9
2.4 Behavioral finance	12
2.5 Efficient Market Hypothesis and limits to arbitrage	13
3.0 Betting markets	16
3.1 Betting terminology	16
3.2 Understanding how odds/spreads are set	18
3.3 Similarities and differences between financial- and betting markets	20
3.4 Financial research in betting markets	22
4.0 Heuristic biases	24
4.1 Representativeness	25
4.2 Conservatism	28
4.3 Overconfidence	29
4.4 Availability bias	31
5.0 Anomalies – behavioral finance in financial markets	33
5.1 Small firm anomaly	33
5.2 Ratio anomaly	33
5.3 Long-term reversal effect	34
5.4 Momentum effect	34
5.5 Earnings announcement effect	35
5.6 Discussion of modeling – a healthy amount of skepticism	36
5.7 Heuristics and financial market findings	38
6.0 Betting strategies	42
6.1 Strategy 1 and 2	43
6.2 Strategy 3 and 4	45
6.3 Strategy 5 and 6	45
6.4 Strategy 7 and 8	46
6.5 Strategy 9 and 10	46
6.6 Strategy 11 and 12	48
7.0 Methodology	51
8.0 Results	54
8.1 Group I – Strategy 1, 2, 3 and 4	54
8.2 Group II – Strategy 5, 6, 7 and 8	59
8.3 Group III – Strategy 9 and 10	66
8.4 Group IV – Strategy 11 and 12	68
8.5 Further comments	70
8.6 Economic consequences	71
9.0 Conclusion	74
10.0 Bibliography	78

Abstract

During the past 4 decades a new paradigm has emerged. So far the culmination of the new paradigm came in 2002, when Daniel Kahneman received the Noble Prize in economics, which is a token of recognition. The paradigm is known as behavioral finance. It challenges traditional finance theory by claiming that investors, due to psychological attributes, do not act in accordance with the underlying assumptions. Behavioral finance also argues that markets are characterized by restrictions and other conditions, which makes it difficult for traditional finance to hold. Hence, what academics and practitioners perceived as being the only truth about security prices and returns, may not be the truth for 100% of the market 100% of the time.

Betting markets offer an opportunity to do financial research outside settings where it usually takes place. As financial markets, betting markets are about decision making under uncertainty. Participants in both markets have to assess relevant noisy information on which they form heterogeneous beliefs and then take the appropriate actions. Their actions are subsequently rewarded, as uncertainty is resolved over time.

This study uses parts of behavioral finance in that it analysis and discusses theoretical aspects as well as empirical findings and use these to formulate analogue betting strategies. The strategies are subsequently tested in a betting market to see whether or not behavioral finance can be justified in a different setting. As is the case in financial markets, the presence of an anomaly, which should be explained by the theoretical part of behavioral finance, is a violation of the efficient market hypothesis, because one can earn abnormal risk adjusted returns. In a betting context, this is the equivalent of finding a particular betting strategy, which generates a profit in excess of the bookmaker's commission.

The betting market chosen for this study is the NFL point spread market. The data consists of 2472 regular season game scores and the corresponding point spreads for the 1995/96 to 2004/05 seasons. Simulations of the betting strategies show that two of the 12 strategies are profitable and thus violations of the efficient market hypothesis. One of the two strategies can be regarded as a test of weak-form efficiency and the

other as semi-strong efficiency. The significant strategies can also be considered resemblances to long term reversal effect and overreaction as described by 3 academics.

1.0 Introduction

Betting has always fascinated mankind. People have, since ancient times, used betting as a form of leisure, entertainment and, of course, as an opportunity to profit. People are in love with the idea of testing one's skills or luck against an uncertain event – it is human nature.

Today, most betting centers around sports events. The point of betting is to rationally assess all relevant variables of an uncertain game/race/match, then compare them to the bookmaker's assessments, which usually comes in the form of odds or spreads and place the proper bet if the assessments differ sufficiently. It is pretty easy to grasp the concept of betting, but being able to consistently beat the bookmaker is not. This thesis is, among other things, interested in shedding light on whether or not bettors assess relevant variables/information rationally. In other words, does human behavior sometimes override rational expectations? Is information interpreted wrongly and sometimes altogether neglected?

The idea behind the above originates in the world of finance. The betting market can be perceived as a relatively simple financial market, since both betting markets and financial markets are about assessing information and taking action under uncertainty. The reason why the betting market is simpler is that there are fewer relevant variables. Moreover, when a sports event has ended one knows the true/fundamental value of the gamble. This is not the case in financial markets, where most securities are traded continuously as long as they have value. Investors never receive an objective signal about the fundamental value. Given the relative simplicity of the betting market one can perceive it as a sort of laboratory, where it is possible to carry out tests that are difficult or even impossible to do and interpret in the financial markets. However, such research has seldom been performed. Far more research has been done on financial markets and it is therefore also natural that it is the financial markets that contribute to the betting market instead of vice versa.

It is the basic connection, as stated above, between the two markets that serve as one of the fundamental drivers of this thesis. The author finds it very interesting that the

two markets have enough of the same characteristics to make it possible to test identical or create analogue hypotheses and, thereby, learn something from the other market.

The main focus of this thesis is to apply some of the findings in financial markets to the betting market. More specifically, this thesis is going to use the relatively new theory of behavioral finance. This thesis will discuss and analyze established findings in behavioral finance and either directly use the findings in their original form or create analogue hypotheses and test them in the betting market. The question of whether it is possible to generate a significant positive return, which also will establish that the betting market is inefficient, will also be discussed. This result is extreme and cannot be expected for all the hypotheses. One could, at best, instead expect to find a few significant betting strategies. This will show that a sufficient number of bettors miscalculate information. This thesis could then, also be perceived as a guide for bettors. It will make the reader aware of potential behavioral pitfalls that are worth considering when betting.

Only a few authors have, to date, analyzed the betting market from a behavioral finance point of view. However, most of these academic articles do not debate the underlying motives, or some in cases only do it superficially. This thesis aims to make a more thorough examination of the link between the two markets and in particular analyzes how the different aspects of behavioral finance can be related to betting markets. Since research on betting markets, utilizing the theories of behavioral finance point of view, have only been undertaken a few times, one cannot perceive the findings as well established. It is also the aim of this thesis to contribute new findings to this small body of research. Furthermore, this thesis will also provide a survey of financial research in betting markets.

In order to do all of the above, it is obvious that the reader needs basic knowledge about the betting markets. This thesis is going to explain how odds and spreads are set, how different markets operate, terminology etc. The most important part of this section will go into depth about the similarities and differences between the financial markets and betting markets, since this is essential for being able to conduct this research at all. In order to test the hypotheses of the thesis, the author needs a sufficient amount of data, where data is results from sporting events as well as a

bookmaker's corresponding assessments regarding the outcome of the events. The betting market used, is the National Football League (NFL) betting market for the 1995/1996 to the 2004/2005 regular season.

1.1 Demarcation

This paragraph sets the limitations for the thesis. First of all, the thesis has decided to focus on the part of behavioral finance known as heuristics driven biases and also empirical findings in financial markets. Not all topics/theories and findings regarding behavioral finance will be used, as this is not a survey or discussion of behavioral finance. The thesis only explains, analyzes and discusses the parts of behavioral finance that are useful for the purpose of formulating the betting strategies. This, for instance, means that the reader will not find an in-depth structured analysis of prospect theory, since the vast majority of the betting strategies are based on heuristics and findings in financial markets. However, elements of prospect theory are referred to occasionally in an ad hoc manner.

2.0 Traditional- and behavioral finance

This section focuses on traditional finance theory. The point of the section is to present the theories and key assumptions, because it is the assumptions, which serve as the fundamental driver for the ongoing discussion, in the financial literature, between proponents and opponents of behavioral finance. The thesis will give a short description of the Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH), the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) and Expected Utility Theory with emphasis on the first, because the thesis, among other things, investigates efficiency of the NFL betting market. The three theories are some of the most recognized and widely used financial models. Together, they constitute the foundation of what is known as modern portfolio theory and are the cornerstones of traditional finance. Furthermore, the tenets of behavioral finance are introduced. The section ends with a theoretical explanation of how traditional finance holds and the theoretical counter argumentation by behavioral finance

2.1 The Efficient Market Hypothesis

The efficient market hypothesis (EMH) has been the central element of traditional finance for over 30 years. According to Fama (1970), an efficient financial market is one in which security prices always reflect all available information. If this is the case, then prices of securities will represent the market's assessment of the true value of the securities. Thus, an average investor cannot consistently beat the market and earn risk adjusted returns in excess of equilibrium expected returns, given that he trades on current available information. So, if the efficient market hypothesis holds, then the market truly knows best.

It was stated above that all available information is always reflected in prices. This means that only new information will influence prices in a correct and fast manner. Since we cannot predict the content of new information, prices and returns will fluctuate by chance. Put differently, returns follow a "random walk".

Fama (1970) argues that the market only needs to meet three conditions in order to have an efficient adjustment of prices to new information:

- (i) “There are no transactions costs in trading securities”
- (ii) “All available information is costlessly available to all market participants”
- (iii) “All agree on the implications of current information for the current price and distributions of future prices of each security”

Furthermore, he argues that the conditions do not have to be satisfied in the strictest form, to have market efficiency, but of course too much violation will create problems, as we shall see later in the thesis. The third condition is often interpreted as the market participants’ display of rational behavior. Academics like Glickman (1994) and Jensen (1978), one the creators of (EMH), have made a connection between rational behavior and Fama’s definition. The author will return to the expression, rational, numerous times throughout the thesis. (for a definition of rational see paragraph 2.4).

Fama (1970) also categorizes market efficiency of financial markets. He uses three distinct levels for this.

- (i) *The weak form* – All historic information is projected into prices. In other words, it is impossible to earn abnormal risk adjusted profits based on historical price patterns, trade volume etc.
- (ii) *The semi-strong form* – All historic and public available information is projected into prices. Put differently, as soon as information becomes known, it is immediately incorporated into prices. It is therefore not possible to earn superior risk adjusted profits by using for instance corporate announcements or other sources of news.
- (iii) *The strong form* – Historic as well as public available and inside-information is projected in prices. Inside-information is information not yet known to the public. Obviously, if markets are strong-form efficient, they must also be semi-strong and by definition weak form efficient, since past prices and publicly available information are proper subsets of the inside-information about a security

A number of researchers, during the 70s, confirm that markets are efficient in weak- and semi-strong form, which makes trading strategies, based on past performances and public available information, incapable of generating abnormal risk adjusted profits. The strong form however, has not gained much support. It should therefore be possible to generate abnormal risk adjusted returns, when trading on inside-information. The fact that insider trading is illegal and one can be put behind bars if found guilty, testifies to the fact that the strong-form EMH does not hold. Thus financial markets are at best efficient in weak- or semi-strong form.

2.2 Capital Asset Pricing Model

The capital asset pricing model (CAPM) was developed during the early- and mid 60s. It was the first successful attempt, proven by its popularity, to define expected rate of return as a function of risk of cash flows. CAPM is the simplest of the models, where the starting point is that capital markets are in equilibrium. An example of another capital market equilibrium model is the Arbitrage Pricing Theory (APT).

As stated, CAPM describes the relationship between risk and expected return. Expected return of a security or a portfolio is determined by the market risk premium times the amount of systematic risk present in a particular asset and in addition the rate on a risk free asset (i.e. government bonds). The relationship is given by:

$$E(r_i) = r_f + [E(r_m) - r_f] * \beta_i$$

The number of assumptions behind the capital asset pricing model are numerous. Generally speaking, an investor should only worry about maximizing expected returns and minimizing risk, when allocating his funds, which should also be diversified in accordance to the theories of Markowitz. Furthermore, the assumptions, which are listed below, are very restrictive and unrealistic and should be regarded as a theoretical simplification of the real world.

1. All investors have the same investment horizon¹.
2. Expectations are homogeneous, meaning that all investors' expected return and risk for each asset under different scenarios are the same. The only differences between investors are initial wealth and aversion toward risk.
3. Perfect competition. No single investor can influence market prices, which are determined by all investors.
4. All assets are infinitely divisible. One can therefore buy 1 cent worth of a security (e.g. Parken Sport and Entertainment).
5. All assets are tradable, meaning not just stocks, but also something as subjective as human capital.
6. There are no limits for borrowing and depositing at the risk free rate.
7. Unlimited short sales possibilities for all assets.
8. No transactions cost. Neither directly nor in the form of bid-ask spread.
9. No taxes.

Even though the assumptions are unrealistic, which is usually something we associate with an unsatisfactory model, the capital asset pricing model has still proven to give a good empirical description of asset pricing. For instance, Fama and McBech (1973) confirm the model. On the other hand, academics like Roll (1977) and Merton (1973) criticize the model quite heavily. The thesis will desist from doing an analysis and discussion of the different arguments for and against CAPM, since the point of this paragraph is merely to put focus on the underlying assumptions. However, the author is able to establish that the capital asset pricing model is very popular among American companies, when estimating cost of equity regardless of the disagreements in the financial literature. A relatively large survey, conducted by Graham and Harvey (2001)², shows that more than 73% of the respondents always or almost always use the capital asset pricing model.

2.3 Expected Utility Theory

Expected utility theory is not a relatively new theory, like some of the other theories used in finance. According to Starmer (2000), it dates back to the 1700s, where it was

¹ The assumptions are based on Christensen and Pedersen (1998) and are informally described in the thesis

² They also point out that not all companies apply CAPM correctly, but nevertheless CAPM is used

used in explaining, why people would only pay a small amount for the chance of gaining up to infinity (St. Petersburg paradox). The theory, as we know it today is developed by Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1944), and it is the dominating theory used when analyzing rational decision making under risk. (e.g. evaluating risky gambles)

Basically, expected utility theory dictates that an individual does not try to maximize the expected value, but rather tries to maximize expected utility. Expected utility theory builds on some axioms, which were formulated by Von Neumann and Morgenstern (1947) and later revised by Savage (1954). They assume that individuals always prefer the alternative with the highest expected utility and thereby obey the axioms. The axioms are listed below:

1. *The completeness axiom*³. Completeness is that individuals have preferences among alternatives. For any prospect, L_1 and L_2 , the decision maker prefers either L_1 to L_2 or L_2 to L_1 or both are equally attractive. Moreover, if L_1 is preferred to L_2 and L_2 to a prospect, L_3 , then L_1 must also be preferred to L_3 . This is known as transitivity.
2. *The continuity axiom*. If the monetary amount x is preferred to amount y and y is preferred to amount z , then there exists some probability, p (between 0 and 1), which makes the decision maker indifferent between a sure gain of y and a game offering x or z with probabilities p and $(1 - p)$, respectively.
3. *The independence axiom*. If the decision maker is indifferent between the alternatives x and y , then he should also be indifferent between two games offering x and z in the first game and y and z in the second, with probabilities p and $(1 - p)$ in each game for any z and p value.
4. *The unequal probability axiom*. If x is preferred to y , then prospect L_1 should be preferred to L_2 when both prospects contain only x and y and when the probability of gaining x is greater in L_1 than in L_2 . That is that the probability, p for x , in L_1 is greater than probability, q for x , in L_2 .
5. *The axiom of complexity*. Consider two prospects, L_1 and L_2 . L_1 produces two new prospects, L_3 and L_4 each with two outcomes. L_1 therefore ultimately has

³ The assumptions are based on Schoemaker (1980, 1982) and are informally described in the thesis

four outcomes. L_2 offers the same four outcomes initially. The point of the axiom is that the decision maker should be indifferent between L_1 and L_2 because of standard probability theory, which ensures that the compound prospect multiplies the two probabilities of L_1 to each of the two for L_3 and L_4 , respectively. Thus making L_1 and L_2 identical.

An important concept underlying expected utility theory is risk aversion. Risk averse decision makers are often assumed in economic and financial models. A decision maker is risk averse, when a prospect is less preferred than the prospect's expected value with certainty. In expected utility theory, risk aversion is equivalent to a concave utility function. Decision makers can also be risk seekers and risk neutral, corresponding to a convex and straight utility function, respectively. The author will not go into more detail, regarding expected utility theory. The reason being that the main interest of the thesis, lies with heuristic biases in relation to betting and not prospect theory. However, the author will present some of the main differences between expected utility theory and the alternative, prospect theory, since the latter is a significant part of behavioral finance. Prospect theory is a descriptive model for decision-making under uncertainty, while expected utility theory also passes itself off as being descriptive, academics, like Kahneman and Tversky (1979), Barberis and Thaler (2003) and Hirshleifer (2001), argue that it does an inadequate job and, therefore, is more of a normative model. In classical finance, it is presumed that people are risk averse in all their choices. In contrast, prospect theory prescribes that they are only risk averse over gains and instead risk-seeking over losses. Furthermore, people are more sensitive to losses than gains of the same amount. Secondly, prospect theory prescribes that people choose among alternatives based on relative changes in wealth instead of absolute changes in wealth. Thirdly, people have difficulties assessing probabilities. Prospect theory argues that people, for instance, overweight low probabilities. Utility theory treats gambles objectively, by its true probabilities. Fourthly, utility theory assumes that the presentation of the problem does not influence people's choices. Prospect theory states that the way a problem is presented can alter a person's choice – the so-called framing effect. The above is just a short description of Kahneman and Tversky's work, regarding prospect theory. Since the thesis is interested in asset pricing, prospect theory will only get limited attention,

which is why the reader will not find an in-depth analysis but only sporadic references.

2.4 Behavioral finance

Behavioral finance is a mix of theories in classical economics and finance combined with psychology and sociology. With the knowledge we have today, there can be little doubt that psychology has always influenced investors in the financial markets. It is also natural that psychology is the main starting point in the origin of behavioral finance.

As described earlier, modern portfolio theory consists of the expected utility theory, efficient market hypothesis and capital asset pricing model (CAPM). Behavioral finance questions whether or not investors actually behave in accordance with the underlying assumptions on which these theories are built. The main arguments in behavioral finance are that decision makers do not maximize their utility in accordance with the utility theory, often make systematic mistakes in their assessments and therefore make inconsistent and irrational choices, which leads to inefficient markets. The financial markets are relatively complex and therefore it is easy for humans to make misvaluations, since the human brain can only comprehend a finite number of things and we often use “shortcuts” too figure out what needs to be figured out. One of the key assumptions in traditional finance is that investors are rational. According to Barberis and Thaler (2003), rationality consists of two things. When new information is received, agents update their beliefs correctly, which is in the manner described by Bayes’ law. Furthermore, given their beliefs, agents make choices that are normatively acceptable, in the sense that they are consistent with Savage’s (1954) idea of Subjective Expected Utility (SEU). However, this is not always the case. If investors are rational, why have academics found anomalies such as holiday effect, weekend effect, January effect, sunshine effect, bubbles such as the IT-bubble in the late 90s and the anomalies presented in this thesis?

As stated above behavioral finance questions key assumptions in traditional finance. Olsen (1998) gives a good, but in this author's opinion a somewhat diplomatic, definition of what behavioral finance, to date, tries to do:

“Behavioral Finance is part of science in that it starts from fundamental axioms and asks whether a theory built on these axioms can explain behavior in the financial marketplace. Contrary to some assertions, behavioral finance does not try to define rational behavior or label biased decision-making as biased or faulty; it seeks to understand and predict systematic financial market implications of psychological decision making processes. In addition, behavioral finance is focused on the application of psychological and economic principles for the improvement of financial decision-making.”

It would not be exaggerating to state that Daniel Kahneman and the late Amos Tversky are the originators of behavioral finance. In 2002 Daniel Kahneman received the Nobel Prize in economics “for having integrated insights from psychological research into economic science, especially concerning human judgment and decision-making under uncertainty”. (Shefrin and Statman (2003)). The work of Kahneman and Tversky can be divided into two main topics: Heuristics driven biases and Prospect theory. It is their work, regarding heuristic driven biases, which will also serve as a framework for this thesis further analysis of sports betting from a behavioral finance point of view.

Other academics have, of course, also contributed to behavioral finance. In the sections to come significant attention will be paid to the contributions of Kahneman and Tversky and other influential academics. By this is meant an explanation of the different contributions and subsequently a discussion of how they can be related to sports betting.

2.5 Efficient Market Hypothesis and limits to arbitrage

The previous short introduction to behavioral finance, with emphasis on the psychological part of behavioral finance, is meant to give counterbalance to

traditional finance and make the reader aware that traditional finance might not be the only truth. The current paragraph explains the theoretical foundation on how traditional finance and especially EMH holds. Furthermore, the counter argumentation against EMH, known as “limits to arbitrage”, is explained on a theoretical level.

Basically, the efficient market hypothesis relies on three arguments or assumptions in order to hold. Firstly, investors are assumed to be rational. By this it is meant that they value securities rationally, which is to calculate the net present value of a security by discounting future cash flows back. Secondly, if not all investors are rational, then the irrational investors’ (sometimes referred to as noise traders) trading patterns are assumed to be random, meaning that the trades cancel each other out and security prices are not affected. Thirdly, if irrational investors’ trading patterns are systematic, then prices are corrected by rational arbitrageurs. This is the defense of EMH in a nutshell.

From the above, it can be derived that the effectiveness of arbitrage⁴ is crucial for EMH to hold, given that the other two defense mechanisms appear to be inadequate. Arguments against them are given in section 4.0. In order to have effective arbitrage the market needs to contain substitutable securities as well as no implementation costs and other restrictions on short positions. The arbitrage argument works like this: if a security, e.g. a stock, is overpriced, due to noise trading, then it is also a bad buy, because its price exceeds discounted future cash flows. Arbitrageurs will then sell or short sell the security and at the same time hedge their risk by buying a similar (substitute) security. The consequence of the arbitrageurs’ selling is that the price of the overpriced security corrects back down to fundamental value. If enough arbitrageurs compete for the profit of the overpriced security, then prices will never get far away from fundamentals and the market is efficient and nobody earns abnormal risk-adjusted returns. A similar argument also works for undervalued securities, buy underpriced security and short sell similar security for the purpose of hedging the risk.

⁴ Brealey and Myers (2003) define arbitrage as “Purchase of one security and simultaneous sale of another to give a risk-free profit.” Arbitrage often involves a long and a short position

As stated, in order for arbitrage to be effective, substitute securities must be available as well as no implementation costs/restrictions. Behavioral finance questions whether or not the two requirements are sufficiently met. This part of behavioral finance is known as “limits to arbitrage”, where the first part is more psychologically oriented, as described in paragraph 2.4. Arbitrage often involves a short position, which in contrast to what is assumed, has implementation costs. A fee is charged, whenever an arbitrageur wants to borrow a security for short selling. Transactions costs do exist in form of commissions and the bid/ask spread, which create a barrier when it comes to exploiting mispricing. Furthermore, finding a mispricing costs money in itself. The market is also characterized by legal constraints. For many institutional investors short selling securities is not legal. The above is indisputable and speaks against effective arbitrage. Furthermore, the availability of substitute securities is also an issue. If close substitutes of the mispriced security do not exist, then the arbitrageurs will be exposed to systematic risk which makes it difficult to do arbitrage, especially if arbitrageurs are risk averse. This allows for deviations from fundamental values to persist. If close substitutes exist, then arbitrageurs can get rid of the systematic risk and the arbitrage argument may be valid. However, if the plausible assumption of risk averse arbitrageurs is added, together with an assumption of short horizons, then it will take a large number of arbitrageurs to get rid of the mispricing, the number, of course, will depend on the “size” of the arbitrageurs. This paragraph has kept out, the discussion of whether or not, noise trader risk is systematic. If it is assumed that the trades of noise traders correlate, then it may take awhile before prices return to fundamental values, because noise traders keep buying the security. Furthermore, prices might even, given already away from fundamental, be driven further away in the short run. This could force the arbitrageurs to liquidate their position and realize a loss. This makes arbitrage a risky matter. This thesis will in section 5.0 explain and discuss empirical findings against the efficient market hypothesis.

The next section explains and analysis various specific betting market topics, in order to give the reader the background information he needs, to be able to understand the empirical research of the thesis. Following this section, the thesis will get back to explaining behavioral finance by presenting heuristics and biases in section 4.0.

3.0 Betting markets

This section explains the characteristics of betting markets that are relevant for the comprehension of this thesis. The author will explain the terminology used in these markets, since this is essential for the understanding of this topic. The thesis also explains how bookmakers set the odds/spread. This is highly relevant, when one wants to apply behavioral finance to betting markets. Along that same line, the current section makes a comparison between financial markets and betting markets, since sufficient similarity is a necessity for applying financial theory to betting markets.

3.1 Betting terminology

Betting markets refer to numerous different markets in which one can bet. Kind of like financial markets is an expression covering different markets of securities. This thesis, for instance, investigates the NFL⁵ betting market, as opposed to NBA or NCAA football or basketball, or more specifically a branch of NFL betting known as point spreads⁶. NFL betting consist of more than one type of bets (point spread bets and over/under bets). One can also define different betting markets as distinction between American-, European odds and pari-mutuel betting. American odds states profits. European odds are probabilities converted to odds, stating total income. Pari-mutuel betting is when the pay back (odds) to bettors is unknown, until the event has begun. Examples of American-, European- and pari-mutuel markets are NFL, SAS-Ligaen and horse tracks. The focus of this paragraph will mainly be on American odds, because the thesis tests the NFL betting market.

The difference between European odds and American odds is basically how profits are stated. American bookmakers use the so-called “11 for 10” rule, meaning that the bookmaker pays the winning bet 10 units for each 11 units wagered. The American odds therefore do only state profits. European odds, on the other hand, state total income. The 11 for 10 rule in a European setting would be $(1 + 10/11) \approx 1.91$, thus showing the total gain if the wager is won. It can be seen that a bettor needs a win-to-bet ratio of more than 50% to break-even, due to the commission fee or transaction

⁵ Readers who are not familiar with scoring system in American Football should consult appendix A

⁶ Explained later in this paragraph. This paragraph also explains other terms and expressions used in betting. Furthermore, appendix A is an elaborative glossary of betting terms.

cost of 1 unit. In a betting market, this unit is known as “vigorish”, “vig” or “juice”. The break-even percentage is given by $p(10) = (1-p)(11)$. Solving for p yields $p = 0.5238$, meaning that a bettor needs a win-to-bet ratio of 52.38% to recover the vigorish assuming no tax. Since the American market use the 11 for 10 rule it can also be argued that American bookmakers have a pay back percentage of $(1 - 1/22)*100 \approx 95.45\%$, if the book is balanced. A balanced book means that the total amount wagered (known as the handle) on a bet is split 50-50 between the two outcomes. Bookmakers prefer a balanced book since this will secure them a profit, regardless of the outcome of the sporting event (more on this later). According to Kuypers (2000), the major British bookmakers have a pay back percentage of 88.5% on soccer. According to Dansk Tipstjeneste, they offer a pay back percentage of 87%. Racetracks offer the lowest pay back percentage with a little over 80% (Woodland and Woodland (2001)).

The betting market is definitely not a monopoly market⁷. The market consists of hundreds of bookmaker companies, both online and in the brick and mortar venues. However, this does not mean that one can observe big differences in the odds supplied by bookmakers. The market is usually in agreement about the odds, especially in the USA, because only a few companies, called line makers, establish the odds and then sell them to bookmakers. If odds differ sufficiently among bookmakers, then bettors can take advantage of this by placing a bet with one bookmaker and then place the counter bet with a different bookmaker, securing a profit. In other words, the bettor could engage in arbitrage.

Bettors can choose from several types of odds. The two main types are point spread and single odds which each contain variations. Generally speaking, point spreads are mostly used in the USA, while single odds are used in Europe. In point spread betting, the bettor is interested in the difference in scores between two teams. For example, suppose that the market clears the Dallas Cowboys as a 3 point favorite over the Cleveland Browns. You bet the Cowboys. You will then win the bet (known as “covering” the spread), if the Cowboys wins by more than 3 points and receive the original staked 11 units + an additional 10 units. The bet is tied against the spread

⁷ The Danish market is a monopoly, at least theoretically. However not in reality, since bettors can bet online.

(called a push), if Cowboys wins by exactly 3 points. When bets tie, the stakes are returned to the bettors. The bet is a lose (known as failed to cover the spread), if the Browns lose by 2 points or less. Also, if the score is tied or if the Browns wins the game. Naturally the stake of 11 units is lost. The usual way a bookmaker lists the game is Cowboys (away team) at Browns (home team) +3. It is the home team that determines the sign of the spread (spread is also known as the “line”). Usually, in statistics, the line is written a little different. In this thesis, for instance, the above would be DAL line -3 under the Dallas Cowboys statistics and CLE line 3 under the Brown, statistics.

Single odds are set differently from point spreads. Bookmakers assess the probabilities of each team to win (and draw for most betting in Europe) in a given game. To illustrate this, we can work on the same example as above. Given that the pay back percentage of the European bookmaker is the same as the American’s, we can calculate the European odds. First the European needs to assess the probabilities. Since the Cowboys are the favorite, but not heavily, the bookmaker estimates the probability to be 60% for Cowboys and 40% for Browns. The European odds will then be:

$$\text{Cleveland Browns } 0.9545/0.4 = 2.39$$

$$\text{Dallas Cowboys } 0.9545/0.6 = 1.59$$

Hence, if the Browns win, the bettor can gain a 139% profit, if this bet is made and a 59% profit if the Cowboys are wagered and wins.

In the above paragraph, the thesis has only briefly explained the objectives of the bookmakers, regarding what determines odds and point spreads. The next paragraph goes more into detail on the topic of how spreads and odds are set.

3.2 Understanding how odds/spreads are set

It was written above that the Dallas Cowboys were a 3 point favorite in a game against the Cleveland Browns. Why not 3.5 (the spread moves in ticks of halves) or some other number? What does the 3 points tell us exactly? The thesis will come back to this in the end of this paragraph.

In a betting market “prices” (i.e. odds a game or point spread) are ultimately set by bookmakers, contrary to financial markets, where prices are set by supply and demand. If the price set by the bookmaker is not the market clearing price, then he is exposed to risk. Skillful bettors can take advantage of the wrong price, set by the bookmaker, which will prove to be expensive or even disastrous for the bookmaker, if done persistently. Given that bookmaker companies operate under the going-concern principle, how can they sustain a profit? Levitt (2004), states three scenarios, under which bookmakers can sustain profits. In the first scenario, bookmakers try to balance the book. In a point spread market, this means that the bookmaker’s objective is to get an equal amount wagered on both sides. In single odds markets the bookmaker also needs to set the odds so that bettors wager in the right proportions, depending on the odds. If the bookmaker can manage this task, he is secured a profit, the vig, since the outcome of the game does not matter. In the second scenario, bookmakers are systematically better than bettors in predicting the outcome of games. If this is the case, then bookmakers could set the “correct” price. Even though the amounts wagered are no longer in the right proportions of equalizing, the bookmaker, on average, will earn an amount equal to the vigorish. In this scenario, spreads and odds are the true prediction of games. The third scenario merges components of the first two scenarios. If bookmakers are better at predicting the outcome of games and know gamblers’ behavior they can earn higher profit margins than simply collecting the vigorish. This is done, by systematically setting prices away from fundamentals and in a manner which accounts for bettors’ preferences. However, there are constraints on how big the distortion can be, since sophisticated bettors can obtain substantial returns if prices deviate too much.

Throughout the relevant literature, authors are in agreement that bookmakers predominantly try to balance the books, which from a risk point of view also makes sense. Bookmakers too are risk averse. Furthermore, American Gaming Association states that of the \$ 2.25 billion wagered in 2005 in Nevada’s sports books, nearly 95 % were returned to patrons in winnings⁸. Since the “theoretical” pay back percentage

⁸ http://www.americangaming.org/Industry/factsheets/issues_detail.cfv?id=16 web page also states that \$ 2.25 billion is less than 1 percent of all sports betting in America. So, a huge amount of money is at stake in betting markets.

is 95.45 %, it can be concluded that bookmakers balance the books. Returning to the initial question of this paragraph, a point spread of 3 is not the true prediction of the game, but rather an expression of the expectation of the betting public.

3.3 Similarities and differences between financial- and betting markets

In the introduction and beginning of this section, it is written that betting markets need to exhibit some of the same characteristics as financial markets, in order to apply finance including behavioral finance to betting markets. The thesis has already pointed out some of the similarities and differences but this paragraph will present an explicit analysis of the relationship.

The most important similarity is that investors with heterogeneous beliefs tries to profit through trading as uncertainty is resolved over time. This distinct feature is what makes or brakes whether or not one can apply financial analysis in betting markets. Betting markets do offer this opportunity since bettors also have to assess relevant but noisy information. Furthermore, trading in both betting markets and financial derivatives is a zero sum game, since a transaction has one trader on each side, where one of them gains what the other one loses, excluding transactions cost. As is the case in financial markets, the betting market has a large information network where traders can gather information about prices. Also, the knowledge of so-called “experts” is in demand in both markets. In betting markets, advice of experts can be found in newspapers, television sports shows, newsletters, online etc. Both markets are also characterized by low entry/exit barriers, which cannot be used as an explanation for unexploited profit opportunities.

In addition to the similarities, differences between the two markets also exist. The preceding paragraph stated that prices in financial markets are determined by supply and demand, while bookmakers simply just announce a price⁹ (the price that balances the book). Furthermore prices do not change as frequently in betting markets as in financial markets, according to Levitt (2004). Given that this is the case, it can be

⁹ Strictly speaking prices are indirectly determined by supply and demand. The initial price changes, if demand is strong – otherwise the bookmaker will have an unbalanced book. The supply of odds by other bookmakers help determine one bookmaker’s price. If his supply does not, roughly, correspond to market prices, then bettors will take their business elsewhere.

concluded that bookmakers are actually pretty good at determining, what price will balance the book. If the price creates an unbalanced book, the bookmaker will change it (changes in fundamentals, for instance injuries to key players will often change the spread). In the example of the Cowboys vs. the Browns, the spread was 3 points. If, during the week between games, too much money is placed on the Cowboys, the bookmaker will increase the spread to for instance 3.5 or more. This is done to attract bets on the Browns and thus balancing the book. Sometimes, if a bookmaker is exposed to substantial risk, due to an unbalanced book, he places bets with another book making company. This is naturally done for hedging purposes, but like bettors, the bookmaker has to pay the vigorish.

One of the major differences between the markets is that participants in betting markets receive an objective signal about the fundamental value. This happens when a given event has ended, because bettors then know the true value of the gamble. This is seldom the case in financial markets where securities are traded continuously as long as they have value. The participants, therefore, never know if the security price equals its fundamental value. This financial market “problem” is often a topic of concern, when the efficient market hypothesis is tested, as is the case in behavioral finance literature. Academics argue that testing for efficiency creates a joint test problem because besides testing for efficiency, one also needs a model of market equilibrium. The joint test problem is discussed further in paragraph 5.6.

Betting markets only consist of individual bettors, while financial markets, namely stock and bond markets, consist of both individuals and institutional investors (e.g. mutual-, pension funds etc.). More importantly, their purposes differ. The purpose of investing is to move wealth from the present to the future for oneself or clients. The purpose of betting is to entertain oneself. It is a leisure activity like playing tennis or going to the movies. If betting does not produce some sort of non-quantifiable utility, then people would not bet because bookmakers earn money at the expense of bettors¹⁰. However, given the non-quantifiable utility betting offers, bettors who are in the market still seek to maximize their financial utility. This makes them fairly similar to investors.

¹⁰ The thesis will later discuss how overconfidence helps explaining people’s desire to bet. Assume this is not a factor

3.4 Financial research in betting markets

Most financial research in betting markets revolves around efficiency of these markets. Overall results of these tests are inconsistent, as some conclude efficiency and others inefficiency. This in itself speaks for efficiency, for two reasons. Firstly, if the market truly is inefficient, then perhaps rational bettors (arbitrageurs) exploit it and correct prices back to fundamentals, which is a degree of efficiency. Although, not the strict theoretical definition of perfect efficiency. Secondly, the inefficiency may not even exist. Perhaps it is due to statistical aberration or methodology issues such as a bad model.

The most well known financial researches in betting markets are those on pari-mutuel betting. Thaler and Ziemba (1988) review this literature and conclude that the “favorite-long shot bias” is consistent at horse tracks. Bettors have a tendency to overbet long shots and underbet favorites relative to their change of winning the race. The expected returns from betting on favorites are, therefore, higher than the expected return from betting on long shots. Thaler and Ziemba state that bettors either overestimate the winning change of long shots or that they prefer the positive skewness, which long shots provide. However, the bias is rarely strong enough to make it a profitable betting strategy. Woodland and Woodland (1994, 2001) found what they refer to as “reverse favorite long shot bias” in baseball and hockey, respectively. Bettors in these markets overbet the favorites, which is why Woodland and Woodland declare these markets inefficient. Both Major League Baseball (MLB) and the National Hockey League (NHL) betting markets are operated as European odds markets.

Point spread markets have also been subject of analysis for the purpose of investigating efficiency. Most of the researches test whether the bookmaker’s predictions of game outcomes are unbiased predictions of actual game outcomes. If the predictions are unbiased, then the market is declared efficient and vice versa. However, in order to profit, the biasedness needs to be of sufficient magnitude otherwise one is not able to generate big enough returns to pay the bookmaker’s

vigorous. Zuber et al. (1985), Gander et al. (1988) and Sauer et al. (1988) find no evidence of biased point spreads using standard ordinary least squares regression. Golec and Tamarkin (1991), document that the NFL betting market is not efficient, during most of the 70s and early 80s. Bettors overbet favorites and home teams. Gray and Gray (1997) use a more sophisticated model for their test of efficiency. Instead of OLS they use a probit model. They are able to conclude inefficiency for in-sample as well as out-of-sample tests. Avery and Chevalier (1999) use a different approach for testing efficiency. They hypothesize that bettors follow the advice of so-called experts, overbet teams that are performing well and wager heavily on teams that are covered in the media. Instead of testing directly on the closing point spread, they investigate whether or not movement in the opening spread (usually set the day after current round's games have ended) to the time the spread closes (just before the next game starts) is predictable by more than fundamental news like injuries etc. If this is the case, then bettors are influenced by factors that should be irrelevant. The authors show that each of the three mentioned sentiments serve as a significant predictor of point spread movement, but not for actual game outcomes. According to the authors "this demonstrates a clear inefficiency in point-spread markets: it should not be possible to predict point-spread movements from information already known at the time the line was set." The authors design strategies that will take advantage of the biased behavior and show that these are borderline profitable.

4.0 Heuristic biases

Heuristics are, generally speaking, indispensable tools to reduce the complexity of different situations. Humans use heuristics in every day life because our brains can only process so much information. We often find ourselves in a situation where we need to estimate something and resources such as attention, memory, understanding, time and other capacities are limited. In order to compensate for this, we use rules of thumb and mental shortcuts, known as heuristics, to solve the problem.

In the traditional finance theory, it is assumed that all available information at any given time is included in the creation of expectations of a security's price and that the information is used correctly. Behavioral finance questions this. Instead it argues that humans have difficulties making an in-depth analysis of complex decision related problems, especially when the outcomes are uncertain. As in every day life, investors therefore use heuristics, as a mean to reduce the complexity of the problem at hand. However, since heuristics is fundamentally a mean of approximating, biases and deviations are bound to occur, which will lead to a less than perfect valuation in the market.

Tversky and Kahneman (1974) use an example that illustrates the bias problem: “the apparent distance of an object is determined in part by its clarity. The more sharply the object is seen, the closer it appears to be. This rule has some validity, because in any given scene the more distant objects are seen less sharply than nearer objects. However, the reliance on this rule leads to systematic errors in the estimation of distance. Specifically, distances are often overestimated when visibility is poor because the contours of objects are blurred. On the other hand, distances are often underestimated when visibility is good because the objects are seen sharply. Thus, the reliance on clarity as an indication of distance leads to common biases.” They further argue that such biases also are found in judgment of probabilities, which is relevant for both betting and investment purposes. Given that this is the case, what then becomes interesting is whether or not the biases correlate among bettors/investors and thereby become systematic and create mispricings¹¹. If errors are independent across individuals, biases will cancel out in equilibrium and the mispricing will be

¹¹ Assuming limits to arbitrage i.e. the arbitrage mechanism cannot correct the mispricing

insignificant. Fuller (1998), Shleifer (2000) and Hirshleifer (2001) use similar arguments, namely, that since people share similar heuristics, biases in a market will also be systematic. The primary consequence of this is that heuristic biases will lead to error in the creation of expectations, which will cause over- and underreaction in the market when new information arrives.

The following paragraph will discuss the most salient heuristics in the behavioral finance literature.

4.1 Representativeness

One of the most important heuristic principles is “representativeness”, which deals with the fact that humans have problems assessing probabilities. People often find themselves in situations where they need to figure out: “What is the probability that object A belongs to class B? What is the probability that event A originates from process B? What is the probability that process B will generate event A? In answering such questions, people typically rely on the representativeness heuristic, in which probabilities are evaluated by the degree to which A is representative of B, that is, by the degree to which A resembles B. For example, when A is highly representative of B, the probability that A originates from B is judged to be high. On the other hand, if A is not similar to B, the probability that A originates from B is judged to be low.” Tversky and Kahneman (1974). It is like the saying: “if it walks like duck, talks like a duck. (What is the probability that it is a duck?) It probably is a duck”

The above captures the essence of representativeness well, but it is difficult to extract what is meant exactly. More explicitly, the representativeness heuristic consists of two types of biases. “Base rate neglect” and “sample size neglect”. In addition, sample size neglect also consists of a “special case” known as “gambler’s fallacy”. Kahneman and Tversky (1973) test the hypothesis that if people evaluate probability by representativeness, prior probabilities will be neglected, which is consistent with base rate neglect. In order to test their hypothesis Kahneman and Tversky conducted an experiment, where subjects were shown a number of uninformative personality descriptions of professionals randomly sampled from a group of 100 professionals.

The professionals were either lawyers or engineers. The subjects were divided into two groups. The first group was told that the descriptions had been drawn from a group consisting of 70 engineers and 30 lawyers. The second group was given a ratio of 30 engineers to 70 lawyers. The point of the experiment is then to assess, for each description, the probability that it is an engineer. All things equal, one could then expect that the answers from the first group would consist of significant more “engineer answers” than the second group’s answers. However, this was not the case. Kahneman and Tversky found that the median were 50 percent for both groups. This suggests that, when worthless information is given, people neglect prior probabilities. In addition to the above, Kahneman and Tversky also asked subjects to assess the same question, but without any information at all. The subjects then used the prior probabilities correctly, meaning that the two groups judged the individual to be an engineer with a probability of 70 and 30 percent, respectively.

The second fundamental bias, sample size neglect, is a result of the fact that people tend to rely too heavily on small samples compared to large samples. The idea that a sample should resemble the population is often correct, especially if it is a large unbiased independent sample. However people often neglect the size of the sample, which leads them to believe that the small sample is just as representative as the large sample. This is also why sample size neglect sometimes is referred to as “the law of small numbers.” The impact from sample size neglect is that people tend to infer conclusions too quickly, meaning that they only use a few data points before reaching a conclusion. For instance a stockbroker with 4 successful picks is perceived talented, because 4 successes are not representative of a mediocre or bad broker. This phenomenon is also found in basketball, where fans believe in the hot hand. They become convinced that a basketball player, who has scored on his last 3 attempts, is on a hot streak and will score on his next attempt. Gilovich, Vallone and Tversky (1985), show that fans believe in the hot hand, even though there is no evidence of a hot hand in the data. They see a trend in something that is actually random.

As stated above, sample size neglect also consists of a special case known as gambler’s fallacy. As opposed to the above, where people do not know the data generating process, gambler’s fallacy deals with circumstances in which people do know the data generating process in advance. For instance if a fair coin is tossed 5

times and all tosses turns out to be tails, people will tend to say that the 6th toss will be heads, even though chances are 50-50. This is so, because people have a strong believe in regression to the mean, which will override both facts that each toss is statistical independent and that the sample is small. Clotfelter and Cook (1993) examined gambler's fallacy in playing the lottery. They found "a clear and consistent tendency for the amount of money bet on a particular number to fall sharply immediately after it is drawn".

The above clearly indicates that people have difficulties assessing probabilities, even when tasks are fairly simple. The logical reasoning applicable to the sports betting markets and financial markets, is that the task of assessing probabilities and future states with a lot of information is much more complex. What is interesting is that the representativeness heuristic can cause a person to believe in something that is not there. This is known in statistics as clustering illusion, where people perceive something that is random as a pattern/trend. The lottery and hot hand examples from above are good examples of this. In the lottery people are irrational, because they believe that the number that just won cannot win two times in a row, therefore, avoid choosing the number that recently won. The reason why this is irrational is of course that the lottery is a game where the probability that each number will be drawn is equal in each lottery drawing. A rational person who knows this should follow a strategy of betting on the previous winning number, because chances that this number will "hit" again is equal too all other numbers chance, but the winnings will be bigger, because of the relatively smaller amount bet on it. The hot hand phenomena is also very interesting in a betting context, because perhaps when people believe in the notion of a hot hand scoring streak, they also tend believe in hot hand game winning (losing) streak. If the hot hand is present in a betting market, one can profit by betting against (on) teams on a streak. The thesis elaborates and investigates this later. Camerer (1989) investigates the hot hand game streaks in the NBA¹². He uses data from the 1983/84 season to the 1985/86 season. He concludes that the NBA betting market is showing signs of the hot hand phenomena, particularly when it comes to teams on a losing streak. However, he also concludes that the effect is too small to be

profitable exploited. Brown and Sauer (1993) also investigate the hot hand (1982/83 to 1987/88) and find similar results to those of Camerer's.

4.2 Conservatism

Individuals how are influenced by conservatism, put too much weight on the base rate. At first glance, the conservatism heuristic seems to be in contradiction to the representativeness heuristic, because individuals who are influenced by the latter neglect the base rate. This section explains how conservatism works and under which circumstances individuals are influenced more by conservatism than representativeness and vice versa.

Edwards (1968) runs an experiment, that adeptly illustrates how the conservatism heuristic works. The experiment consists of two urns, each containing a given mix of 10 blue and red balls. The first urn contains 3 blue balls and 7 red. The second contains 7 blue balls and 3 red. With replacement, a random draw of 12 balls from one of the urns results in 8 reds and 4 blues. Using the correct bayesian updating, yields a probability of 0.97 that the urn drawn from is the first urn. However, most individuals give an estimate of around 0.7 for the first urn, because they rely too much on the base rate of 0.5. From the above experiment and the section regarding representativeness, it seems that conservatism and representativeness are at odds. Nevertheless, if one examines the evidence closer, one will find that they actually fit well together. When the data is representative of the underlying model or a person's beliefs, individuals put too much emphasis on the data and thus display base rate neglect and sample size neglect. When the data, like the above, is not particularly representative, of the model or a belief, individuals put too little emphasis on the data and therefore hang on to the base rate or prior beliefs. Griffin and Tversky (1992) contribute to the understanding of which heuristic is present under which circumstances. In their opinion, information can be regarded as two dimensional; strength of information and weight of information. By strength of information is meant how extreme the signal is, while weight is a measure of reliability. For instance, investors receive a large sample of both favorable and unfavorable information regarding a company from a variety sources. This sample of information

signals is high in weight, due to the large sample and the many sources, but low of strength, since the signals are mixed. When information signals are high in weight, people tend to display conservative behavior, because they rely too little on the reliable evidence, which, even though reliable, does not provide definite support for their prior beliefs. When information signals are high of strength, people tend to suffer from base and sample size neglect, because they perceive a small sample of signals pointing in one direction as enough information to draw conclusions. Section 5.0 elaborates on the above, by showing how conservatism works in financial markets.

4.3 Overconfidence

“Overconfidence” is one of the most established findings in psychological studies of decision processes. The overconfidence heuristic contains two overall aspects. People’s ability to assess probabilities and the way they judge their own skills. According to Alpert and Raiffa (1982), people are too optimistic in determining a confidence interval of estimates. A 98 percent confidence interval will only contain the correct estimates 60 percent of the time. Furthermore Fischhoff, Slovic and Lichtenstein (1977) find that, what people perceive as certain only occurs 80 percent of the time and what people deem as impossible occurs 20 percent of the time. This is obviously very interesting when dealing with bettor’s behavior, because it indicates that a heavy favorite, in a given game, actually does not win as often as people think and that the underdog, therefore, wins more often than people think. This will be elaborated on in paragraph 6.6.

Humans have a tendency to think that they are better than average and they often rate themselves higher than others rate them¹³. For instance, they rate themselves above average in such domains as driving, ability to get along with others and sense of humor. Moreover people are especially overconfident, when it comes to tasks of moderate to extreme difficulty and when the outcome is of low predictability or completely determined by chance¹⁴. Griffin and Tversky also show that experts are more overconfident than laymen. Numerous academics have observed this behavior

¹³ Taylor and Brown (1988)

¹⁴ Griffin and Tversky (1992)

among psychologists, physicians, nurses, engineers, lawyers, managers, investment bankers and others¹⁵. Furthermore, according to Einhorn (1980), individuals are usually more overconfident in scenarios where feedback is deferred or inconclusive.

Most of the above findings show under which circumstances individuals in particular are overconfident. It is obvious that the findings fit the financial markets and people who participate in them pretty well. Odean (1998a) studied overconfidence in the market and found that overconfidence increases volume, volatility and depth in the market, but decreases overconfident traders expected utility. Furthermore Odean (1998b) also shows that private investors trade too often and thereby decrease their expected utility. Barber and Odean (2001) document that males trade more often than females, which leads to higher transaction cost and therefore lower returns. These results indicate that the overconfident market participants trade too much compared to rational investors, because they believe too much in their own abilities and the accuracy of their knowledge is greater than it actually is.

The above describes under which circumstances overconfidence is especially salient and how it influences the financial market participants. The question now is, how does it influence betting markets and bettors? Generally speaking individuals are overconfident, this should then also hold for bettors. Furthermore, males are especially overconfident and it is definitely realistic to assume that the majority of bettors are males, which lends support to the idea that overconfidence can be found among bettors. Moreover, betting can be perceived as a task of moderate to extreme difficulty and with relatively low predictability and some change. However, the vast majority of bettors are not professionals in the traditional sense, but most think they are quite knowledgeable, which will lead to some degree of overconfidence. Feedback from a bet is pretty clear – either the bettor wins or loses, but in a way it can be close. Therefore you can often hear a phrase like “they would have won if...” among bettors and fans. This kind of behavior helps maintain overconfidence, because according to “attribution theory” people have a tendency to credit themselves, when the outcome is a success and attribute a less successful outcome to noise or bad luck¹⁶. So, by blaming an unsuccessful outcome on the players, the referee or something else they

¹⁵ Barber and Odean (2001)

¹⁶ Bem (1965)

can preserve their perception of their ability to predict the outcome of a game. From the above it is clear that the overconfidence heuristic fits bettors and the task of betting fairly well. The author believes that overconfidence has two implications. Firstly, it can help explain why people bet in the first place. By following sports you will automatically gain knowledge. Since people overestimate their knowledge it is logical that they will try to take advantage of their overestimated abilities by betting. The second implication is derived from Odean's findings, which was that overconfident market participants trade too often and thereby decrease their expected utility. Converted to betting, this means that bettors bet too much. Instead of just betting on a few well-thought of games, overconfidence will lead them to bet on a number of games, where they perceive to have some sort of information. Because they are overconfident, they will overestimate the probability that their personal assessment of the bet is more accurate than the bookmaker's assessment and place a bet, which in actuality is based on too sparse or speculative information.

4.4 Availability bias

The "availability bias" is another bias that reveals something about how individuals assess probabilities. According to Tversky and Kahneman (1973), information that is easier to recall is judged to be more common. This will lead to overestimation of salient or easy to retrieve information. For instance, people will overestimate the probability of young females getting breast cancer, if someone they know was diagnosed with it, especially if it is in the recent past. Tversky and Kahneman (1973,1974) illustrate how this heuristic works by stating some examples. Below, is an example that nicely demonstrates the availability bias.

In an experiment a number subjects were asked to judge whether a list of people read to them, contained more females than males. The lists contained an equal proportion of females and males. Different lists were read to different subjects. Some of the lists had females that are perceived more famous than the males on the list and vice versa. When the lists contained more famous females, subjects erroneously concluded that the list had more females than males. The opposite was the case, when the lists contained relatively more famous male personalities.

Availability bias is relevant in relation to betting. Teams that perform out of the ordinary, either good or bad, will get the most attention by both the media and bettors. They will be labeled winners and losers. Because of the media coverage and their unusual statistics from previous games played, one could easily imagine that bettors retrieve this information and bet on for instance a team that won with a big margin last week or are perceived to be on a streak.

The next section presents the so-called anomalies, which are violations of the efficient market hypothesis. The section also discusses, why one should be skeptical of these empirical findings. Furthermore, the section outlines several academics' use of Kahneman and Tversky's heuristics as explanations for the anomalies. In this regard, the thesis clarifies what is needed in order for such models to be useful.

5.0 Anomalies – behavioral finance in financial markets

For many years people involved with financial markets have worked from the dictum that all available information at any time is incorporated into the price of a given financial asset. This means that prices are correct and that no investment strategy will result in a risk adjusted excess return – cf section 2.0. However, a number of empirical studies produce damning evidence against the above. The findings from these studies have come to be known as “anomalies”, because they are deviations from what is usually considered to be the truth, namely, the efficient market hypothesis. The anomalies are in general characterized by the fact that they cannot be explained by, the probably, most used model of risk and return, the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM). This section takes a closer look at some of the more salient and for this thesis, relevant anomalies found in the literature. Furthermore, emphasis is put on analyzing how the heuristic biases can explain the anomalies found in financial markets.

5.1 Small firm anomaly

Fama and French (1992) document a finding/anomaly called “the size premium” or “small firm anomaly”. In a period from 1963 to 1990, they form portfolios of all stocks traded on NASDAQ, AMEX and NYSE based on their market capitalization. They then measured the average return of each portfolio on a yearly basis. Fama and French found out that the average return for the portfolio of stocks with low market capitalization (smallest firms) were 0.74% per month higher than the return of the high market capitalization portfolio. This is an anomaly, because CAPM cannot explain the big difference in return between the two portfolios. Even though the small stocks have higher beta than large stocks, the difference in risk is not enough to explain all of the difference in average returns.

5.2 Ratio anomaly

A number of authors, beginning with Banz (1981), have analyzed different ratio measures like book-to-market (B/M) and earnings-to-price (E/P) and found evidence that is not consistent with what the CAPM predicts and therefore anomalies. In Fama

and French's paper (same as above) they also group the stocks by their B/M and E/P and measure the average return for each portfolio over the following year. They found that the average return for the highest B/M portfolio, so called value stocks, was 1.53% higher than portfolio with the lowest B/M, growth stocks, ratios per month. Grouping by E/P resulted in a difference of 0.68% per month. Fama and French determine that the differences are too great to be explained by differences in beta, especially when the stocks are grouped using B/M ratio.

5.3 Long-term reversal effect

DeBondt and Thaler (1985) discovered an anomaly known as “long term reversal”¹⁷. Like the ones mentioned above, this anomaly is also about the cross section of average returns, meaning that one group of stocks earn higher average return than another. DeBondt and Thaler formed two portfolios each consisting of 35 stocks picked from all the stocks traded on the NYSE. The selection for each portfolio was based on each stocks prior three year cumulative return, thereby creating a “winner” portfolio containing the 35 stocks with the highest three year cumulative returns and a “loser” portfolio containing the 35 stocks with the lowest return. After the formation, they measured the average return of the portfolios for the three succeeding years. This pattern was repeated every three years from 1926 to 1982. The authors found that the average annual return of the loser portfolio was around 8% higher than the winner portfolio for the sample period. Again one can expect that beta can help explain the difference. DeBondt and Thaler examined this possibility and some what surprisingly found out that the beta of the winner portfolio was significantly higher than the beta of the loser portfolio.

5.4 Momentum effect

Jegadeesh and Titman (1993); Rouwenhorst (1998, 1999)¹⁸; Grinblatt and Moskowitz (1999) report an anomaly known as “momentum”. Jegadeesh and Titman have conducted a similar study to that of DeBondt and Thaler. They group the NYSE

¹⁷ Chan (1988), Chopra et. al (1992) Lee and Swaminathan (2000), Jegadeesh and Titman (2001) found similar results

¹⁸ Found momentum effect in European and emerging markets

stocks in the same manner, but instead of three year intervals they use 6 month intervals from 1963 to 1989. They establish that the prior winner portfolio outperforms the prior loser portfolio by an average of 10% per year. This is the opposite of what DeBondt and Thaler discovered. The only major difference in the setup between the two studies is the length of the intervals, so time definitely plays a crucial role for the outcome that the previous winners continue to win in the short run and loses in the longer run¹⁹. Grinblatt and Moskowitz find that tax-loss selling can help explain some of the momentum effect, but far from all of it. The reasoning behind their analysis is that stocks with negative capital gains are subject to selling at the end of the year, since the realized loss will reduce the tax liability of assets with positive gains. Selling the poor performing stock puts pressure on the price thus creating momentum effect. However, at the turn of the year selling pressure eases off, which allow the stock to regain some of it's lost value, thus weakening the momentum effect. As stated, this seasonal variation does explain some of the momentum effect, but not all of it.

5.5 Earnings announcement effect

A number of academics have examined what happen to stock returns after corporate announcements. Such announcements could for instance be stock repurchases, stock splits, new equity offerings, change in dividend policies, earnings announcements etc. These types of analysis are known as event studies. Like the above anomalies, traditional finance has difficulties explaining the findings in these event studies. This thesis only presents one of the effects – “earnings announcements effect”. Every quarter from 1974 to 1986, Bernard and Thomas (1989) use all traded stocks on the NYSE and AMEX to form portfolios, based on how surprising their most recent earnings announcements were. The level of surprise is measured as the earnings deviation from a random walk of earnings. Over the 60 day period after announcements, the portfolio with the greatest positive deviation outperformed the portfolio with the greatest negative deviation by 4%. (The greatest positive deviation portfolio was up by almost 2%, while the greatest negative deviation was down by a little more than -2%) This phenomenon is known as post-earnings announcement drift

¹⁹ DeBondt and Thaler also found that one year winners continue to win the following year, but they do not put emphasis on this.

and, as was the case with the above studies, the difference in returns can not be explained by differences in beta. Chan, Jegadeesh and Lakonishok (1996) have conducted the same research from 1977 to 1993 and found similar results, but instead of a random walk they measured against analyst's expectations. Using more recent data from 1991 to 2003, Mendenhall (2004) conclude that the earnings announcement effect still persists.

5.6 Discussion of modeling – a healthy amount of skepticism

When analyzing the above anomalies, one should have a healthy amount of skepticism toward the findings. A general concern should be data-mining. If academics sort securities in enough different ways, they will find significant, but spurious differences in returns. However, this problem can be eliminated, if enough tests are conducted both for different time periods and across different markets. This thesis clearly shows that a number of tests have been conducted for each anomaly, mainly with regards to time but also across markets. Furthermore, this thesis has not presented all the literature that lends support to the anomalies. The reason for not including more, when it lends further support, is that this thesis's main point is not to survey or directly justify the existence of behavioral finance, but rather to test whether psychological patterns and findings in financial markets, justified or not, might hold in a different setting. A number of academics are skeptical, when it comes to the methodology of these empirical tests. Fama (1998) is probably the most skeptical. He concludes that the anomalies disappear, if the statistical methods are changed. Hence the anomalies are not due to behavioral finance, but are merely a result of vague models. Ball (1995) also addresses methodology issues by discussing the difficulties in interpreting the "joint tests", which are used for testing. The problem arises, because the joint tests test for both efficiency and a price model. In order to test for efficiency or rational behavior the price model needs to be able to give a reliable estimation of the fundamental value of the assets. This, in it self, is a difficult task, considering the various models that are in use today. The world never receives an objective signal about a given assets true value, since most assets are infinitely lived. If this was not the case, then the world would have a clear benchmark. So, since it is difficult to calculate the fundamental value, it is also difficult to determine whether an

anomaly is a true deviation from the efficient market hypothesis or a result of modeling problems. However, it is the opinion of the author that, if a number of independent tests across time and markets show the same pattern, then we also have predictability, which can be exploited regardless of joint tests problems. Thus, these problems are negligible.

Skepticism is also warranted, because anomalies come and go. In recent years academics, like Hirshleifer (2001) and Ciccone (2003), have argued that the small firm anomaly has vanished. Gu (2003) and Chen and Signal (2004) reach the same conclusion for the January effect (not presented above), while Schwert (2001) states that the effect from grouping by book-to-market is no longer evident. This only makes anomalies transiently important in the very long run. However, just because an anomaly has been established over a considerably period of time and numerous markets and eventually disappears, does not mean that an investor cannot make an abnormal return or that it is not incriminating against the efficient market hypothesis. It simply means that as a sufficient number of investors become aware of the anomaly, they exploit it and thereby correct prices towards fundamentals. Such a process of correction is erratic and could lead to mispricing, because investors might think they see an anomaly that in actuality is not there, which could create mispricing. Furthermore, if an anomaly is discovered, aware investors might overexploit the anomaly, which creates a reverse anomaly, due to the fact that is very difficult to extrapolate other investors' actions.

Before turning to behavioral models that try to explain the above anomalies, the thesis will discuss some minimum requirements that these models need to meet in order to provide any useful insight as to why these anomalies exist. If the models do not fulfill these requirements the behavioral approach is not worth a great deal, because one could then mold behaviors such that the models fit with the collected data. First of all, financial markets participants' behavior should stem from already established psychological patterns and other related areas. This could for instance be systematic biases such as representativeness, overconfidence etc. Since they are established elsewhere, they might also exist in financial markets. Secondly, a behavioral model becomes more credible, if it captures more than one effect in a market and its credibility increases with the number of effects explained. Therefore, a model

capturing both momentum effect and long term reversal effect is better than a model that only captures momentum effect. Thirdly, the model should be able to make predictions about the attributes of a market. The predictions should be empirically tested in order to evaluate the underlying assumptions of the model. Out of sample tests should also be conducted, especially, if the model is based on historical data. This prevents data mining or molding as stated above. The models below satisfy the requirements, since they stem from established psychological patterns, capture more than one effect and are empirically tested. However, since this is a fairly new topic in finance, further testing of the authors' findings will help increase the robustness of the results.

5.7 Heuristics and financial market findings

Daniel, Hirshleifer and Subrahmanyam (1998, 2001) use the overconfidence bias and self attribution bias to explain the above effects. Daniel et al. distinguish between private and public information in regards to overconfidence. They assume that investors are more overconfident when the information signal is private. What is meant by private is information that the investor has generated himself through analysis. This could for instance be an analysis of financial statements or other announcements. The key here is the level of the investor's personal involvement. If he is involved personally he will be more overconfident compared to when the information is public. If a given piece of private information is positive, then overconfident investors will push up prices too far relative to fundamentals. As time passes more and more public information arrives and overconfidence slowly declines and thus pushes prices back towards the correct value. According to Daniel et al. this pattern is consistent with long term reversal effect. The authors then go on to determine how self attribution bias helps explain momentum and earnings announcement effect. From paragraph 4.3 we have that people credit their own abilities when things turn to their advantage and regard the opposite as being noise or bad luck. This asymmetric behavior comes in to play when investors evaluate the public information that arrives relatively shortly after the initial private information. When the public information confirms the investor's own research (initial private information), it too strongly increases his already build-up confidence, due to a sort of

“I knew it” mentality. If the public information is disconfirming, the information is more or less neglected and the initial confidence from the private information declines too little or remains the same. This way of handling information or even evidence is closely related to an other heuristic, known as belief perseverance or confirmation bias(not described in section 4.0). Lord, Ross and Lepper (1979) show that once humans form an opinion they stick to it for too long. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, humans are reluctant to search for contradicting evidence, instead they seek for confirming evidence. Secondly, even after they find contradicting evidence, they treat this with excessive skepticism.

The confirmation bias, self attribution bias and confidence pattern are what generates momentum and earnings announcement effect and later long term reversal effect. Investors react by buying, when they receive confirming evidence of their initial private information and do little or nothing when receiving disconfirming evidence. So on average they overreact to new information. As more information “hits” the market more and more investors realize that they overreacted and prices then reverse.

Barberis, Shleifer and Vishny (1998) have also contributed in shedding light on why investors make systematic mistakes, when they form expectations about financial assets. Instead of overconfidence and self attribution bias, they incorporate conservatism and representativeness as explanations in their model. The conservatism bias, the tendency to underweight new information, causes investors to underreact to for instance a company announcing a piece of surprisingly good news. Underreaction deals with the notion that the demand for the given asset is not strong enough to push the price up to the correct level. When the price is too low, subsequent returns will on average be higher, which is why one can observe momentum and post-earnings announcement drift. When a piece of good news is followed by more good news and thereby becomes a series, investors will overreact and push the price up too high, relative to fundamentals. This is due to representativeness and in particular the part known as the law of small numbers, where by people mistakenly believe that a small sample is enough to draw conclusion on the population. So by receiving a small series of good earnings announcements they think that this is a company with great potential for high future earnings. Since the price now has become too high, subsequent returns are on average too low, thus creating long term reversals and ratio effect.

Barberis et al's. model is based on the fact that earnings for an asset follow a random walk and that investors mistakenly believe that this is not the case. Instead they believe that earnings stochastically changes between two regimes – “mean-reverting” regime and “trend” regime. Investors erroneously think that the company is in a mean reverting regime, if earning changes reverse. This causes underreaction to new information, consistent with conservatism, which again generates momentum and post-earnings announcement drift. The trend regime is in force, when investors observe a sequence of growing earnings. They see a trend in something that is actually random and overreact due to representativeness. From the above we have that representativeness generates long term reversals and ratio effect. Barberis et al. conclude that their model is able to confirm the four anomalies from above. Investors who are influenced by the above, see it as their task to try to figure out, which regime currently is valid and act upon this. A phenomenon closely related to this is “positive feedback trading”, where investors' expectations of future returns are based on past returns. A positive feedback trader buys a stock that just went up in price, causing the price to rise further, which is equivalent to creating momentum and post-earnings announcement drift. From the above, we then know that this later generates long-term reversal and ratio effects. So it is not unlikely that behavioral finance offers a good explanation for the well known positive feedback trading phenomenon.

Hong and Stein (1999) also offer a model, which helps explain the above anomalies, given that investors are less than perfectly rational. One of the pillars in their work is positive feedback trading, which will be elaborated on below. Hong and Stein's behavioral model is based on two kinds of investors – “News watchers” and “momentum traders”. Each group exhibits limited rationality and interact in the same market. Limited rationality means that each group can only process so much information and then act rationally upon this. Momentum traders condition their demand for a stock on recent price changes of that stock, while news watchers base their actions on the fundamental news that is available at that time. Hong and Stein assume that fundamental news disseminate slowly among news watchers, which initially leads to underreaction, but still a small increase. Given that the momentum traders engage in positive feedback trading they will buy the stock, because they see the small price increase as good news, which currently is disseminating among news watchers. The momentum traders then hope to profit from the continuation of the

slow dissemination of information. This preserves momentum, but later also leads to long term reversals, because momentum traders do not know how long the dissemination process takes and therefore continues to buy even after the stock price reaches its fundamental value. This overreaction will then later be reversed.

It is interesting that the above authors have different stories when it comes to explaining the anomalies – especially the explanations for momentum differ. Barberis et al. and Hong and Stein found that momentum occurs because of initial underreaction followed by correction, while Daniel et al. conclude that momentum can be observed due to initial overreaction followed by more overreaction. As time passes it will be interesting to see, which argument will gain (if any) the most support in future finance literature.

6.0 Betting strategies

This section presents the betting strategies or hypotheses that this thesis is testing. All the strategies are based on behavioral finance and findings in the financial markets. The strategies are stated below and subsequently the reasoning for them is discussed.

- (1) Big win – Bet against the teams that won their previous game by a large margin. Large margin is defined as > 14.67 and > 19.67 ²⁰.
- (2) Big loss – Bet on the teams that lost their previous game by a large margin. Large margin is defined as < -14.67 and < -19.67 ²¹
- (3) Covered the spread – Bet against the teams that covered the spread by a large margin in the previous game. Large cover is defined as > 13.36 and > 18.36 ²².
- (4) Failed to cover the spread – Bet on the teams that failed to cover the spread by a large margin in the previous game. Large failure is defined as < -13.24 and < -18.24 ²³.
- (5) Trend chasing results positive – Bet against the teams that won the previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games in a row.
- (6) Trend chasing results negative – Bet on the teams that lost the previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games in a row.
- (7) Trend chasing spread positive – Bet against the teams that covered the spread in the previous 3-, 4-, 5 or more games in a row.
- (8) Trend chasing spread negative – Bet on the teams that failed to cover the spread in the previous 3-, 4-, 5 or more games in a row.
- (9) Popular teams I – For the first 6 weeks of the new season, bet against the teams that played in the Super Bowl²⁴ the previous season²⁵.
- (10) Popular teams II – Bet on teams from a small city, when playing teams from large cities.
- (11) Home underdog – Bet on teams that are playing at their home field and are underdogs to a certain degree. Degree of underdog is defined as > 3.34 and > 6.84 ²⁶.

²⁰ See Appendix B for determination of large margin

²¹ See Appendix B for determination of large margin

²² See Appendix B for determination of large margin

²³ See Appendix B for determination of large margin

²⁴ The Super bowl is the finale game of the season. It determines who is league champions

²⁵ See Appendix C for participants in Super Bowls

- (12) Away underdog – Bet on teams that are playing away games and are underdogs to a certain degree. Degree of underdogs is defined as < -8.4 and < -10.4 ²⁷.

The point of the above strategies is obviously to take advantage of the general betting public. As stated earlier the spread in a bet is not a prediction of the outcome of the game, but rather an attempt to create matched books. This is done, by estimating how the public will bet and set the spread accordingly. So, if a sufficient number of bettors over- or underreact to some information, the bookmaker must account for this, when determining the spread. This creates an opportunity for the sophisticated bettor to profit from the biases of the general betting public. The sophisticated bettor can then be perceived as the betting markets answer to an arbitrageur or rational trader, because he is aware of possible mispricings and, if he chooses, can try to take advantage of it. Bettors who over- or underreact to some information can be perceived as noise traders or at least as irrational traders.

6.1 Strategy 1 and 2

The first two betting strategies are derived from the representativeness heuristic, availability bias and post earnings announcement effect. From representativeness and in particular base rate neglect, we have that people tend to overweigh recent information and underweigh prior data. This is very much in line with availability, which dictates that new information is more retrievable than older information, all things being equal. Furthermore, availability states that salient information is judged to be more common than it really is and that easy to retrieve and salient information therefore causes overestimation of probabilities. The first two strategies capture this, because they pick out teams that recently performed out of the ordinary. A big win or loss in the last game corresponds to both recent and salient information. In addition these teams get a lot of media coverage and are discussed among sports fans, which make them easier to retrieve from memory, when next weeks bets are placed. Strategies (1) and (2) are also replicas of the post earnings announcement effect, where the most surprisingly good or bad recent earnings announcements led to a

²⁶ See Appendix E for determination of the degree of underdog

²⁷ See Appendix E for determination of the degree of underdog

cumulative abnormal return of close to 2% and -2% respectively and thereby an outperformance of 4% in total over the next 60 days following the announcement. It is the element of surprise and subsequently the differences in returns that helped formulate these two betting strategies. If a surprisingly good (bad) earnings announcement results in positive (negative) abnormal return, then a surprising result in sports may also cause deviations when betting. If an investor observes an unanticipated positive earnings announcement he should buy (hold if he already owns) the security and, of course, short sell (sell if he already owns) securities with a surprisingly negative announcement. In a betting market a big win or loss can often be interpreted as a surprisingly “good or bad earnings announcement”. However, since the betting market does not quite work like a financial market, the sophisticated bettor needs to bet “opposite” of the masses in order to hold the same positions as an arbitrage investor. By opposite, it is meant that he needs to bet against the team with a big win in the last game and bet on the team that lost big in their last game. When a bettor is influenced by the above biases and/or if the earnings announcement effect holds, he will overestimate or underestimate the performance of a big win or loss team in next week’s game. If a sufficient number of bettors display this behavior, the bookmaker increase or decrease the spread accordingly to balance the bet. For instance team X won (lost) big last week. The true “value” of this week’s game is -7, but since bettors are influenced by the above, meaning that they overbet (underbet) team X, the bookmaker has to move the line to say -7.5 (-6.5) to get an equal amount of money on either side. It is no longer the true value of the game. A sophisticated bettor can take advantage of this by betting on the other team (team X in case of loss). Team X wins by 7 points, which is not enough to cover the spread (cover, when the previous week was a large loss). The sophisticated bettor wins the bet that he would have tied, had the unsophisticated bettors not been displaying the above behavior. The move of -0.5 (+0.5) is the equivalent of an overvalued (undervalued) asset in a financial market. Thus, if you own the asset you should sell (hold it), if you do not own the asset short sell (buy it). Both instances correspond to a bet on the other team (team X) in a betting market.

6.2 Strategy 3 and 4

The reasoning for strategy (3) and (4) is very similar to (1) and (2). They are included, because of the framing of football wagering. Individuals, who bet, often think in point-scored differences. A winning margin of 20 is not spectacular, in the betting world, if a team is a 20 point favorite to begin with. These two strategies capture the same reasoning as strategies (1) and (2), except that they are more in tune to the “nature” of betting. Furthermore, strategies (3) and (4) will do a better job of incorporating surprising results, because a result that is significantly different from the spread is not what the public expected, since the spread is a reflection of the public opinion.

6.3 Strategy 5 and 6

Strategies (5) and (6) stem from the representativeness bias and, specifically, the part known as sample size neglect. In paragraph 4.1, this thesis argues that individuals who practice sample size neglect sometimes draw conclusions about the population on just a few data samples. For instance, recall the stockbroker who had 4 successful picks. He was perceived talented, because 4 successes are not representative of a mediocre or bad broker. This behavior was also found among sports fans, who have a tendency to believe in the hot hand (seeing a pattern/trend). Since they believe that a basketball player will make the next shot after just a few successful attempts, one could also imagine that a bettor sees a trend after a few victories or losses and therefore over- or underestimates the probability that a team will win or lose the next game. The two strategies also have their roots in findings in financial markets. Barberis et al. (cf. paragraph 5.7) found that some investors perceive trading as a game of determining which regime, mean-reverting or trend, is currently valid. If investors observe a small sequence of information signals pointing in the same direction, they sometimes falsely conclude that the security is in a trend regime and therefore buy or sell the security. This causes the price to rise or fall beyond its fundamental value. Subsequently the returns are on average too low (high), which as stated creates long term reversal. In a betting context, this means that bettors believe, too strongly, that a team that has won or lost a number of previous games also will win or lose the next game. If enough bettors are influenced by the above, then the

odds maker will have to account for this by increasing or decreasing the spread too much, compared to what is the true prediction of the game. This could lead to a profitable betting strategy, since past losers, after the spread adjustment, might perform better than past winners, as is documented in financial markets.

6.4 Strategy 7 and 8

Strategies (7) and (8) are identical to strategy (5) and (6) except that they measure win or losses against the spread. As, strategy (3) and (4) they are included, because bettors not only think in terms of actual points scored, win or losses, but also how teams did against the spread.

6.5 Strategy 9 and 10

Strategy (9) incorporates some security markets findings²⁸ and halo effect. The tendency to extend one positive characteristic of an object to the object's other characteristics. Furthermore, it incorporates a sort of band wagon effect, in other words, people like to associate themselves with winners. The two effects combined might cause a deviation in the spread from the true prediction of a game. The logic behind this is that a winning team has relatively more fans due to the above effects²⁹. Moreover, one could also expect that the betting part of these fans sometimes let their emotions guide them, and bet on their favorite team instead of being completely rational and pick the best bet. For instance, it is no secret that Dansk Tipstjeneste provide low odds on the Danish national soccer team. This is due to the fact that a lot of bettors are influenced by their emotions and Tipstjenesten needs to lower the odds in order to avoid an unbalanced book. Strategy (9) states that: For the first 6 weeks of the new season, bet against the teams that competed in the Super Bowl the previous season. The reason why this thesis has chosen the first 6 weeks instead of for instance the entire season is to avoid too much noise. Noise refers to the new statistics about the teams' performances, which during the new season gradually will influence bettors more than which teams were in the Super Bowl, even though they gained

²⁸ The relations to security markets are explained under strategy (10)

²⁹ An indication of the size of the fan-base is merchandise sells. For 2004 the Super Bowl champions the New England Patriots tops the merchandise sells list. The runner up, Carolina Panthers is no. 4. The list is retrieved from the web site www.nflshop.com

many fans because of their past success. This thesis also argues that individuals, under some circumstances, neglect prior data and put too much weight on small samples etc. This might also create noise as the season progresses. By using relatively few weeks, the thesis is also able to incorporate the conservatism bias, which in theory might enhance the effect. Recall from paragraph 4.2 that individuals might display conservatism bias³⁰, when a sequence of information signals is mixed. During the 7 month long off-season (period between seasons), football followers receive a lot of information about the teams. Teams sign and release players, members of the coaching staff are replaced, the teams draft new college players etc. All of these events are information signals that are relevant, when next season's betting begins. Often, what happens in the off-season is hard to interpret. Is the team better or worse of, with the release of a good player and the hiring of a top coach? Indeed, the information signals are mixed. According to conservatism bias, this will lead bettors to put too great an emphasis on the base rate, in this case, last season's performance. So at the beginning of the season, bettors in general, along with the fans, might overbet the two best teams of last season.

The 10th strategy is sort of similar to the 9th, because it also accounts for a given team's fan base. As above, the spread might be biased for a franchise with many followers. A vast amount of evidence from financial markets suggests that people do not diversify their portfolios as much as they should according to financial theory. Even Harry Markowitz, the father of modern portfolio theory, admits that he does not allocate his funds sufficiently. (Shefrin (2002)). French and Poterba (1991) found that investors in the USA, Japan and the UK allocate 94%, 98% and 82% of their investments to domestic equities, respectively. Such allocations cannot be regarded as well-diversified. Huberman (2001) found that employees invest heavily in their own company's stock and believe it to be low of risk. Ambiguity and familiarity offer an explanation for the lack of diversification. Investors are, in general, more familiar with national stocks than foreign stocks, which also is the same as saying that national stocks offer less ambiguity. The same argument can be used for employees buying their own company's stock. Halo effect also helps in explaining why employees buy their own company's stock. An employee might think. I like my colleagues; we work

³⁰ conservatism bias is to put too much weight on the base rate or prior believes

well as a team etc. This might cause him to extend these favorable characteristics onto how the company's stock will perform in the future. Even though the two factors correlate to some degree, one should not base one's decisions on such grounds. Furthermore, when buying company stocks one obviously takes on unjustified risk, because, in worst case, a bankruptcy will leave you with worthless stocks and no income. Strategies (9) and (10) are in a sense analogues to the above, because, everything equal, a betting fan is more familiar with the team he follows. He might also use the fact that he is a fan to justify a wager on the team. Strategy (10) assumes that teams of large cities have relatively more followers than teams of small cities, which might result in fans overbetting large city teams. Strategy (10) is designed, so that when a small city team plays against a large city team a bet is placed on the small city team. The author has decided to use the 6 largest and 6 smallest cities corresponding to roughly 20% of the NFL cities in each category³¹.

6.6 Strategy 11 and 12

Strategies (11) and (12) differ from the above strategies in a number of ways. All of the above strategies test the weak form efficient market hypothesis, since they only use past performances in games, against the spread or city population. (11) and (12) test efficiency in semi-strong form, because they allow public available information that arrives between games to be incorporated into the spread, before they pick out the appropriate bets. An example will illustrate this well. Recall that strategy (11) was to bet on a home underdog, in a given game, of either greater than 3.34 points or 6.84 points. Most games are played on Sundays and the initial lines for next week's games are usually set during Mondays or Tuesdays. The Monday (Tuesday) line for team H (home) vs. team A (away) is 1.5, which makes team H, the underdog of 1.5 point. At this point no betting using strategy (11) will take place (below 3.34), but bets for strategies (1) to (10) have already been decided, because they use the outcomes of Sunday's games or information prior to that. During the week some disturbing news for team H becomes available. This could for instance be injuries to key players, illness in the squad, failed illegal substance tests etc. It could also be good news for team A, like quicker than expected recovery of injured players etc. The disturbing

³¹ See Appendix D for large and small NFL cities

news changes the line from 1.5 to 3.5 before kick-off Sunday. The change in the spread results in a wager, since team H has become an underdog of sufficient magnitude. Strategies (11) and (12) also differ from the other strategies in that they distinguish between home and away games. The reason for this dissection is that the home-field advantage³², in itself, is difficult to assess, which might make a difference, when the public bets. Byway of this division of betting strategies, the thesis aims at providing better information, than a simple bet on the underdog, regardless of away or home, would have. The two strategies are also related to behavioral finance. Recall, the findings of Fischhoff et al.(1977) (cf - paragraph 4.3). They are in direct relations to the strategies, because if something that people perceive as certain only happens 80% of time and something they perceive as impossible occur 20% of the time, then they might overbet heavy favorites and/or underbet heavy underdogs. Daniel, Hirshleifer and Subrahmanyam (1998, 2001) explanation regarding overreaction also fits the strategies quite well. Recall that one of the pillars in their explanation was personal involvement, which stems from enlightenment through analyzing evidence yourself(private information signal). This builds overconfidence. Moreover, they determined, due to belief perseverance, that when the private information signal is confirmed by subsequent public information/evidence, it increases the overconfidence even more, which causes overreaction. Disconfirming information/evidence however is treated with a high level of skepticism. So, on average, investors overreact in the short run. The same argumentation can be used in a betting market. People interested in sports usually, including bettors, know which teams are playing each other in the next game, before they know the spread of the game. In the “worst” case, the information is received at the same time. Due to their knowledge, regarding the strength of the different teams, they also form an opinion, on which team is the favorite and which is the underdog in the next game. This is the private information signal, because they figure the strength relationship out for themselves. Later on they receive the public information, which is the spread. This might be confirming or disconfirming of their prior believes. The asymmetric treatment of confirming or disconfirming information will lead to overreaction as argued by Daniel et al. If sufficient overreaction occurs in the betting market, then the betting public will either

³² For the interested reader: the home-field advantage is on average 2.87 point for the 10 year period examined in this thesis

overbet the favorite or underbet the underdog. This changes the spread beyond fundamental value, which can be exploited by betting the underdog.

The next section describes the data as well as the statistical method used for testing the 12 strategies.

7.0 Methodology

The above hypotheses are going to be evaluated using the regular season NFL games from 1995 – 2005. During this period two teams, Cleveland Browns and Houston Texans, were added to the league in 1999 and 2002 respectively. Thereby, increasing the number of teams from first 30 to 31 and finally to 32 teams. This results in a total of 2472 games. Furthermore the thesis needs the corresponding point spreads in order to test the hypotheses. The required data are retrieved from the web-page, covers.com.

The outcome of a bet will result in one of three outcomes. A win, a loss or a tie (push), which makes the data follow a multinomial distribution. However, since a tie is equivalent to getting the stake back, there is no point in including these in the sample. After discarding the ties, this leaves 2386 observations and only two possible outcomes. Instead of a multinomial distribution the data now follow a binomial distribution, where X = number of trials with the outcome as a win. The assumptions of the binomial distribution are discussed below. (1) Each trial, denoted by n , results in one of two mutual exclusive outcomes. You win the bet or you lose the bet of a given strategy. (2) The probability (p) of success, that is that the strategy is a success, remains constant from trial to trial. As stated in paragraph 3.1, American book-makers uses the “eleven for ten” rule, which implies that in order for the bettor to break even he must win 52.38 % of the bets of a given strategy. P is therefore set to equal the break even percentage. The probability of failure is also constant and denoted by $q = 1 - p$. (3) The trials are independent. This means that the outcome against the point spread of a given betting strategy in a given game is independent of the strategy’s performance in both previous and future games. Whether or not this assumption is violated is not clear, because a given teams past performance, to some degree, does influence future spreads set by the odds maker. However, past performance of a given team is only one of many considerations that go into setting the spread of that team’s completely different game the following week. Furthermore, following a betting strategy most often does not result in betting on the same team all the time, but rather different teams that meet various criteria, like winning margin for instance. Different team’s outcome against the spread is definitely independent. From the above discussion, the thesis finds it reasonable to assume that the trials are independent.

The mean and the variance of a binomial distribution are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &= n * p \\ \sigma^2 &= n * p * (1 - p)\end{aligned}$$

When the sample size is large, the binomial distribution approaches the normal distribution. Large is defined as $n \cdot p > 5$ and $n \cdot (1-p) > 5$, which is the case for all the strategies. The normal distribution can normally only be used, when the standard deviation (σ) is known. The standard deviation is not known in these tests, because the sample is drawn from an infinite population. Therefore one should use the t-distribution instead. However if the degrees of freedom (ν) are > 100 the normal distribution will yield a satisfying result. The normal distribution test statistic is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}Z &= \frac{X - \mu}{\sigma} \sim N(0,1) \\ &= \frac{X - n * p}{\sqrt{n * p * (1 - p)}}\end{aligned}$$

For the few instances where the degrees of freedom are < 100 , the t-distribution is used. The t-distribution test statistic is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}T &= \frac{\bar{X} - \mu}{s_x} \\ &= \frac{\bar{X} - n * p}{\sqrt{n * p * (1 - p)}}\end{aligned}$$

To figure out whether the formulated strategies are profitable, statistical tests of hypotheses are needed. This thesis uses a one tailed test, because it is interested in testing whether a parameter is greater than a pre-specified value. The null hypothesis, denoted H_0 , states that a given strategy is unprofitable (win frequency $\leq 52.38\%$) against the alternative hypothesis, H_1 , that it is profitable (win frequency $> 52.38\%$). H_0 and H_1 are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Accept } H_0: & \text{ if } \frac{X}{n} \leq n * 52.38\% \text{ for any given strategy} \\ \text{Accept } H_1: & \text{ if } \frac{X}{n} > n * 52.38\% \text{ for any given strategy}\end{aligned}$$

As is usually the case for hypotheses testing, this thesis is also interested in keeping a small chance of committing a type I error. That is the probability of falsely concluding that a strategy is profitable, when in fact it is not. The significance level is therefore

set at $\alpha = 0.05$, which is a common level to use. The next section presents the empirical results of the thesis.

8.0 Results

This section presents and discusses the empirical findings of the thesis. The simulated betting strategies are divided into groups depending on which psychological patterns and findings in financial markets they reflect. The reason for this is that this thesis's main interest is to investigate whether or not the patterns and findings hold in a different yet similar market, where market efficiency and profitable betting then sort of become second priorities, instead of the main driving force. However, they are still interesting, which is why this section consists of a presentation of the economic consequences of the statistically significant betting strategies.

8.1 Group I – Strategy 1, 2, 3 and 4

The first group of strategies consists of strategies (1) through (4). In section 6.0 it is argued that the strategies incorporate the representativeness heuristic, particularly base rate neglect, and availability bias. In addition, it was explained how the strategies could also be regarded as resembling post earnings announcement effect in financial markets, which was that they also measure surprisingly positive and negative results and then act upon them. Results are shown in table 1 and 2. As is the case for all the strategies, the findings have been split in two 5 year periods and a 10 year period, in order to increase the robustness. One of the more interesting aspects of this and behavioral finance in general is that anomalies, as discussed in paragraph 5.6, come and go. Even though the sample period is relatively short, one may detect a significant strategy in one 5 year period, which then is insignificant in another. However one should be skeptical, before concluding that the market has picked up the anomaly, as a 5 year period in this context is a short time period.

Table 1: *Strategy 1 and 2*; Strategy 1 is to bet against the teams that won their previous game by a large margin (more than 14.67 points and 19.67 points). Strategy 2 is to bet on the teams that lost their previous game by a large margin (more than -14.67 points and -19.67 points). “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate. “ σ ” is the calculated sigma value. “z” is the z-value and “p” is the p-value. Values for “rate”, “ σ ” and “z” have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	Strategy 1			Strategy 1			Strategy 2			Strategy 2		
	margin > 14.67			margin > 19.67			margin < -14.67			margin < -19.67		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	63	35	0.556	30	16	0.533	63	32	0.508	30	13	0.433
96/97	70	35	0.500	39	16	0.410	70	39	0.557	39	22	0.564
97/98	68	35	0.515	45	20	0.444	67	33	0.493	45	21	0.467
98/99	65	34	0.523	48	26	0.542	65	35	0.539	48	28	0.583
99/00	73	33	0.452	42	19	0.452	74	31	0.419	42	18	0.429
95/00	339	172	0.507	204	97	0.476	339	170	0.502	204	102	0.500
00/01	72	27	0.375	45	18	0.400	71	36	0.507	44	16	0.364
01/02	58	35	0.603	41	23	0.561	58	27	0.466	41	22	0.537
02/03	69	29	0.420	41	19	0.463	69	39	0.565	41	22	0.537
03/04	77	40	0.520	53	25	0.472	77	36	0.468	53	27	0.509
04/05	68	33	0.485	48	23	0.479	68	36	0.529	48	25	0.521
00/05	344	164	0.477	228	108	0.474	343	174	0.507	227	112	0.493
95/05	683	336	0.492	432	205	0.475	682	344	0.504	431	214	0.497
95/00	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	P
	9.20	-0.61	0.728	7.13	-1.38	0.916	9.20	-0.82	0.795	7.13	-0.68	0.752
00/05	σ	z	P	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	Z	P	
	9.26	-1.75	0.96	7.54	-1.52	0.935	9.25	-0.61	0.73	7.52	-0.92	0.82
95/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	P	σ	Z	P
	13.1	-1.67	0.952	10.4	-2.05	0.98	13.0	-1.01	0.845	10.4	-1.13	0.872

In the above table 1, it is shown that teams that won by more than 14.67 points (in reality 14 points, since points move in ticks of 1) in a given week failed to cover the spread 336 times out of 683 in their next game, during the 1995/96 to 2004/05 seasons. Recall that strategy (1) was to bet against teams that won by a large margin in their previous game. This is the equivalent of betting that the other team covers and thus the big win team fails to cover. Following the first part of strategy (1) would have yielded a winning rate of approximately 49.2%(49.195%) for the 10 year period. This is not a profitable strategy, because a winning rate of 52.38% is needed. The p-value of 0.952 reveals that the H_0 hypothesis is far from being rejected. This means that the winning rate is far from being significantly higher than the 52.38%, including the vigorish, which is required to break even. Also recall that strategy (2) was to bet on

teams that lost big in their previous game and then, due to the big loss, the betting public would bet heavily on the other team. Results from table 1 show that neither strategy (1) nor strategy (2) are close to being significant for any of the two 5 year periods or for the 10 year period. Looking by year, table 1 shows that there are 13 out of 40 seasons where the winning rate surpasses 52.38% and that the highest rate is approximately 60.3%(60.345%) for strategy (1) margin > 14.67 points 2001/02 season³³. This is not very useful, since the winning seasons are scattered and sporadic. With the above evidence, it cannot be concluded that the anomaly, tested in this way, exist in the NFL betting market, let alone that the market is inefficient or that these are profitable betting strategies.

Perhaps the reason for not really finding anything, following strategies (1) and (2), is that data is not extreme or surprising enough. Imagine a team winning by 15 in their previous game. This would lead to a wager, following the above relevant strategy. However, if the team was a 15 point favorite to begin with, then a win of this margin is not that surprising or extreme. Strategies (3) and (4) dictate the same as (1) and (2) except that a large margin is against the line. So, from the above, the team should have won by more than $15 + 14.67 = 29.67$ points, in order to result in a wager in their next game using strategy (3) with the same margin as strategy (1).

Results are shown in table 2. 18 out of 40 season results produce a winning rate of 52.38% or higher. 10 of those 18 are found under positive outstanding performances, where 4 of those 10 are clustered. This makes strategy (3), bet against teams that covered the spread by more than 18.36 points, the most interesting. It is able to generate a winning rate of 55.1% for the first 5 year period. As a result, if a bettor had followed strategy (3) in that period, he would have earned a positive return, since the winning rate exceeds 52.38%. Nevertheless, the strategy is not able to pass the test of significance, due to the small sample size. In fact, none of the strategies are able to reject the H_0 hypothesis for any of the periods. Thus, the conclusion is that surprisingly positive or negative results in a previous game do not lead to an overreaction by bettors.

³³ The σ , t- and p-values for that particular year are 3.803570228, 1.21454 and 0.118 respectively using the t-distribution. Not enough to reject the H_0 hypothesis.

Table 2: *Strategy 3 and 4*: Strategy 3 is to bet against the teams that covered the spread by a large margin in the previous game (more than 13.24 points and 18.24 points). Strategy 4 is to bet on the teams that failed to cover the spread by a large margin in the previous game (more than -13.24 and 18.24). “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate. “ σ ” is the calculated sigma value. “z” is the z-value and “p” is the p-value. Values for “rate”, “ σ ” and “z” have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	Strategy 3			Strategy 3			Strategy 4			Strategy 4		
	margin > 13.24			margin > 18.24			margin < -13.24			margin < -18.24		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	64	36	0.563	30	20	0.667	63	34	0.538	30	14	0.467
96/97	70	39	0.557	36	20	0.556	70	41	0.586	36	20	0.556
97/98	68	34	0.500	38	21	0.553	67	33	0.493	38	17	0.447
98/99	61	33	0.541	35	20	0.571	61	33	0.541	35	20	0.571
99/00	71	36	0.507	39	17	0.436	71	32	0.451	39	15	0.385
95/00	334	178	0.533	178	98	0.551	332	173	0.521	178	86	0.483
00/01	75	26	0.347	44	14	0.318	72	36	0.500	40	18	0.450
01/02	69	38	0.551	34	18	0.529	69	33	0.478	34	16	0.471
02/03	78	34	0.436	39	16	0.410	78	45	0.577	39	21	0.539
03/04	75	43	0.573	46	23	0.500	75	36	0.480	46	22	0.478
04/05	73	34	0.466	42	20	0.476	73	34	0.466	42	22	0.524
00/05	370	175	0.473	205	91	0.444	367	184	0.501	201	99	0.493
95/05	704	353	0.501	383	189	0.494	699	357	0.511	379	185	0.488
95/00	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	9.13	0.33	0.369	6.66	0.71	0.237	9.10	-0.10	0.539	6.66	-1.09	0.861
00/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	9.61	-1.96	0.975	7.15	-2.29	0.989	9.57	-0.86	0.805	7.08	-0.89	0.813
95/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	13.3	-1.19	0.883	9.77	-1.19	0.883	13.2	-0.69	0.755	9.72	-1.39	0.918

A summary of strategies (1) through (4) yields results that do not resemble the post earnings announcement effect and market inefficiency. None of the p-values were below the 0.05 level, which is required to accept the H_1 hypothesis that a strategy is significantly profitable.

Even if the data is “reasonably” manipulated, which of course is an activity one should never indulge in, it is not possible to create a significant profitable betting strategy. By “reasonably” it is meant that the manipulations should not be too unrealistic. This thesis has tried to manipulate the data, not for the purpose of rejecting the H_0 hypothesis, but rather to show that it is difficult to obtain a significant result, even if such unorthodox methods are used. For instance, one could exclude the

1999/00 season under (3) margin bigger than 18.36 points. This would leave $178 - 39 = 139$ bets, 81 covers and a winning rate of 58.27%. The sigma, z- and p-values would then be 5.88231045, 1.39122 and 0.082 respectively. So even with a winning rate of this level and fairly many bets, it is still not enough to reject the H_0 hypothesis. One could also manipulate the data by changing the definition of a large margin. For instance, instead of using > 18.36 points, 17.86 or 17.36 points could be used in order to increase the number of bets. Of course, one would also need the winning rate to either increase or at least stay at the same level. This type of manipulation has not been conducted, but instead the thesis has made calculations for intervals instead of larger than definitions. Table 2 shows that strategy (4), < -13.24 points for all time periods perform better than < -18.24 points. Since < -18.24 points also is included in < -13.24 points, an exclusion of < -18.24 results in higher winning rates. Subtracting < -18.24 results from < -13.24 results will create an interval between the two numbers. Bets, covers and rates for the 1995/00, 2000/05 and 1995/05 periods as well as sigma, z- and p-values are shown in table 3. H_0 cannot be rejected for any of the periods.

Table 3: Example of data manipulation. Bet on teams that lost their previous game in an interval of -13.24 points to -18.24 points. "Bets" refers to number of wagers. "Cover" refers to number of bets that covered the spread. "Rate" is the winning rate

	-18.24<margin<-13.24					
year	bets	cover	rate	sigma	z-value	p-value
95/00	154	87	0.5649	6.197804	1.022104	0.153
00/05	166	85	0.5120	6.434747	-0.30317	0.619
95/05	320	172	0.5375	8.934133	0.490702	0.312

The two examples, first of all, illustrate that it is not easy to reject the H_0 hypothesis, even if the data is "reasonably" manipulated. Secondly, the examples also help in giving an indication of what is actually needed to be able to reject the H_0 hypothesis. The first manipulated example yielded a 0.082 p-value with 139 bets and a winning rate of 58.27%. The second example is able to generate a p-value of 0.153 with 154 bets and a winning rate of 0.5649. So without specific calculations, it can be estimated that a winning rate of approximately 60% is needed for a bet-level of 150, if the H_0 hypothesis should be rejected. The winning rate needed, of course declines, as the number of bets goes up.

It can be argued, despite insignificance, that strategies (3) and (4) do a better job than (1) and (2), which could be expected, since the data used for strategies (3) and (4) are

more extreme, surprising or outstanding, if you will. The reason for the better job is that the p-values, in general, are a little lower. Furthermore, strategy (3) is able to generate two 5 year periods with positive returns. It should be kept in mind, though, that the two positive return strategies are not independent of each other.

8.2 Group II – Strategy 5, 6, 7 and 8

The second group of strategies counts strategies (5) through (8). Paragraph 6.3 outlines how sample size neglect is integrated into the strategies. The same section also discusses how the strategies can be related to Barberis, Shleifer and Vishny (1998) findings regarding mean reverting- vs. trend regimes and ultimately long term reversal effect in financial markets. Recall, that the strategies capture trend chasing in several ways. Strategies (5) and (6) pick out teams that won or lost their previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games and then respectively wager against or on these teams. Strategies (7) and (8) do the same except that they measure won or lost against the spread and only count 3-, 4-, 5 or more games³⁴. So, in total, trend chasing is measured in four ways – as a result of actual game scores, as performance against the line, as a distinction between positive and negative performances and finally different streak lengths are used to increase the strength of the information signals, which might cause overreaction.

³⁴ The reason for not including 6 or more games against the spread, is that the sample becomes very small. Each time a game is added to the streak, like for instance from 5 to 6, the sample is roughly bisected. The thesis would then end up having very few observations, which damages the validity.

Table 4: *Strategy 5*; Bet against the teams that won the previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games in the row. “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to the number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate. “ σ ” is the calculated sigma value. “z” is the z-value, “t” is the t-value and “p” is the p-value. Values for “rate”, “ σ ” and “z” have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	won 3 or more games			won 4 or more games			won 5 or more games			won 6 or more games		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	57	34	0.596	28	18	0.643	13	7	0.538	7	4	0.571
96/97	58	35	0.603	24	16	0.667	10	5	0.500	6	4	0.667
97/98	54	28	0.519	32	18	0.563	19	10	0.526	11	7	0.636
98/99	60	27	0.450	34	15	0.441	20	8	0.400	13	4	0.308
99/00	65	37	0.569	35	20	0.571	21	14	0.667	13	10	0.769
95/00	294	161	0.548	153	87	0.569	83	44	0.530	50	29	0.580
00/01	65	31	0.477	37	20	0.541	20	10	0.500	11	7	0.636
01/02	45	25	0.556	20	8	0.400	10	6	0.600	2	2	1.000
02/03	55	31	0.564	25	14	0.560	10	7	0.700	3	2	0.667
03/04	59	20	0.339	42	16	0.381	28	10	0.357	19	5	0.263
04/05	73	37	0.507	48	27	0.563	30	17	0.567	20	13	0.650
00/05	297	144	0.485	172	85	0.494	98	50	0.510	55	29	0.527
95/05	591	305	0.516	325	172	0.529	181	94	0.519	105	58	0.552
95/00	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	t	p
	8.56	0.82	0.207	6.18	1.11	0.156	4.55	0.12	0.455	3.53	0.80	0.217
00/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	t	p
	8.61	-1.34	0.911	6.55	-0.78	0.782	4.94	-0.27	0.607	3.70	0.05	0.21
95/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	12.1	-0.38	0.647	9.00	0.20	0.422	6.72	-0.12	0.548	5.12	0.59	0.279

Table 4 shows results for strategy (5). For instance, it can be seen that following strategy (5), won 3 or more games, for the first 5 year period would have resulted in 294 bets, which covered the spread 161 times and thus yielding a winning rate of approximately 54.8%(54.762%). Using the strategy for that particular period, would have been profitable, because the winning rate exceeds the required 52.38%. However 54.8% is not enough too reject the H_0 hypothesis, due to the calculated p-value of 0.207. In fact, none of the p-values are below the 0.05 level that is required for accepting the H_1 hypothesis. It can then be concluded that the amount of money that bettors place is not sufficient enough to cause a significant deviation in the spread, meaning that the betting public does not overreact by overbetting past winners. Furthermore, table 4 does not provide a clear picture of what happens to bettors' behavior, when a team's winning streak is increased. One could expect that the p-

values decrease (the thesis does not need significance to detect this) as information signal grows stronger, because, with an increase of signal strength, more bettors will bet on the streak teams, due to representativeness bias. Recall, the discussion in paragraph 4.2 regarding weight and strength of information. If information is high in strength, that is when signals correlate, it leads to base- and sample size neglect. In contrast, high in weight information is uncorrelated signals, which leads to conservatism, because data does not fit the underlying model. Instead, the p-values fluctuates between streak lengths, thus it cannot be concluded that bettors chase a positive trend as the trend grows stronger.

Strategy (6) also measures trend chasing. The difference between the two is that (5) determines whether bettors overbuy past winners, while (6) determines whether bettors persistently believe past losers will continue to deliver a poor performance.

Table 5: *Strategy 6*; Bet on the teams that lost the previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games in a row. “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate. “ σ ” is the calculated sigma value. “z” is the z-value, “t” is the t-value and “p” is the p-value. Values for “rate”, “ σ ”, “t” and “z” have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	lost 3 or more games			lost 4 or more games			lost 5 or more games			lost 6 or more games		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	51	31	0.608	21	14	0.667	9	5	0.556	3	2	0.667
96/97	57	33	0.579	29	17	0.586	16	12	0.750	9	8	0.889
97/98	55	28	0.509	32	15	0.469	20	9	0.450	13	8	0.615
98/99	57	30	0.526	30	15	0.500	15	8	0.533	8	4	0.500
99/00	60	33	0.550	30	17	0.567	16	10	0.625	8	6	0.750
95/00	280	155	0.554	142	78	0.549	76	44	0.579	41	28	0.683
00/01	68	31	0.456	39	20	0.513	21	12	0.571	11	8	0.727
01/02	59	30	0.508	38	20	0.526	25	14	0.560	18	10	0.556
02/03	62	31	0.500	34	20	0.588	19	10	0.526	12	7	0.583
03/04	54	29	0.537	26	11	0.423	14	8	0.571	6	3	0.500
04/05	66	35	0.530	34	20	0.588	19	12	0.632	11	9	0.818
00/05	309	156	0.505	171	91	0.532	98	56	0.571	58	37	0.638
95/05	589	311	0.528	313	169	0.540	174	100	0.575	99	65	0.657
95/00	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	t	p
	8.36	1.00	0.159	5.95	0.61	0.271	4.35	0.96	0.174	3.20	2.04	0.024
00/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	t	p
	8.78	-0.67	0.748	6.53	0.22	0.413	4.94	0.94	0.178	3.80	1.74	0.045
95/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p
	12.1	0.20	0.419	8.84	0.57	0.284	6.59	1.34	0.09	4.97	2.65	0.004

Results for strategy (6) are shown in table 5. The results are very interesting for a number of reasons. First of all, the winning rates are relatively high, which yield low p-values. The H_0 hypothesis, that the strategy is not able to generate a winning rate significantly higher than 52.38%, can actually be rejected for 6 or more losses. Since the alternative hypothesis is accepted, one can conclude that enough money is wagered on one side to drive the spread far enough away from its fundamental value. The NFL betting market is therefore inefficient and betting on teams who lost their previous 6 or more games is a profitable betting strategy. The thesis can also conclude that bettors, like other people, are trend chasers and believe in the hot hand (or not so hot, if you will), because they display a behavior of avoiding the losers. What also is interesting, is that as bettors receive stronger and stronger information signals (p-values decrease as streaks increase), they collectively become more and more convinced of the losing teams' persistently poor performances. The statistical significant strategy is later subject for an economic analysis.

A comparison between the two strategies shows asymmetry in the results. The initial idea of trend chasing or hot hand is not present, when teams are on a winning streak, but is present, when teams are on a losing streak. Bettors have stronger beliefs, when it comes to losing than winning. This might seem a little peculiar, but when considering the findings of DeBondt and Thaler (1985), it makes sense. DeBondt and Thaler found that prior losers outperformed prior winners by 8% on an annual basis. The thesis findings can be regarded as reminiscent of DeBondt and Thaler findings, because the empirical findings in the thesis also show that past losers generate a higher return, than past winners.

Table 6: *Strategy 7*; Bet against the teams that covered the spread in the previous 3-, 4-, 5 or more games in a row. “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate. Values for “sigma”, “t” and “z” have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	won 3 or more against spread			won 4 or more against spread			won 5 or more against spread		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	40	25	0.6250	14	9	0.6429	4	3	0.7500
96/97	55	28	0.5091	26	16	0.6154	9	6	0.6667
97/98	47	25	0.5319	20	15	0.7500	4	2	0.5000
98/99	37	23	0.6216	12	9	0.7500	2	1	0.5000
99/00	55	25	0.4545	27	14	0.5185	12	5	0.4167
95/00	234	126	0.5385	99	63	0.6364	31	17	0.5484
00/01	55	29	0.5273	24	14	0.5833	10	6	0.6000
01/02	38	24	0.6316	11	6	0.5455	5	3	0.6000
02/03	52	27	0.5192	23	13	0.5652	9	6	0.6667
03/04	52	21	0.4038	29	13	0.4483	15	7	0.4667
04/05	61	26	0.4262	33	13	0.3939	19	7	0.3684
00/05	258	127	0.4922	120	59	0.4917	58	29	0.5000
95/05	492	253	0.5142	219	122	0.5571	89	46	0.5169
95/00	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
	7.640	0.449	0.327	4.969	2.243	0.015	2.781	0.274	0.393
00/05	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
	8.022	-1.015	0.845	5.471	-0.705	0.759	3.804	-0.363	0.642
95/05	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
	11.08	-0.425	0.665	7.391	0.986	0.162	4.712	-0.131	0.552

Table 6 shows results for strategy (7). The most interesting in these results are won 4 or more against the spread columns. The thesis is able to reject the H_0 hypothesis for the first 5 year period, but not for the second and for all the seasons pooled. The author is skeptical, when it comes to the significant 5 year period for a number of reasons. It is only a 5 year period and not for the pooled seasons. In the beginning of the current section, the thesis explained that one should be skeptical, when such findings occur, because of the relatively short time span. Furthermore, one also needs to consider that wins of 3-, 4-, 5 or more against the spread are highly dependent strategies. This is a cause for concern, because the thesis only detects one significant result for the exact same time span and moreover, it is 4 or more, which is the one in the middle. Due to the above, the author regards the significant result as a sort of aberration and therefore does not make much of it. As was the case for strategy (5), there is no trend in winning rate and p-values as streak lengths increase, which is why

the thesis can conclude that trend chasing behavior does not grow stronger as information signals increase in strength.

Table 7: *Strategy 8*; Bet on the teams that failed to cover the spread in the previous 3-, 4-, 5 or more games in a row. "Bets" refers to number of wagers. "Cover" refers to number of bets that covered the spread. "Rate" is the winning rate. Values for "sigma", "t" and "z" have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	lost 3 or more against the spread			lost 4 or more against the spread			lost 5 or more against the spread		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	42	24	0.5714	17	12	0.7059	4	1	0.2500
96/97	48	24	0.5000	23	9	0.3913	13	6	0.4615
97/98	47	25	0.5319	19	7	0.3684	10	4	0.4000
98/99	44	21	0.4773	20	12	0.6000	7	3	0.4286
99/00	54	21	0.3889	30	11	0.3667	17	8	0.4706
95/00	235	115	0.4894	109	51	0.4679	51	22	0.4314
00/01	56	28	0.5000	26	14	0.5385	12	7	0.5833
01/02	36	21	0.5833	12	6	0.5000	5	2	0.4000
02/03	53	24	0.4528	28	13	0.4643	14	7	0.5000
03/04	51	23	0.4510	27	11	0.4074	15	6	0.4000
04/05	56	28	0.5000	25	14	0.5600	10	7	0.7000
00/05	252	124	0.4921	118	58	0.4915	56	29	0.5179
95/05	487	239	0.4908	227	109	0.4802	107	51	0.4766
95/00	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
	7.656	-1.057	0.855	5.214	-1.169	0.879	3.567	-1.322	0.907
00/05	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
	7.928	-1.009	0.843	5.425	-0.702	0.759	3.737	-0.089	0.536
95/05	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
	11.02	-1.460	0.928	7.525	-1.316	0.906	5.166	-0.977	0.836

Table 7 shows that bettors do not display the same behavior, when measuring failed to cover the spread for a number of games in a row, as they do, when teams have lost a number of games in a row. This is so, because strategy (8) results in low winning rates and high p-values opposite strategy (6). Consequently, it can be concluded that bettors are not trend chasers or believe in the hot hand, when measured against the spread. The attentive reader may have noticed that the winning rates are almost exclusively below 50%. This raises an interesting question, which will be analyzed below.

In the above, the thesis has only emphasized trend chasing and neglected, what Barberis, Shleifer and Vishny (1998) refer to as, mean-reverting. One could easily imagine that bettors believe that a team cannot win or lose continuously and therefore

place counter bets, when a given team wins or loses enough games. This is especially the case, when measured against the spread, because the spread is the accumulated expectation of the public, regarding the differential of scores in a game. In paragraph 4.1, the gambler's fallacy is explained. Gambler's fallacy deals with this kind of behavior. Recall the coin toss experiment and Clotfelter and Cook's (1993) examination of how individuals avoid a number just drawn in the lottery. Even though the probabilities of success or failure in sports are not constant, which is the case when tossing a coin or playing the lottery, it is still worthwhile to investigate whether or not bettors might display this type of behavior. Strategies (5) to (8) do this implicitly. The strategies register³⁵ whenever a team has won or lost a series of games or covered or failed to cover a number of times in a row, so one already knows whenever a sequence, in this case won or lost games, of the same outcome occurs. Strategies (5) and (7) also register, when the streak teams do not cover the subsequent bet³⁶. If bettors display mean-reverting behavior, then the winning rates of strategies (5) and (7) will be low. This happens, because the bettors overbet the opponent and when they do that, they shift the spread in favor of the team that has won/covered a number of times in a row, which then, due to the shift, covers the spread more often. This is the equivalent of the opponent not covering the spread and thus strategies (5) and (7) result in low win rates. A similar argumentation can be used for strategies (6) and (8). Bettors are convinced that a losing team will not continue to lose and at some point systematically begin to bet that the team will cover the spread. When enough bettors display this behavior and the line moves in favor of the opponent, then strategies (6) and (8) – “Bet on the teams that lost the previous 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or more games” and “Bet on the teams that failed to cover the spread in the previous 3-, 4-, 5 or more games” will yield low win rates. Since numbers are now in “reverse”, one should be interested in winning rates below $1 - 0.5238 = 0.4762$ or 47.62%. Furthermore, since the winning rate needed to be around 60% before, a rate of approximately 40% is what should capture one's attention, given fairly many bets. Looking at tables 4, 5, and 6 for strategies (5), (6) and (7) show no signs of mean reverting behavior. As stated above, table 7 mainly contains winning rates below 50%. This indicates that bettors under the given circumstances display mean reverting behavior. They believe that the team is able to cover the spread in their next game,

³⁵ See the “bets” columns in tables 4-7

³⁶ See the “cover” columns in tables 4 and 6

when they have failed to cover the spread 3-, 4-, 5 or more times. However the evidence is not strong, since the winning rates are close to 50%. The strategy that performs “best” is failed 5 or more times for the first 5 year period, which generates a winning rate of 43.14% ($100\% - 43.14\% = 56.86\%$) with only 51 bets, yielding a p-value of 0.265. This is not enough to conclude that bettors display mean reverting behavior, but one can detect that the tendency is there. That the tendency shows up, when measuring against the spread is not a surprise, because it is the accumulated expectation of the public. What the thesis finds interesting is that the tendency only occurs, when teams fail to cover the spread and not when they cover the spread.

8.3 Group III – Strategy 9 and 10

The third group of strategies includes strategies (9) and (10). In their own way, each strategy incorporates the bias known as the halo effect, which is the tendency to extend one positive characteristic of an object to the object’s other characteristics. From financial markets, strategies (9) and (10) replicate the fact that individuals invest too heavily in the company for which they work. Furthermore, the strategies replicate that, people do not diversify enough, neither among domestic securities nor between domestic- and foreign securities. As explained earlier, this was due to familiarity and ambiguity. The interpretation of the financial market findings, in a betting market, is that fans might also not diversify enough and therefore bet on teams they know and like. This can be exploited, by betting against teams with the largest fan-base. Strategy (9) investigates this, by stating that winning teams have more fans, thus bet against the previous years Super Bowl participants. Strategy (10) takes a different approach, by assuming that large city teams have more fans than small city team. Hence, when ever small cities play against large cities, bet on the small city teams.

Table 8: *Strategy 9 and 10*; Strategy 9 is, for the first 6 weeks of the new season, to bet against the teams that played in the Super Bowl the previous season. Strategy 10 is to bet on teams from a small city, when playing teams from large cities. “Bets” refers to number of wagers. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread. “Rate” is the winning rate.

	Strategy 9			Strategy 10		
	bet against Super Bowl teams			bet on small city vs. large city		
year	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	12	8	0.6667	20	10	0.5000
96/97	12	6	0.5000	24	15	0.6250
97/98	12	8	0.6667	26	14	0.5385
98/99	12	4	0.3333	19	8	0.4211
99/00	12	7	0.5833	25	12	0.4800
95/00	60	33	0.5500	114	59	0.5175
00/01	12	8	0.6667	23	8	0.3478
01/02	12	6	0.5000	25	12	0.4800
02/03	12	9	0.7500	18	8	0.4444
03/04	12	9	0.7500	17	9	0.5294
04/05	12	5	0.4167	20	9	0.4500
00/05	60	37	0.6167	103	46	0.4466
95/05	120	70	0.5833	217	105	0.4839
95/00	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
	3.868593	0.406349	0.356	5.332488	-0.13375	0.553
00/05	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
	3.868593	1.440317	0.081	5.068694	-1.56873	0.942
95/05	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
	5.471017	1.30579	0.0958	7.357111	-1.17772	0.881

From table 8, it can be seen that strategy (10) is not supportive of the halo effect and findings in financial markets. This, of course, is due to the low winning rates, which also lead to high p-values. Strategy (9), however, lends much more support to the halo effect and financial market findings. The winning rates, for both 5 year periods and the 10 year period, exceed the required 52.38%. This result in fairly low p-values, especially for the second 5 year period and for the whole period examined. The p-values actually come close to rejecting the H_0 hypothesis. The implications from this are that this thesis is almost able to conclude that the halo effect and financial market findings hold in the NFL sports betting market. Furthermore, the thesis could have concluded that the market to some degree is inefficient. A reason for not being able to reject the H_0 hypothesis could be that the NFL does not provide enough ambiguity and unfamiliarity. After all, there are only 32 teams, which compared to financial markets are not much.

8.4 Group IV – Strategy 11 and 12

The last group of strategies consists of strategies (11) and (12). Paragraph 6.6 discussed how (11) and (12) differ from the above strategies regarding efficiency. Furthermore, they were seen as resembling Daniel et. al's. work concerning overreaction. The unsophisticated betting public overbet the favorite due to overconfidence and asymmetric treatment of information/evidence. This increases the spread and might make it favorable to bet the underdog. Strategies (11) and (12) in addition, distinguish between home- and away underdogs as well as how big an underdog a given team is.

Table 9: *Strategy 11 and 12*; Strategy 11 is to bet on teams that are playing at their home field and are underdogs to a certain degree (underdog by more than 3.34 points and 6.84 points). Strategy 12 is to bet on teams that are playing away games and are underdogs to a certain degree. (underdog by more than -8.4 points and -10.4 points) "Bets" refers to number of wagers. "Cover" refers to number of bets that covered the spread. "Rate" is the winning rate. " σ " is the calculated sigma value. "z" is the z-value. "t" is the t-value and "p" is the p-value. Values for "rate", " σ ", "t" and "z" have been rounded, due to size, but all decimals have been used for various calculations. (see appendix F for table with all decimals)

	Strategy 11			Strategy 11			Strategy 12			Strategy 12		
	home-dog > 3.34			home-dog > 6.84			away-dog < -8.4			away-dog < -10.4		
year	bets	cover	Rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate	bets	cover	rate
95/96	48	29	0.604	21	15	0.714	42	25	0.595	24	15	0.625
96/97	39	26	0.667	16	9	0.563	41	18	0.439	19	8	0.421
97/98	36	22	0.611	12	9	0.750	33	18	0.545	17	8	0.471
98/99	44	23	0.523	20	12	0.600	36	16	0.444	27	14	0.519
99/00	41	20	0.488	15	7	0.467	40	22	0.550	17	8	0.471
95/00	208	120	0.577	84	52	0.619	192	99	0.516	104	53	0.510
00/01	46	24	0.522	27	16	0.593	38	21	0.553	23	9	0.391
01/02	41	25	0.610	15	10	0.667	35	19	0.543	16	9	0.563
02/03	35	21	0.600	16	10	0.625	32	17	0.531	13	8	0.615
03/04	42	22	0.524	12	10	0.833	31	15	0.484	17	10	0.588
04/05	41	16	0.390	20	9	0.450	33	21	0.636	14	9	0.643
00/05	205	108	0.527	90	55	0.611	169	93	0.550	83	45	0.542
95/05	413	228	0.552	174	107	0.615	361	192	0.532	187	98	0.524
95/00	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	7.20	1.53	0.0625	4.58	1.75	0.043	6.92	-0.23	0.59	5.09	-0.29	0.614
00/05	σ	z	p	σ	t	p	σ	z	p	σ	t	p
	7.15	0.09	0.465	4.74	1.66	0.0504	6.49	0.69	0.245	4.55	0.34	0.37
95/05	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p	σ	z	p
	10.1	1.15	0.125	6.59	2.41	0.008	9.49	0.31	0.38	6.83	0.01	0.497

Direct your attention to strategy (12). Table 9 shows that this strategy is able to come up with winning rates that exceed 52.38%, meaning that if one had followed the strategy for the appropriate periods, one would have been profitable. However, the relatively low winning rates combined with the actual number of bets in each period are not enough to reject the H_0 hypothesis. Strategy (12), therefore, does not offer sufficient support to overreaction, but the 10 year period numbers indicate the strategy is on to something. Table 9 also shows that, compared against other periods, away underdog < -8.4 points performs better than away underdog < -10.4 points. The thesis has, under strategy (1) – (4), shown that under such circumstances higher winning rates can be achieved, by betting in the interval between the two numbers. However, in this particular case, this would not change much, as the winning rates are close. Furthermore, as stated above, one should not manipulate the data in this way, so it merely serves as an observation.

In order to be more complete, the thesis has also tested the favorite vs. underdog hypothesis, when the home-team is the underdog. This enables the thesis to detect whether there is a difference in betting patterns, when the underdogs play at home or away. As argued in paragraph 6.6, bettors may, in addition to all the other variables, have a hard time assessing the “value” of the home-field. Even though strategies (11) and (12) do not provide any explicit insights into how home-field influences bettors, they still drop a hint, if differences in betting patterns are revealed. Table 9 clearly shows that differences in betting patterns exist, which tell us that the “valuation” of home-field advantage is not consistent, but not what causes this inconsistency. Further research of what causes this could be interesting, but the thesis desists from doing this. Strategy (11) generates winning rates above 52.38% for all the periods. Especially home underdog > 6.84 points is interesting, because it produces winning rates above 61%. This makes the thesis able to reject the H_0 hypothesis, that the strategy generates a winning rate equal to or below 52.38%. Instead the alternative hypothesis, the strategy generates a winning rate higher than 52.38%, is accepted, for the first 5 year period, the 10 year period and almost for the second 5 year period. The p-value for the 10 year period is calculated to be 0.008. This is far below the pre-specified significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and even below $\alpha = 0.01$. Because of the low p-value, chances of committing a type I error are very small, which makes the

conclusions strong. Since the thesis is able to reject the H_0 hypothesis, it can be concluded that bettors do overreact, when it comes to betting the NFL. Furthermore, inefficiency is detected and of course the thesis has a betting strategy that can generate a profit, which is subject for further analysis.

8.5 Further comments

Before turning to the profit opportunities of the betting strategies, the thesis would like to put forward some comments regarding the above findings. An issue is the intra- and interdependence between some of the strategies. 10 of the 12 strategies contain sub-strategies, because the thesis would like to investigate what happens to bettors' behavior as the received information signal gets more extreme. The intra dependences within these 10 strategies are naturally highly dependent. However, this is not a major cause of concern, because the ones that perform best, for the two significant strategies, are the most extreme. Furthermore, when this is not the case, this thesis treats the result with a high level skepticism, for instance strategy (7) – covered the spread 4 or more times. A bigger issue is the interdependence between strategies. Betting on the same outcome of almost the same games, using two different strategies, should not lead to the conclusion that one has found two profitable strategies. The thesis faces this problem, since it contains numerous strategies. In the above analysis of the betting strategies, the thesis concluded that the strategies (6) and (11) are profitable. The question now is, how dependent are they? An immediate rational guess is that they are very dependent, because a team that has lost 6 or more games in a row, probably also is the underdog most of the time. This proves to hold, as the loser teams turn out to be the underdog 88 times out of the 99. Furthermore, the away games need to be eliminated, since the thesis only found home underdog significant. The loser teams play at home 45 times out of the 88. Finally, the loser teams also need to be more than 6.84 points underdogs. This happens 16 times and the bets cover the spread 12 times. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the dependence is small. Even if the 16 bets and 12 covers are eliminated from strategy (11), which makes the strategies independent, this thesis is still able to conclude that the strategy is significant. This will yield 158 bets, 95 covers, a winning rate of 60.13% and a p-value of 0.026. This thesis has not investigated the inter dependence

between other strategies. The reason for this being that they are insignificant and therefore not neither damaging to the market efficiency hypothesis nor are they supportive of behavioral finance and financial market findings in the NFL betting market.

In paragraph 5.6, the author pointed out that one should be aware of data-mining. That is, if one sorts data in enough different ways, one might get a significant result, due to statistical aberration. One should be especially skeptical, if hypotheses have been randomly generated, contrary to originating from some economic- or human behavioral pattern. If this is the case and one tests 100 hypotheses one can expect that 5, erroneously, will pass statistical test of significance, given an $\alpha = 0.05$ level. Thus one is committing 5 type I errors of falsely concluding that the hypotheses are significant, when in reality they are not. The thesis tests 12 hypotheses and given that they were randomly generated, one could expect that $12 * 0.05 = 0.6$ hypothesis will be significant, when in fact it is not. However, the hypotheses are not randomly generated, which minimizes the problem. Furthermore, the two strategies which are significant, are far below the level of 0.05(also when the strategies are made independent), which minimizes the problem further. The author therefore does not consider the chance of committing a type I error a problem.

8.6 Economic consequences

As stated in the introduction to section 8.0, the thesis will also present economic consequences of the statistical significant strategies. This is done, in order to give the reader a better understanding of a betting market. Often dollars and cents are better educational tools than statistical tests. The reason why it is even worth considering carrying out an economical analysis, has to do with how the strategies were created. The strategies are derivations from behavioral finance, which consists of established psychological patterns that are used as logical explanations for the anomalies and effects found in financial markets. Since the strategies are based on already documented patterns and findings, it makes sense to carry out an illustrative economic analysis on the same data. Had the point of the thesis, instead been to come up with a profitable betting strategy, then showing the economic consequences would not have made as much sense. The reason for this is that the author can keep sorting the data in

different ways until something turns up. He does not need to take behavioral finance into consideration, before he starts working with the data sample. Had the approach of the thesis been the one just described, then the “artificial” profitable strategies would need to be tested in a different data sample, in order to be able to conclude that they are profitable. The author has decided not to place the same bets twice, so the 16 bets and 12 covers that figure in both strategies are omitted from strategy (11). For the nominal returns, the author has decided to wager \$ 10 on each bet, because this seems realistic for a leisure bettor.

Table 10: Economic consequences of strategies. “Bets” refer to number of bets. “Cover” refers to number of bets that covered the spread.

Strategy 6:						
year	bets	covers	\$ wagered	\$ won	\$ return	%return
95/96	3	2	30	38.2	8.2	27.33
96/97	9	8	90	152.8	62.8	69.78
97/98	13	8	130	152.8	22.8	17.54
98/99	8	4	80	76.4	-3.6	-4.50
99/00	8	6	80	114.6	34.6	43.25
00/01	11	8	110	152.8	42.8	38.91
01/02	18	10	180	191	11	6.11
02/03	12	7	120	133.7	13.7	11.42
03/04	6	3	60	57.3	-2.7	-4.50
04/05	11	9	110	171.9	61.9	56.27

Strategy 11:						
year	bets	covers	\$ wagered	\$ won	\$ return	%return
95/96	21	15	210	286.5	76.5	36.43
96/97	15	8	150	152.8	2.8	1.87
97/98	9	7	90	133.7	43.7	48.56
98/99	19	12	190	229.2	39.2	20.63
99/00	15	7	150	133.7	-16.3	-10.87
00/01	23	13	230	248.3	18.3	7.96
01/02	12	7	120	133.7	13.7	11.42
02/03	15	9	150	171.9	21.9	14.60
03/04	11	9	110	171.9	61.9	56.27
04/05	18	8	180	152.8	-27.2	-15.11

Strategy 6 and 11 combined:						
year	bets	covers	\$ wagered	\$ won	\$ return	%return
95/96	24	17	240	324.7	84.7	35.29
96/97	24	16	240	305.6	65.6	27.33
97/98	22	15	220	286.5	66.5	30.23
98/99	27	16	270	305.6	35.6	13.19
99/00	23	13	230	248.3	18.3	7.96
00/01	34	21	340	401.1	61.1	17.97
01/02	30	17	300	324.7	24.7	8.23
02/03	27	16	270	305.6	35.6	13.19
03/04	17	12	170	229.2	59.2	34.82
04/05	29	17	290	324.7	34.7	11.97

Table 10 shows the economic consequences of the two strategies individually as well as betting them simultaneously. Using strategy (6) for the 1995/96 season, only 3 bets are placed of which 2 covers the spread. The bettor lays \$ 30 for the season and wins a total of \$ 38.2, leaving him a net return of \$ 8.2 and an impressive 27.33% rate of return. From table 10 it can be seen that the bettor only will be experiencing losing seasons two times, using either one of the two strategies. If he chooses to bet the two strategies simultaneously, he will not experience losing seasons, since losing seasons do not correlate and winnings exceeds losing for the seasons in question. Wagering \$ 10 per bet does not produce enormous net returns. The accumulated amounts wagered, won and net returns for the strategies combined, during the 10 season period, are \$ 2570, \$ 3056 and \$ 486 respectively. However, relative returns are high. If one has a large enough bankroll or is able to borrow enough money, at a low rate, one could make a living betting on the NFL, but do not quit your day job just yet. In paragraph 5.6 it was argued that anomalies come and go. A number of academics argue that anomalies such as January effect, small firm anomaly and grouping by book-to-market have vanished, because a sufficient number of investors have exploited the mispricings. If, in the future, more bettors realize the profit opportunities of the two strategies, then they will revise how they place bets. More bettors will begin to wager on teams that have lost 6 or more games in row and on teams that are home field underdogs by 7 points or more. If this happens, the average spread will decrease for those games, due to the balanced book principle. When this happens, less of the teams in question will cover, winning rates will be lower and profit opportunities diminish. Hence, the mispricings are been exploited. Whether or not this will happen only time can tell. One thing is for certain, the NFL betting market has not been efficient in the efficient market hypothesis sense, during the past ten years.

9.0 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to apply finance to the betting markets. More specifically, the relatively new paradigm of behavioral finance was used as a frame for formulating hypotheses i.e. betting strategies, which were tested empirically in the National Football League betting market. The point of this was to investigate whether some of the findings in financial markets might also be found in a different, yet sufficiently similar market. The tests could also be perceived as tests of whether or not the NFL betting market is efficient and furthermore determine, if a given strategy is able to generate a profitable return.

The point of origin was an explanation of three of the cornerstones in traditional finance theory – the Efficient Market Hypothesis, the Capital Asset Pricing Model and Expected Utility Theory. Emphasis was put on explaining assumptions, since behavioral finance argue that markets and market participants do not work or act in accordance with these assumptions. Behavioral finance was also introduced and theoretical challenges to traditional finance were analysed

Subsequently, the author explained different features about the betting markets. Distinctions among the betting markets were analyzed in order to give the reader sufficient background information as to how these markets function. The author also explained how bookmakers determine prices in the market. It was established that bookmakers do not quote prices that are equivalent to their predictions of actual game outcomes, but instead quote prices that balances the books. A balanced book, in point spread markets, means that the total amount wagered on the outcome of the game is equally split between the two teams. This makes the bookmaker indifferent as to who will win the game. The bookmaker then just gains the commission that he charges bettors for taking their bets, which makes him risk averse, as is also often assumed in economic and financial models. The price that the bookmakers offer can, therefore, also be perceived as an expression of the accumulated expectations of the betting public.

The thesis also made a direct comparison between the financial- and the betting markets. This is essential, because the betting market needs to resemble financial markets in order for it to be suitable for conducting research, similar to those of

financial markets. It was concluded that the resemblance is sufficient, mainly because both markets consist of participants with heterogeneous beliefs who tries to profit as uncertainty is resolved over time. However, differences are also present. One of the main differences was that the betting markets receive an objective signal about the fundamental value, while this is not the case for all the financial markets. The betting market can, therefore, be perceived as a sort of laboratory, where some the of difficulties you encounter in the financial markets are eliminated or diminished. The joint tests problem was an example of this. Another difference was that the purpose of bettors and investors differ. Betting is regarded as a leisure activity, while investors move wealth from the present to the future. However, the two can still be perceived similar, because both tries to maximize their financial utility, given the non-quantifiable utility that betting offers.

The thesis worked with behavioral finance in more detail. The point of interest was heuristics and the biases that they cause. The heuristics served as a foundation for the further analysis of financial markets findings and subsequently formulation of betting strategies using heuristics and financial markets findings. As stated, financial market findings, known as anomalies, were analyzed. They are characterized by the fact that they are empirical challenges to the traditional finance theory. Traditional finance has a hard time explaining the risk adjusted excess returns, which is why the anomalies are perceived as violations of the efficient market hypothesis. A number of academics, instead, use heuristics in explaining the anomalies and conclude that they do a satisfactory job. The author discussed 4 requirements that are needed in order for these models to do a satisfactory job of “catching” the anomalies. 1. Behaviors should stem from already established psychological patterns 2. The model becomes more credible as number of captured effects increases. 3. The model should be able to make predictions about the attributes of the markets. 4. Out-of-sample tests should be conducted. A discussion of potential problems regarding the actual detection of the anomalies was given. Fama and Ball address methodology issues. Problems arise because, in order to detect an anomaly, one needs a joint test of efficiency and a pricing model.

The thesis formulated 12 betting strategies based on the heuristic driven biases and the anomalies in financial markets. 10 of the 12 strategies contained sub-strategies in

order to investigate what happened to bettors' behavior as information signals got more extreme. Generally speaking, bettors displayed more bias, at least for the significant strategies, as signals got stronger, because most of the strategies containing sub-strategies turned out to have the highest winning rates and lowest p-values for the most extreme data.

The strategies were divided into 4 groups depending on the connection to behavioral finance. The first group, strategies 1 to 4, incorporated base rate neglect from the representativeness heuristic and availability bias. Furthermore, they resembled post earnings announcements effect in that they measured what happened to bettors' behavior, when they received somewhat surprising announcements in the form of large wins or losses. To make announcements more surprising large wins and losses were also measured against the accumulated expectation of the public (the spread). The thesis was not able to conclude that the post earnings announcements effect, tested in this way, exists in the NFL betting market.

Strategies 5 to 8, the second group, integrated sample size neglect and long term reversal effect. Strategy 5 and 6 proved to be, what can be regarded as reminiscent to long term reversal effect, since past games losers generated higher returns than past games winners. The thesis also established that bettors systematically avoid betting on past losers of 6 or more games in a row. This makes the strategy profitable, which also provides damaging evidence against an efficient betting market. Strategy 7 and 8, sequences of wins or losses against the spread, did not offer support for the integrated behavioral finance elements. However, strategy 8 came up with a tendency of mean reverting behavior, because when teams have lost a number of games in a row, against the spread, bettors started betting that they would cover the spread, which can be regarded as mean reverting behavior.

Strategies 9 and 10 replicated halo effect and findings, which show that investors do not diversify enough, due to unfamiliarity and ambiguity. This was done by assuming that bettors wager on teams they know and like. Hence, the thesis placed bets against teams with the potentially largest fan bases measured in two ways. Bettors' behavior did not deviate sufficiently from equilibrium to conclude that halo effect and financial market findings also are present in the NFL betting markets.

The fourth and last group of strategies tested efficiency in semi-strong form, since they allowed news between games to be incorporated into prices. Furthermore, the

strategies resemble Daniel, Hirshleifer and Subrahmanyam explanation regarding overreaction, which are built on the heuristics overconfidence and belief perseverance. Strategy 11 was concluded statistical significant, which means that bettors overreact. Bettors consistently overbet the heavy favored teams, when these are playing away games. As was the case for strategy 6, this is damaging evidence against the efficient market hypothesis in a similar yet different market setting.

The thesis ends with an explanation of how one should be careful with conclusions about market inefficiency. Researches have concluded that anomalies come and go and therefore, in the long run, are only transiently important. Intuitively, this is also the case for betting markets.

10.0 Bibliography

Alpert, M. and H. Raiffa, 1982: *A progress report on the training of probability assessors*, in Kahneman, D., P. Slovic and A. Tversky, eds., *Judgement under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 294-305

Avery, C. and J. Chevalier, 1999: *Identifying Investor Sentiment from Price Paths: The Case of Football Betting*, *The Journal of Business*, Vol. 72, No. 4, 493-521

Ball, R., 1995: *The Theory of Stock Market Efficiency: Accomplishments and Limitations*, *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 8, 4-17

Banz, R. W., 1981: *The relationship between return and the market value of common stocks*, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 14, 421-441

Barber, B. and T. Odean, 2001: *Boys will be boys: gender, overconfidence and common stock investment*, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 261-292

Barberis, N., A. Shleifer and R. Vishny, 1998: *A model of investor sentiment*, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 49, 307-343.

Barberis, N. and R. Thaler, 2003: *A survey of behavioural finance*, *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, Vol 1B, 1054-1116

Bem, D. J., 1965: *An experimental analysis of self-persuasion*, *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 1, 199-218

Bernard, V. L. and J. K. Thomas, 1989: *Post-earnings-announcement drift: Delayed price response or risk premium?*, *Journal of Accounting Research*, Supplement 27, 1-48

Brown, W. O., and R. D. Sauer, 1993: *Does the Basketball Market Believe in the Hot Hand? Comment*, *The American Economic Review*, Dec. 1993, 1377-1386

Camerer, C. F., 1989: *Does the Basketball Market Believe in the "Hot Hand"?*, The American Economic Review, Dec. 1989, 1257-1261

Chan, K., 1988: *On the contrarian investment strategy*, Journal of Business, 61, 147-163

Chan, L., N. Jegadeesh and J. Lakonishok, 1996: *Momentum strategies*, Journal of Finance, 51, 1681-1713

Chen, H. and V. Singal, 2004: *All things considered taxes drive the January effect*, Journal of Financial Research, Vol 27, Issue 3, 351-272

Chopra, N., J. Lakonishok and J. R. Ritter 1992: *Measuring abnormal performance: Do stocks overreact?*, Journal of Financial Economics, 31, 235-268

Ciccone, S. J., 2003: *Forecast dispersion and error versus size, book-to-market ratio and momentum: A comparison of anomalies from 1992 to 2001*, Journal of Asset Management, Vol. 3, Issue 4, 333-345

Coltfeiler, C. T. and P. J. Cook, 1993: *The "Gambler's Fallacy" in Lottery Play*, Management Science, Vol. 39, No. 12, 1521-1525

Daniel, K., D. Hirshleifer and A. Subrahmanyam, 1998: *Investor psychology and security market under- and overreaction*, Journal of Finance, 53, 1839-1885

Daniel, K., D. Hirshleifer and A. Subrahmanyam, 2001: *Overconfidence, arbitrage and equilibrium asset pricing*, Journal of Finance, 56, 921-965

DeBondt, W. and R. Thaler, 1985: *Does the Stock Market Overreact?*, Journal of Finance, 40, 793-808

Edwards, W., 1968: *Conservatism in human information processing*, In: Kleinmütz, B. (ed): *Formal Representation of Human Judgement*, Wiley New York

Einhorn, H. J., 1980: *Overconfidence in Judgement*, New Directions for Methodology of Social Behavioral Science 4, 1-16

Fama, E.F., 1970: *Efficient Capital Markets: A review of Theory and empirical Work*, Journal of Finance, 25, 383-417

Fama, E. F., 1998: *Market efficiency, long-term returns, and behavioural finance*, Journal of Financial Economics, Vol 49, 283-306

Fama, E. F. and J. D. MacBeth, 1973: *Risk, Return and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests*, Journal of Political Economy, Vol 81, Issue 3, 607-637

Fama, E. F. and K. R. French, 1992: *The cross-section of expected stock returns*, Journal of Finance, 47, 427-465

Fischhoff B., P. Slovic, and S. Lichtenstein, 1977: *Knowing With Certainty: The Appropriateness of Extreme Confidence*, Journal of Experimental Psychology, Human Perception and Performance, Vol. 3, 552-564

French, K., and J. Poterba (1991): *Investor diversification and international equity markets*, American Economic Review, 81, 222-226

Fuller, R. J., 1998: *Behavioral Finance and the Sources of Alpha*, Journal of Pension Plan Investing, Volume 2, No. 3

Gandar, J. M., R. A. Zuber, T. O'Brien and B. Russo, 1988: *Testing rationality in the point spread betting market*, Journal of Finance, 43, 995-1007

Gilovich, T., R. Vallone and A. Tversky, 1985: *The hot hand in basketball: On the misperception of random sequences*, Cognitive Psychology, 17, 295-324

Glickman, M., 1994: *The Concept of Information, Intractable Uncertainty, and the Current State of the Efficient Markets theory: A Post Keynesian view*, Journal of Post Keynesian Economics, a6, 325-349

Golec, J., and M. Tamarkin, 1991: *The degree of inefficiency in the football betting market*, Journal of Financial Economics, 30(2), 311-323

Graham, J.R. and C.R. Harvey, 2001: *The theory and practice of corporate finance: Evidence from the field*, Journal of Financial Economics, Vol 60, Issue 2/3, 187-243

Gray, P. K. and S. F. Gray, 1997: *Testing market efficiency: Evidence from the NFL sports betting market*, Journal of Finance, 52, 1725-1737

Griffin, D. and A. Tversky, 1992: *The weighing of evidence and the determinants of confidence*, Cognitive Psychology, 24, 411-435

Grinblatt, M. and T. Moskowitz, 1999: *The cross-section of expected returns and its relation to past returns*, Working Paper, Yale School of Management's Management Research Network

Gu, A. Y. and J. T. Simon, 2003: *Declining January Effect – Experience in the United Kingdom*, American Business Review, Vol. 21, Issue 2, 117-122

Hirshleifer, D., 2001: *Investor Psychology and Asset Pricing*, The Journal of Finance, Vol. LVI, No. 4, 1533-1597

Hong, H. and J. C. Stein, 1999: *A unified theory of underreaction, momentum trading and overreaction in asset markets*, Journal of Finance, 54, 2143-2184

Huberman, G., 2001: *Familiarity breeds investment*, Review of Financial Studies, 14, 659-680

Jegadeesh, N. and S. Titman, 1993: *Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency*, Journal of Finance, 48, 65-91

Jegadeesh, N. and S. Titman 2001: *Profitability of momentum strategies: an evaluation of alternative explanations*, Journal of Finance, 56, 699-720

Jensen, M.C., 1978: *Some Anomalous Evidence Regarding Market Efficiency*, Journal of Financial Economics, 6, 95-101

Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky, 1979: *Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk*, Econometrica, Volume 47, Issue 2, 263-292

Kuypers, T., 2000: *Information and efficiency: empirical study of a fixed odds betting market*, Applied Economics, 32, 1353-1363

Lee, C. M., and B. Swaminathan, 2000: *Price momentum and trading volume*, Journal of Finance, 55, 2017-2069

Levitt, S. D., 2004: *Why are gambling markets organised so differently from financial markets?*, The Economic Journal, 114, 223-246

Lord, C., L. Ross and M. Lepper, 1979: *Biased Assimilation and Attitude Polarization: The Effects of prior Theories on Subsequently considered Evidence*, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 2098-2109

Mendenhall, R. R., 2004: *Arbitrage Risk and Post-Earnings-Announcement Drift*, Journal of Business, Vol 77 Issue 4, 875-894

Merton, R., 1973: *An intertemporal capital asset pricing model*, Econometrica, 41, 867-888

Neumann, J. V. and O. Morgenstern, 1944: *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, Princeton University Press

Odean, T., 1998a: *Are Investors Reluctant to Realize Their Losses?*, Journal of Finance, 53, 1775-1798

Odean, T., 1998b: *Volume, Volatility, Price and Profit When All Trades Are Above Average*, Journal of Finance, 54(2), 10-18

Olsen, R., 1998: *Behavioral finance and its implications for stock price volatility*, Financial Analysts Journal, 54(2), 10-18

Roll, R., 1977: *A critique of the asset pricing theory's tests*, Journal of financial Economics, 4, 129-176

Rouwenhorst, K. G., 1998: *International momentum strategies*, Journal of Finance, 53, 267-284

Rouwenhorst, K. G., 1999: *Local return factors and turnover in emerging stock markets*, Journal of Finance, 54, 1439-1464

Sauer, R., V. Brajer, S. Ferris, and M. Marr, 1988: *Hold your bets: Another look at the efficiency of the gambling market for national football league games*, Journal of Political Economy, 96, 206-213

Savage, L.J., 1954: *Foundations of Statistics*, New York, Wiley

Schwert, G., W., 2001: *Anomalies and market efficiency*, In: Constantinides, G., M. Harris and R. Stulz, (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economic of Finance*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, Cap 17

Shefrin, H, 2002: *Beyond Greed and Fear*, Oxford University Press, New York, USA

Shefrin, H. and M. Statman, 2003: *The Contributions of Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky*, Journal of Behavioral Finance, Vol. 4, Issue 2, 54-58

Shleifer, A., 2000: *Inefficient markets: An introduction to behavioural finance*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Starmer, C., 2000: *Developments in Non-Expected Utility Theory: The Hunt for descriptive Theory of choice under Risk*, Journal of Economic Literature, Vol XXXVIII, 332-382

Taylor, S. E. and J. D. Brown, 1988: *An economic theory of self control*, Journal of Political Economy, 89(2), 292-410

Thaler, R. H., and W. T. Ziemba, 1988: *Anomalies: Parimutuel betting markets: racetracks and lotteries*, Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2(2), 161-174

Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman, 1973: *Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability*, Cognitive Psychology, 5, 207-232

Tversky, A. and D. Kahneman, 1974: *Judgement Under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*, Science, 185, 1124-1131

Woodland, L. and B. Woodland 1994: *Market efficiency and the favourite-longshot bias: The baseball betting market*, Journal of Finance, 49, 269-279

Woodland, L., and B. Woodland, 2001: *Market Efficiency and Profitable Wagering in the National Hockey League: Can Bettors Score on Longshots?*, Southern Economic Journal, 67(4), 983-995

Zuber, R. A., J. M. Gandar and B. D. Bowers, 1985: *Beating the spread: Testing the efficiency of the gambling market for National Football League games*, Journal of Political Economy, 93, 800-806

Overview of appendices

Appendix A: Scoring system of American football and sports betting terms

Appendix B: Determination of large margin

Appendix C: Participants in Super Bowls

Appendix D: Large and small NFL cities

Appendix E: Determination of the degree of underdog

Appendix F: Empirical results

Appendix G: Simulation of strategies

Appendix A: Scoring system of American football and sports betting terms¹

Opposite the European version of football, where a score equals 1 goal (point), American football scoring system contains several values. A fieldgoal equals 3 points. Touchdown equals 6 points with the option of gaining 1 or 2 points additionally. A safety equals 2 points.

Action - Any wager; The total amount bet, either from the bettor's point of view or that of the house. In baseball, placing a bet regardless who pitches.

ATS - "Against the spread," taking points rather than betting with the spread and laying points.

Beard - a friend or acquaintance who is used to place bets as to conceal the true identity of the real bettor.

Bet – Any wager.

Book - an establishment that accepts bets on the outcome of horse racing and sporting events.

Bookie - a person who accepts bets.

Buy (Points) - a player pays an additional price to receive half a point or more in his favor on a point spread game.

Chalk - The favorite.

Chalk Player - someone who usually only plays the favored teams, rarely betting on the underdogs.

Circled game - a game in which the betting action is reduced; usually occurs in added games, games with injuries, bad weather, propositions, or halves of games. These games cannot be included in parlays or teasers.

Cover - When the betted team wins by more than the required number of points.

Dime Line - a line where the juice is 10%.

Dog - the team perceived to be most likely to lose.

Dog Player - refers to one who mostly plays the underdog.

Double action - An "if bet" in sports betting that is processed if the precedent bet wins, ties or cancels.

Double Header – Two separate games played by the same teams on the same day.

¹ From www.2betdsi.com/glossary.aspx

Edge - A persons Advantage when it comes to sports betting.

Even Money - a bet whose odds are 1/1; a wager in which no vigorish or juice is laid.

Exotic - any wager other than a straight bet or parlay - also called a prop or proposition.

Exposure - The maximum amount of money a sports book stands to lose on a game.

Favorite - the team expected to win an event. The quoted odds reflect the extent to which the choice is favored.

Figure - the amount owed to or by a bookmaker

Future - odds are posted in advance on the winners of various major events including the Super Bowl, the World Series, the Stanley Cup, and the NBA Championship this is called a Future bet

Getting Down - making a bet.

Handicapper - one who studies, rates and wagers on sporting events and/or races.

Handicapping - the attempt to predict the outcome of sporting events.

Handle - the total amount of bets taken.

Hedging - A sports betting term that means placing wagers on the opposite side in order to cut losses or guarantee a minimum amount of winnings.

Holding Your Own - Neither winning or losing, just breaking even.

Hook - a half point added to football and basketball betting lines.

Hot game - a game which is drawing a lot of action on one side by knowledgeable handicappers.

Juice - The bookmaker's commission on a losing bet, also known as "vigorish."

Layoff - money bet by a house with another bookmaker to reduce its liability.

Limit - the maximum amount a bookmaker will allow you to bet before he changes the odds and/or the points.

Line - the current odds or point spread on a particular event.

Linemaker - in the sports betting industry this is the person who establishes the original and subsequent betting lines.

Lock - Easy winner, can not lose.

Longshot - a team or horse perceived to be unlikely to win.

Middle - to win both sides of the same contest in sports betting event. Wagering on the underdog at one point spread and the favorite at a different point spread and winning both sides.

Money line - odds expressed in terms of money. With money odds, whenever there is a minus (-) you lay that amount to win a hundred dollars, where there is a plus (+) you get that amount for every hundred dollars wagered.

Move the line - a player pays an additional price to receive half a point or more in his favor on a point spread game.

Newspaper Line - the betting line which quite often appears in the daily newspapers. The lines are only approximate and quite often totally inaccurate and misleading.

No action - A wager in sports betting in which no money is lost nor won.

Odds On Favorite - A horse, team, or individual so favored by the public that the odds are less than even.

Off the board - a game on which the bookmaker will not accept action.

Official Line - The line that the bookmaker uses for wagering purposes. The line which comes from Las Vegas is quite often referred to as the official line; however, the line that your bookie offers you is actually your "official line."

Outlaw Line - term for the earliest line in sports betting. This is an overnight line which only a handful of players are allowed to bet into.

Over - the "over" is a sports bet in which the bettor guesses that the combined point total of two teams will be above a specified total.

Overplay - An advantage for the bettor in which the price on a given wager is greater than the real probability of its success.

Parlay - a bet with two or more teams in which all teams must win or cover for the bettor to win and receive higher payouts

Pick 'em - When neither team is favored. Also called a "pick" in sports betting terms.

Points spread - The points spread - also called "the line" - is used as a margin to handicap the favorite team. The oddsmaker - also called the handicapper - "gives" points (or goals) to the underdog - for betting purposes only. The bettor must take either the favorite or the underdog. The favorite is always indicated by a minus sign (e.g. -8.5) and the underdog by a plus sign (e.g.+8.5). For betting purposes, the outcome of the game is determined by taking the actual game score and finding the difference between the scores of the two teams playing (called the points spread or just the "spread").

Price - Sports betting term for the odds or point spread.

Prop (Proposition) Bet - a special wager offered by the sports book on unique and various topics. These wagers can be on sporting events, politics, and even trial outcomes. The wagers use the money line format of pay off odds and might include who scores the first touchdown in the super bowl, who will win the next presidential election, or whether or not O. J. will be found guilty.

Puppy - The underdog

Push - When the contest ends with no winner or loser for wagering purposes.

Run down - all the lines for an specific date, sport, time, etc.

Runner - One who places bets for another when it comes to sports betting

Scouts - person(s) who waits for what he thinks is an unusually strong wager. A.K.A. Sports Player.

Sharp - a sophisticated or professional gambler.

Sides - the names of the two teams playing: the underdog and the favorite.

Single action - An "if bet" in sports gambling that is processed only if the precedent bet wins.

Spread - A spread in sports wagering is the predicted scoring differential between two opponents as quoted by a sports book. See "point spread."

Square - A novice when it comes to sports betting.

Steam - when a line starts to move rapidly. Most "steam games" do not necessarily reflect objective circumstances, but are games that a mass of bettors are drawn to for some reason.

Store - A bookie or sports betting establishment.

Straight bet - a wager on just one team or horse.

Taking the points - betting the underdog and its advantage in the point spread.

Taking the price - betting the underdog and accepting money odds.

Teaser - A teaser is a special type of parlay in sports betting in which you adjust the point spread or total of each individual play. The price of moving the point spread (teasing) is lower pay off odds winning wagers.

Ticket - A sports betting wager.

Tie - a wager in which no money is lost nor won because the teams' scores were equal to the number of points in the given line.

Total - The combined amount of runs, points or goals scored by both teams during the game, including the overtime.

Totals Bet - a proposition bet in which the bettor speculates that the total score by both teams in a game will be more or less than the line posted by the sports book.

Tout - Someone who sells their expertise on sports wagering.

Under - an under is a wager in which the bettor guesses that the total points scored by two teams will be under a certain figure.

Underdog - The team perceived to be most likely to lose. Also known as the "dog" .

Value - getting the best odds on a wagering proposition; the highest possible edge.

Vigorish - The bookmaker's commission on a losing bet; also known as juice in sports betting

Wise guy - a well-informed or knowledgeable handicapper or bettor.

Appendix B: Determination of large margin

Instead of just picking a more or less random number, this thesis has calculated the standard deviations for both the difference in scores of a game and the difference in score + the spread/line in order to come up with a qualified estimation of a large margin. As is usually the case one should figure out which distribution ones data follow. In this case both difference in scores and difference + line follow a normal distribution, because skewness as well as kurtosis is fairly close to zero. Furthermore the data are discrete opposed to continuous, because scores move in ticks of 1 and the line move in ticks of 0.5. This does not course a problem, but defining a large scoring margin as for instance bigger than 14.00, 14.67 or 14.99 yields the same results. The thesis uses accurate numbers instead of “rounding”.

Difference in score:		Dif in score + the line:	
Average:	0	Average:	0,059828
Std. Dev:	14,67439	Std. Dev:	13,29967
Skewness:	-0,00029	Skewness:	0,040859
Kurtosis:	0,051774	Kurtosis:	0,148829

A large margin is determined as 1 standard deviation away from the average. This will leave the thesis with approximately 30% of the observations in each instance. Since the data are normally distributed the first part of strategy (1) – (4) will each contain 15% of the observations. For the second part of strategy (1) – (4), “5” is either added to or subtracted from the standard deviations, leaving approximately 10% of the observations.

Appendix C: Participants in Super Bowls

Contestants in Super Bowls:

Year of game ²	Year of relevance	Contestants
1994/95	1995/96	SF – SD
1995/96	1996/97	DAL – PIT
1996/97	1997/98	GB – NE
1997/98	1998/99	DEN – GB
1998/99	1999/00	DEN – ATL
1999/00	2000/01	STL – TEN
2000/01	2001/02	BAL – NYG
2001/02	2002/03	NE – STL
2002/03	2003/04	TB – OAK
2003/04	2004/05	NE – CAR

Appendix D: Large and small NFL cities

The 6 largest nfl cities:

City ³ :	Population:	Team:
New York	8,085,742	New York Giants (NYG)
New York	8,085,742	New York Jets (NYJ)
Chicago	2,869,121	Chicago Bears (CHI)
Philadelphia	1,479,339	Philadelphia Eagles (PHI)
San Diego	1,266,753	San Diego Chargers (SD)
Dallas	1,208,318	Dallas Cowboys (DAL)

The 6 smallest nfl cities:

City:	Population:	Team:
Green Bay	101,467	Green Bay Packers (GB)
Tempe	158,880	Arizona Cardinals (ARI)
St. Paul	280,404	Minnesota Vikings (MIN)
Buffalo	285,018	Buffalo Bills (BUF)
Cincinnati	317,361	Cincinnati Bengals (CIN)
Tampa	317,647	Tampa Bay Buccaneers (TB)

² Information retrieved from www.superbowl.com

³ The population information is retrieved from www.citypopulation.de/USA.html

The author has decided to use both New York teams, because of the size of the city. Furthermore the thesis only uses teams that have been located in a given city the entire test period. Houston Texans, which is the US' 4th largest city, is therefore not included, because the team entered the league prior to the 2002/2003 season. The author also decided not to distinguish between state and city names. So instead of using the state population of Arizona and Minnesota, the thesis uses the population of the teams' home towns.

Appendix E: Determination of the degree of underdog

Naturally one can define the underdog as the least favored of two teams. However this thesis is only using underdogs that are just that to a certain degree, meaning that a distinct difference in strength is detectable. Otherwise the effect that the thesis is testing for might not surface, because ambiguity about who is the favorite and who is the underdog perhaps will create some noise. From the number below, it is worth noticing that the home team on average is a 2.53 point favorite according to the book maker and thus the betting public. This comes as no surprise, as even people remotely interested in sports know that home field in general is an advantage.

Spread/Line:

Average:	-2,53374
Std. Dev:	5,870244
Skewness:	0,231666
Kurtosis:	-0,27833

As was the case for strategies (1) – (4), strategies (11) and (12) will also use the average +/- one standard deviation to determine, when a team can be considered a big enough underdog. The thesis also conducts tests, when the gap between favorite and underdog increases. This is done by adding “3.5” points for the home underdog and subtracting “2” points for the away underdog. The reason for not subtracting the same number of points is that subtracting 3.5 points will leave the thesis with less than 4.5 % of the observations, due to the distribution of the observations. If one compares skewness and kurtosis of spread/line with those in appendix A one will observe that spread/line skewness and kurtosis are further away from “0”, which makes the data less normally distributed.

Appendix F: Empirical results

Year	> 14,67 res	Strat (1)	Rate	> 19,67 res	Strat (1)	Rate	< -14,67 res
Total95/96	63	35	0,5556	30	16	0,5333	63
Total 96/97	70	35	0,5000	39	16	0,4103	70
Total97/98	68	35	0,5147	45	20	0,4444	67
Total98/99	65	34	0,5231	48	26	0,5417	65
Total 99/00	73	33	0,4521	42	19	0,4524	74
Total 95/00	339	172	0,5074	204	97	0,4755	339
Total 00/01	72	27	0,3750	45	18	0,4000	71
Total 01/02	58	35	0,6034	41	23	0,5610	58
Total 02/03	69	29	0,4203	41	19	0,4634	69
Total 03/04	77	40	0,5195	53	25	0,4717	77
Total 04/05	68	33	0,4853	48	23	0,4792	68
Total 00/05	344	164	0,4767	228	108	0,4737	343
Total 95/05	683	336	0,4919	432	205	0,4745	682

	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
Total 95/00	9,1955411	-0,6055	0,728	7,1333335	-1,3816	0,916	9,1955411

	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
Total 00/05	9,2631066	-1,7475	0,96	7,5412765	-1,5152	0,935	9,249633

	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
Total 95/05	13,052322	-1,6668	0,952	10,380525	-2,0501	0,98	13,042764

Strat (2)	Rate	< -19,67 res	Strat (2)	Rate	> 13,36 spread	Strat (3)	Rate
32	0,5079	30	13	0,4333	64	36	0,5625
39	0,5571	39	22	0,5641	70	39	0,5571
33	0,4925	45	21	0,4667	68	34	0,5000
35	0,5385	48	28	0,5833	61	33	0,5410
31	0,4189	42	18	0,4286	71	36	0,5070
170	0,5015	204	102	0,5000	334	178	0,5329
36	0,5070	44	16	0,3636	75	26	0,3467
27	0,4655	41	22	0,5366	69	38	0,5507
39	0,5652	41	22	0,5366	78	34	0,4359
36	0,4675	53	27	0,5094	75	43	0,5733
36	0,5294	48	25	0,5208	73	34	0,4658
174	0,5073	227	112	0,4934	370	175	0,4730
344	0,5044	431	214	0,4965	704	353	0,5014

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-0,823	0,795	7,1333335	-0,6806	0,752	9,127475502	0,334244	0,369

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-0,6123	0,73	7,5247205	-0,9173	0,82	9,606790161	-1,95757	0,975

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-1,0145	0,845	10,368503	-1,134	0,872	13,25146129	-1,18894	0,883

> 18,36 spread	Strat (3)	Rate	< -13,24 spread	Strat (4)	Rate	< -18,24 spread
30	20	0,6667	63	34	0,5397	30
36	20	0,5556	70	41	0,5857	36
38	21	0,5526	67	33	0,4925	38
35	20	0,5714	61	33	0,5410	35
39	17	0,4359	71	32	0,4507	39
178	98	0,5506	332	173	0,5211	178
44	14	0,3182	72	36	0,5000	40
34	18	0,5294	69	33	0,4783	34
39	16	0,4103	78	45	0,5769	39
46	23	0,5000	75	36	0,4800	46
42	20	0,4762	73	34	0,4658	42
205	91	0,4439	367	184	0,5014	201
383	189	0,4935	699	357	0,5107	379

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
6,663270494	0,7149	0,237	9,100106698	-0,0991	0,539	6,663270494

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
7,150795746	-2,2905	0,989	9,567764447	-0,8607	0,805	7,080688212

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma
9,77410116	-1,1884	0,883	13,20431969	-0,6919	0,755	9,722927504

Strat (4)	Rate	Won 3 or more games	Strat (5)	Rate	4 or >	Strat (5)	rate
14	0,4667	57	34	0,5965	28	18	0,6429
20	0,5556	58	35	0,6034	24	16	0,6667
17	0,4474	54	28	0,5185	32	18	0,5625
20	0,5714	60	27	0,4500	34	15	0,4412
15	0,3846	65	37	0,5692	35	20	0,5714
86	0,4831	294	161	0,5476	153	87	0,5686
18	0,4500	65	31	0,4769	37	20	0,5405
16	0,4706	45	25	0,5556	20	8	0,4000
21	0,5385	55	31	0,5636	25	14	0,5600
22	0,4783	59	20	0,3390	42	16	0,3810
22	0,5238	73	37	0,5068	48	27	0,5625
99	0,4925	297	144	0,4848	172	85	0,4942
185	0,4881	591	305	0,5161	325	172	0,5292

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-1,086	0,861	8,563496169	0,81775	0,207	6,17765	1,11023	0,156

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-0,8875	0,813	8,607076584	-1,3441	0,911	6,55001	-0,7776	0,782

z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
-1,3905	0,918	12,14146754	-0,3761	0,647	9,00366	0,19603	0,422

5 or >	Strat (5)	rate	6 or >	Strat (5)	rate	Lost 3 or more games	Strat (6)
13	7	0,5385	7	4	0,5714	51	31
10	5	0,5000	6	4	0,6667	57	33
19	10	0,5263	11	7	0,6364	55	28
20	8	0,4000	13	4	0,3077	57	30
21	14	0,6667	13	10	0,7692	60	33
83	44	0,5301	50	29	0,5800	280	155
20	10	0,5000	11	7	0,6364	68	31
10	6	0,6000	2	2	1,0000	59	30
10	7	0,7000	3	2	0,6667	62	31
28	10	0,3571	19	5	0,2632	54	29
30	17	0,5667	20	13	0,6500	66	35
98	50	0,5102	55	29	0,5273	309	156
181	94	0,5193	105	58	0,5524	589	311

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value
4,55005	0,1153	0,455	3,53153	0,79569	0,217	8,357116536	0,99747

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value
4,94414	-0,2695	0,607	3,7039	0,05157	0,521	8,779235163	-0,6668

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value
6,71919	-0,1202	0,548	5,11767	0,5864	0,279	12,12090619	0,20475

Rate	4 or >	Strat (6)	rate	5 or >	Strat (6)	rate	6 or >	Strat (6)
0,6078	21	14	0,6667	9	5	0,5556	3	2
0,5789	29	17	0,5862	16	12	0,7500	9	8
0,5091	32	15	0,4688	20	9	0,4500	13	8
0,5263	30	15	0,5000	15	8	0,5333	8	4
0,5500	30	17	0,5667	16	10	0,6250	8	6
0,5536	142	78	0,5493	76	44	0,5789	41	28
0,4559	39	20	0,5128	21	12	0,5714	11	8
0,5085	38	20	0,5263	25	14	0,5600	18	10
0,5000	34	20	0,5882	19	10	0,5263	12	7
0,5370	26	11	0,4231	14	8	0,5714	6	3
0,5303	34	20	0,5882	19	12	0,6316	11	9
0,5049	171	91	0,5322	98	56	0,5714	58	37
0,5280	313	169	0,5399	174	100	0,5747	99	65

p-value sigma z-value p-value sigma t-value p-value sigma t-value
0,159 5,95143 0,60832 **0,271** 4,35396 0,96262 **0,174** 3,19793 2,04013

p-value sigma z-value p-value sigma t-value p-value sigma t-value
0,748 6,53094 0,21899 **0,413** 4,94414 0,94407 **0,178** 3,80357 1,74036

p-value sigma z-value p-value sigma z-value p-value sigma t-value
0,419 8,83588 0,5716 **0,284** 6,58798 1,34469 **0,09** 4,9693 2,645

rate	Won 3 or more against spread	Strat (7)	Rate	4 or >	Strat (7)	Rate
0,6667	40	25	0,6250	14	9	0,6429
0,8889	55	28	0,5091	26	16	0,6154
0,6154	47	25	0,5319	20	15	0,7500
0,5000	37	23	0,6216	12	9	0,7500
0,7500	55	25	0,4545	27	14	0,5185
0,6829	234	126	0,5385	99	63	0,6364
0,7273	55	29	0,5273	24	14	0,5833
0,5556	38	24	0,6316	11	6	0,5455
0,5833	52	27	0,5192	23	13	0,5652
0,5000	52	21	0,4038	29	13	0,4483
0,8182	61	26	0,4262	33	13	0,3939
0,6379	258	127	0,4922	120	59	0,4917
0,6566	492	253	0,5142	219	122	0,5571

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value
0,024	7,639859491	0,44907	0,327	4,9693	2,24253	0,015

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
0,045	8,022085669	-1,0147	0,845	5,47102	-0,7048	0,759

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
0,004	11,07796513	-0,4251	0,665	7,39094	0,98605	0,162

5 or >	Strat (7)	Rate	Lost 3 or more against the spread	Strat (8)	Rate
4	3	0,7500	42	24	0,5714
9	6	0,6667	48	24	0,5000
4	2	0,5000	47	25	0,5319
2	1	0,5000	44	21	0,4773
12	5	0,4167	54	21	0,3889
31	17	0,5484	235	115	0,4894
10	6	0,6000	56	28	0,5000
5	3	0,6000	36	21	0,5833
9	6	0,6667	53	24	0,4528
15	7	0,4667	51	23	0,4510
19	7	0,3684	56	28	0,5000
58	29	0,5000	252	124	0,4921
89	46	0,5169	487	239	0,4908

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
2,78073	0,2741	0,393	7,656166573	-1,0571	0,855

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
3,80357	-0,3629	0,642	7,928256878	-1,0087	0,843

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
4,71164	-0,1312	0,552	11,02153092	-1,4599	0,928

4 or >	Strat (8)	Rate	5 or >	Strat (8)	Rate	Bet against SB	Strat (9)
17	12	0,7059	4	1	0,2500	12	8
23	9	0,3913	13	6	0,4615	12	6
19	7	0,3684	10	4	0,4000	12	8
20	12	0,6000	7	3	0,4286	12	4
30	11	0,3667	17	8	0,4706	12	7
109	51	0,4679	51	22	0,4314	60	33
26	14	0,5385	12	7	0,5833	12	8
12	6	0,5000	5	2	0,4000	12	6
28	13	0,4643	14	7	0,5000	12	9
27	11	0,4074	15	6	0,4000	12	9
25	14	0,5600	10	7	0,7000	12	5
118	58	0,4915	56	29	0,5179	60	37
227	109	0,4802	107	51	0,4766	120	70

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	t-value
5,21424	-1,1688	0,879	3,56667	-1,3216	0,907	3,868593233	0,40635

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	t-value
5,42523	-0,702	0,759	3,73742	-0,089	0,536	3,868593233	1,44032

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value
7,52472	-1,316	0,906	5,16618	-0,9769	0,836	5,471017017	1,30579

Rate	Small vs. Large	Strat (10)	Rate	Home-dog > 3.34	Strat (11)	Rate
0,6667	20	10	0,5000	48	29	0,6042
0,5000	24	15	0,6250	39	26	0,6667
0,6667	26	14	0,5385	36	22	0,6111
0,3333	19	8	0,4211	44	23	0,5227
0,5833	25	12	0,4800	41	20	0,4878
0,5500	114	59	0,5175	208	120	0,5769
0,6667	23	8	0,3478	46	24	0,5217
0,5000	25	12	0,4800	41	25	0,6098
0,7500	18	8	0,4444	35	21	0,6000
0,7500	17	9	0,5294	42	22	0,5238
0,4167	20	9	0,4500	41	16	0,3902
0,6167	103	46	0,4466	205	108	0,5268
0,5833	217	105	0,4839	413	228	0,5521

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
0,356	5,332487772	-0,13375	0,553	7,202928604	1,534043	0,0625

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
0,081	5,068693784	-1,56873	0,942	7,150795746	0,086843	0,465

p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
0,0958	7,357111017	-1,17772	0,881	10,14968277	1,149849	0,125

Home-dog > 6.84	Strat (11)	Rate	Away-dog < -8.4	Strat (12)	Rate
21	15	0,7143	42	25	0,5952
16	9	0,5625	41	18	0,4390
12	9	0,7500	33	18	0,5455
20	12	0,6000	36	16	0,4444
15	7	0,4667	40	22	0,5500
84	52	0,6190	192	99	0,5156
27	16	0,5926	38	21	0,5526
15	10	0,6667	35	19	0,5429
16	10	0,6250	32	17	0,5313
12	10	0,8333	31	15	0,4839
20	9	0,4500	33	21	0,6364
90	55	0,6111	169	93	0,5503
174	107	0,6149	361	192	0,5319

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
4,577381243	1,747899	0,043	6,920349956	-0,22681	0,59

sigma	t-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
4,738039721	1,658492	0,0504	6,492632104	0,689674	0,245

sigma	z-value	p-value	sigma	z-value	p-value
6,587976885	2,407234	0,008	9,489231537	0,306474	0,38

Away-dog < -10.4	Strat (12)	Rate
24	15	0,6250
19	8	0,4211
17	8	0,4706
27	14	0,5185
17	8	0,4706
<hr/>		
104	53	0,5096
23	9	0,3913
16	9	0,5625
13	8	0,6154
17	10	0,5882
14	9	0,6429
<hr/>		
83	45	0,5422
<hr/>		
187	98	0,5241

sigma	z-value	p-value
5,093239661	-0,28964	0,614

sigma	t-value	p-value
4,550053349	0,335073	0,37

sigma	z-value	p-value
6,829646822	0,007233	0,497

Appendix G: Simulation of strategies

(#) refers to the given strategy. These columns register when ever a bet is made for the given strategy - noted by "1".

The columns next to (#), indicate the sub-strategies in a given strategies.

They also register when a bet is won, using the (sub) strategy - noted by "1".

Week	Results	Other team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PIT 29 at BUF 24	29	24	-5	-9,5	-14,5	1	1	1	0	0
Week 16	BUF 41 at SF 7	7	41	34	-11	23	1	0	1	0	1
Week 15	BUF 33 at CIN 17	17	33	16	-3	13	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CLE 7 at BUF 37	7	37	30	-11,5	18,5	1	0	1	0	1
Week 13	BUF 42 at MIA 32	32	42	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 38 at SEA 9	9	38	29	4,5	33,5	1	0	1	0	1
Week 11	STL 17 at BUF 37	17	37	20	-2	18	1	0	1	0	1
Week 10	BUF 6 at NE 29	29	6	-23	7	-16	0	0	0	1	0
Week 9	NYJ 17 at BUF 22	17	22	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	ARI 14 at BUF 38	14	38	24	-4,5	19,5	1	0	1	0	1
Week 7	BUF 6 at BAL 20	20	6	-14	4,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 13 at BUF 20	13	20	7	-5	2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BUF 14 at NYJ 16	16	14	-2	6,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NE 31 at BUF 17	31	17	-14	5,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 10 at OAK 13	13	10	-3	3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	JAC 13 at BUF 10	13	10	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIA 23 at BAL 30	30	23	-7	11	4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CLE 7 at MIA 10	7	10	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NE 28 at MIA 29	28	29	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 17 at DEN 20	20	17	-3	11,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	BUF 42 at MIA 32	42	32	-10	4,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIA 24 at SF 17	17	24	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIA 17 at SEA 24	24	17	-7	9,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	ARI 24 at MIA 23	24	23	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIA 14 at NYJ 41	41	14	-27	7	-20	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	STL 14 at MIA 31	14	31	17	5	22	1	0	0	0	1
Week 6	MIA 13 at BUF 20	20	13	-7	5	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 10 at NE 24	24	10	-14	11	-3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYJ 17 at MIA 9	17	9	-8	6	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PIT 13 at MIA 3	13	3	-10	-2,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIA 13 at CIN 16	16	13	-3	5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TEN 17 at MIA 7	17	7	-10	3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SF 7 at NE 21	7	21	14	-13	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NE 23 at NYJ 7	7	23	16	0	16	1	0	0	0	1
Week 15	NE 28 at MIA 29	29	28	-1	-10	-11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 28 at NE 35	28	35	7	-10,5	-3,5	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	NE 42 at CLE 15	15	42	27	-11,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	1
Week 12	BAL 3 at NE 24	3	24	21	-7	14	1	0	1	0	1
Week 11	NE 27 at KC 19	19	27	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BUF 6 at NE 29	6	29	23	-7	16	1	0	1	0	1
Week 9	NE 40 at STL 22	22	40	18	2	20	1	0	0	0	1
Week 8	NE 20 at PIT 34	34	20	-14	-3	-17	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 20 at NE 30	20	30	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 10 at NE 24	10	24	14	-11	3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NE 31 at BUF 17	17	31	14	-5,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 23 at ARI 12	12	23	11	-7,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)

Week 5	NYG 26 at DAL 10	26	10	-16	-3,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 21 at WAS 18	18	21	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CLE 12 at DAL 19	12	19	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 17 at MIN 35	35	17	-18	5,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 24 at NYG 28	24	28	4	-1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYG 22 at CIN 23	23	22	-1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 33 at NYG 30	33	30	-3	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	NYG 14 at BAL 37	37	14	-23	10,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	NYG 7 at WAS 31	31	7	-24	3	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	PHI 27 at NYG 6	27	6	-21	7	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	ATL 14 at NYG 10	14	10	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 14 at ARI 17	17	14	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 28 at NYG 21	28	21	-7	-9	-16	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYG 34 at MIN 13	13	34	21	7	28	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 7	DET 28 at NYG 13	28	13	-15	-7	-22	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 26 at DAL 10	10	26	16	3,5	19,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	NYG 14 at GB 7	7	14	7	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	CLE 10 at NYG 27	10	27	17	-3,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	WAS 14 at NYG 20	14	20	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYG 17 at PHI 31	31	17	-14	8,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 38 at PHI 10	38	10	-28	3,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 7 at STL 20	20	7	-13	4,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 7 at PHI 12	7	12	5	-11	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 17 at WAS 14	14	17	3	-9,5	-6,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	GB 17 at PHI 47	17	47	30	-5,5	24,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	PHI 27 at NYG 6	6	27	21	-7	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	WAS 6 at PHI 28	6	28	22	-10	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 49 at DAL 21	21	49	28	-7	21	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 9	PHI 3 at PIT 27	27	3	-24	-1	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 8	BAL 10 at PHI 15	10	15	5	-7,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 34 at CLE 31	31	34	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 8 at PHI 30	8	30	22	-9,5	12,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 19 at CHI 9	9	19	10	-8,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PHI 30 at DET 13	13	30	17	-5,5	11,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 16 at PHI 27	16	27	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYG 17 at PHI 31	17	31	14	-8,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 18 at WAS 21	18	21	3	4,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	WAS 10 at DAL 13	13	10	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 26 at SF 16	16	26	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 17 at WAS 14	17	14	-3	9,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYG 7 at WAS 31	7	31	24	-3	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	WAS 7 at PIT 16	16	7	-9	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	WAS 6 at PHI 28	28	6	-22	10	-12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	CIN 17 at WAS 10	17	10	-7	-4	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	WAS 17 at DET 10	10	17	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	GB 28 at WAS 14	28	14	-14	1	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 13 at CHI 10	10	13	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 17 at WAS 10	17	10	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 13 at CLE 17	17	13	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 21 at WAS 18	21	18	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 14 at NYG 20	20	14	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 10 at WAS 16	10	16	6	-1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)

Week 15	SEA 14 at NYJ 37	37	14	-23	7	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	SEA 27 at MIN 23	23	27	4	6.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 43 at SEA 39	43	39	-4	-7	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 38 at SEA 9	38	9	-29	-4.5	-33.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	MIA 17 at SEA 24	17	24	7	-9.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SEA 12 at STL 23	23	12	-11	-2	-13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SEA 42 at SF 27	27	42	15	-7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CAR 17 at SEA 23	17	23	6	-8	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SEA 17 at ARI 25	25	17	-8	-7	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 20 at NE 30	30	20	-10	3.5	-6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 33 at SEA 27	33	27	-6	-8	-14	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SF 0 at SEA 34	0	34	34	-10	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	SEA 10 at TB 6	6	10	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SEA 21 at NO 7	7	21	14	-2.5	11.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYJ 29 at STL 32	29	32	3	3.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 7 at STL 20	7	20	13	-4.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	STL 7 at ARI 31	31	7	-24	-3	-27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	STL 7 at CAR 20	20	7	-13	7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SF 6 at STL 16	6	16	10	-11	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	STL 17 at GB 45	45	17	-28	7	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	STL 17 at BUF 37	37	17	-20	2	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	SEA 12 at STL 23	12	23	11	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 40 at STL 22	40	22	-18	-2	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 7	STL 14 at MIA 31	31	14	-17	-5	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 33 at SEA 27	27	33	6	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	STL 24 at SF 14	14	24	10	-3.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 28 at STL 25	28	25	-3	-6.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	STL 17 at ATL 34	34	17	-17	1.5	-15.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 10 at STL 17	10	17	7	-11	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 04/05							68	33	48	23	68	36	48	25	73
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BUF 0 at NE 31	31	0	-31	9.5	-21.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	MIA 20 at BUF 3	20	3	-17	-3	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 26 at TEN 28	28	26	-2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYJ 6 at BUF 17	6	17	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	BUF 24 at NYG 7	7	24	17	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	HOU 12 at BUF 10	12	10	-2	-7	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BUF 5 at KC 38	38	5	-33	6	-27	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 7	WAS 7 at BUF 24	7	24	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 6	BUF 3 at NYJ 30	30	3	-27	-1.5	-28.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	CIN 16 at BUF 22	16	22	6	-7.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 23 at BUF 13	23	13	-10	-3	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BUF 7 at MIA 17	17	7	-10	3	-7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 38 at JAC 17	17	38	21	-3	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	NE 0 at BUF 31	0	31	31	-1.5	29.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYJ 21 at MIA 23	21	23	2	-4	-2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	MIA 20 at BUF 3	3	20	17	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	PHI 34 at MIA 27	34	27	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 0 at NE 12	12	0	-12	3	-9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 40 at DAL 21	21	40	19	3	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	WAS 23 at MIA 24	23	24	1	-7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 6 at MIA 9	6	9	3	-4.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 7 at TEN 31	31	7	-24	5.5	-18.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	IND 23 at MIA 17	23	17	-6	-3	-9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week 8	MIA 26 at SD 10	10	26	16	-6	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NE 19 at MIA 13	19	13	-6	-6.5	-12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	MIA 24 at JAC 10	10	24	14	-3.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	MIA 23 at NYG 10	10	23	13	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 3	BUF 7 at MIA 17	7	17	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	MIA 21 at NYJ 10	10	21	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	HOU 21 at MIA 20	21	20	-1	-13	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BUF 0 at NE 31	0	31	31	-9.5	21.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NE 21 at NYJ 16	16	21	5	-3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	JAC 13 at NE 27	13	27	14	-6.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 0 at NE 12	0	12	12	-3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NE 38 at IND 34	34	38	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 23 at HOU 20	20	23	3	-5.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 0 at NE 12	0	12	12	-4.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 30 at DEN 26	26	30	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 3 at NE 9	3	9	6	-5.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NE 19 at MIA 13	13	19	6	6.5	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYG 6 at NE 17	6	17	11	-2.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TEN 30 at NE 38	30	38	8	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 16 at NE 23	16	23	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 31 at PHI 10	10	31	21	4	25	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 1	NE 0 at BUF 31	31	0	-31	1.5	-29.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYJ 21 at MIA 23	23	21	-2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NE 21 at NYJ 16	21	16	-5	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 0 at NYJ 6	0	6	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYJ 6 at BUF 17	17	6	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TEN 17 at NYJ 24	17	24	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 10 at NYJ 13	10	13	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 31 at IND 38	38	31	-7	6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYJ 17 at PHI 24	24	17	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYJ 19 at HOU 14	14	19	5	-3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BUF 3 at NYJ 30	3	30	27	1.5	28.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	DAL 17 at NYJ 6	17	6	-11	-3	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 16 at NE 23	23	16	-7	6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIA 21 at NYJ 10	21	10	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PIT 10 at BAL 13	10	13	3	-6	-3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 16	BAL 35 at CLE 0	0	35	35	-3	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 12 at OAK 20	20	12	-8	-7	-15	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 13 at BAL 31	13	31	18	-4.5	13.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	SF 6 at BAL 44	6	44	38	-3	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	BAL 6 at MIA 9	9	6	-3	4.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BAL 22 at STL 33	33	22	-11	7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 17 at BAL 24	17	24	7	-6.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DEN 6 at BAL 26	6	26	20	-2.5	17.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	BAL 26 at CIN 34	34	26	-8	-1.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 26 at ARI 18	18	26	8	-6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 17 at BAL 10	17	10	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BAL 24 at SD 10	10	24	14	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	CLE 13 at BAL 33	13	33	20	-3	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 1	BAL 15 at PIT 34	34	15	-19	6	-13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CLE 22 at CIN 14	22	14	-8	-8.5	-16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CIN 10 at STL 27	27	10	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Week 9	CAR 10 at HOU 14	10	14	4	6,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	HOU 21 at IND 30	30	21	-9	13,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NYJ 19 at HOU 14	19	14	-5	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	HOU 17 at TEN 38	38	17	-21	9,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 4	JAC 20 at HOU 24	20	24	4	2,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 3	KC 42 at HOU 14	42	14	-28	7,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 2	HOU 10 at NO 31	31	10	-21	8,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 1	HOU 21 at MIA 20	20	21	1	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	IND 20 at HOU 17	17	20	3	-8,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	DEN 31 at IND 17	31	17	-14	-7	-21	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	ATL 7 at IND 38	7	38	31	-7,5	23,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	IND 29 at TEN 27	27	29	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NE 38 at IND 34	38	34	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 31 at IND 38	31	38	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 23 at JAC 28	28	23	-5	-6	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	IND 23 at MIA 17	17	23	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	HOU 21 at IND 30	21	30	9	-13,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 23 at IND 20	23	20	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	IND 38 at TB 35	35	38	3	4,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	IND 55 at NO 21	21	55	34	-2,5	31,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	JAC 13 at IND 23	13	23	10	-7,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TEN 7 at IND 33	7	33	26	-2,5	23,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	IND 9 at CLE 6	6	9	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 14 at ATL 21	21	14	-7	2,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NO 19 at JAC 20	19	20	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	JAC 13 at NE 27	27	13	-14	6,5	-7,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	HOU 0 at JAC 27	0	27	27	-8,5	18,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	TB 10 at JAC 17	10	17	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 10 at NYJ 13	13	10	-3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	JAC 3 at TEN 10	10	3	-7	9,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 23 at JAC 28	23	28	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 17 at BAL 24	24	17	-7	6,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TEN 30 at JAC 17	30	17	-13	4,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 24 at JAC 10	24	10	-14	3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 21 at JAC 27	21	27	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 20 at HOU 24	24	20	-4	-2,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	JAC 13 at IND 23	23	13	-10	7,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 38 at JAC 17	38	17	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	JAC 23 at CAR 24	24	23	-1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TB 13 at TEN 33	13	33	20	-4,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	TEN 27 at HOU 24	24	27	3	-6,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 26 at TEN 28	26	28	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 29 at TEN 27	29	27	-2	-4	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TEN 17 at NYJ 24	24	17	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	JAC 3 at TEN 10	3	10	7	-9,5	-2,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 7 at TEN 31	7	31	24	-5,5	18,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	TEN 30 at JAC 17	17	30	13	-4,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	TEN 37 at CAR 17	17	37	20	1	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	HOU 17 at TEN 38	17	38	21	-9,5	11,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TEN 30 at NE 38	38	30	-8	0	-8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TEN 30 at PIT 13	13	30	17	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	NO 12 at TEN 27	12	27	15	-4,5	10,5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	TEN 7 at IND 33	33	7	-26	2,5	-23,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 5	WAS 25 at PHI 27	25	27	2	-4,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	PHI 23 at BUF 13	13	23	10	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	NE 31 at PHI 10	31	10	-21	-4	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	TB 17 at PHI 0	17	0	-17	-3	-20	0				1				0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PHI 31 at WAS 7	31	7	-24	9	-15		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 24 at CHI 27	27	24	-3	4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	DAL 27 at WAS 0	27	0	-27	3	-24	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	WAS 20 at NYG 7	7	20	13	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	NO 24 at WAS 20	24	20	-4	-1	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	WAS 23 at MIA 24	24	23	-1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	WAS 17 at CAR 20	20	17	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SEA 20 at WAS 27	20	27	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	WAS 14 at DAL 21	21	14	-7	6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 7 at BUF 24	24	7	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TB 35 at WAS 13	35	13	-22	3,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	WAS 25 at PHI 27	27	25	-2	4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 24 at WAS 21	24	21	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 33 at ATL 31	31	33	2	3	5	0				0				0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CHI 3 at KC 31	31	3	-28	7,5	-20,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 24 at CHI 27	24	27	3	-4,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CHI 21 at GB 34	34	21	-13	7	-6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 3 at CHI 28	3	28	25	-4,5	20,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	CHI 19 at DEN 10	10	19	9	10,5	19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	STL 23 at CHI 21	23	21	-2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CHI 10 at DET 12	12	10	-2	1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SD 7 at CHI 20	7	20	13	-1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 16 at CHI 24	16	24	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 17 at SEA 24	24	17	-7	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CHI 13 at NO 20	20	13	-7	6,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	OAK 21 at CHI 24	21	24	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 4	GB 38 at CHI 23	38	23	-15	4	-11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 13 at MIN 24	24	13	-11	10	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CHI 7 at SF 49	49	7	-42	7	-35	0				1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	STL 20 at DET 30	20	30	10	12,5	22,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	DET 14 at CAR 20	20	14	-6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	DET 17 at KC 45	45	17	-28	14,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	SD 14 at DET 7	14	7	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	GB 14 at DET 22	14	22	8	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	DET 14 at MIN 24	24	14	-10	10,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	DET 14 at SEA 35	35	14	-21	10,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	CHI 10 at DET 12	10	12	2	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	OAK 13 at DET 23	13	23	10	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 16 at CHI 24	24	16	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 38 at DET 7	38	7	-31	3	-28	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	DET 17 at SF 24	24	17	-7	7,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DET 16 at DEN 20	20	16	-4	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	MIN 23 at DET 13	23	13	-10	4,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 6 at GB 31	31	6	-25	7	-18	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	ARI 24 at DET 42	24	42	18	-4	14	1				0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DEN 3 at GB 31	3	31	28	-9,5	18,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	GB 41 at OAK 7	7	41	34	-6	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Week 9	CAR 10 at HOU 14	14	10	-4	-6.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	CAR 23 at NO 20	20	23	3	2.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	TEN 37 at CAR 17	37	17	-20	-1	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 6	CAR 23 at IND 20	20	23	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 13 at CAR 19	13	19	6	-7	-1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ATL 3 at CAR 23	3	23	20	-6.5	13.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	CAR 12 at TB 9	9	12	3	9.5	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	JAC 23 at CAR 24	23	24	1	-4	-3	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 7 at NO 13	7	13	6	1	7		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NO 19 at JAC 20	20	19	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYG 7 at NO 45	7	45	38	-8	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	TB 14 at NO 7	14	7	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 24 at WAS 20	20	24	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NO 20 at PHI 33	33	20	-13	5.5	-7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ATL 20 at NO 23	20	23	3	-8.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NO 17 at TB 14	14	17	3	7.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CAR 23 at NO 20	23	20	-3	-2.5	-5.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NO 45 at ATL 17	17	45	28	-3	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	CHI 13 at NO 20	13	20	7	-6.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 13 at CAR 19	19	13	-6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 4	IND 55 at NO 21	55	21	-34	2.5	-31.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	NO 12 at TEN 27	27	12	-15	4.5	-10.5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	HOU 10 at NO 31	10	31	21	-8.5	12.5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 10 at SEA 27	27	10	-17	3	-14	0		0		1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TB 13 at TEN 33	33	13	-20	4.5	-15.5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	ATL 30 at TB 28	30	28	-2	-8.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	HOU 3 at TB 16	3	16	13	-11.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 14 at NO 7	7	14	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TB 10 at JAC 17	17	10	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 20 at TB 13	20	13	-7	-3.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TB 24 at CAR 27	27	24	-3	-3.5	-6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NO 17 at TB 14	17	14	-3	-7.5	-10.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DAL 0 at TB 16	0	16	16	-6.5	9.5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 7	TB 7 at SF 24	24	7	-17	-4.5	-21.5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TB 35 at WAS 13	13	35	22	-3.5	18.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	IND 38 at TB 35	38	35	-3	-4.5	-7.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 31 at ATL 10	10	31	21	-6.5	14.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	CAR 12 at TB 9	12	9	-3	-9.5	-12.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 17 at PHI 0	0	17	17	3	20	1		0		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 17 at ARI 18	17	18	1	7.5	8.5		0		0		1		0	
Week 16	ARI 10 at SEA 28	28	10	-18	15	-3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CAR 20 at ARI 17	20	17	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	ARI 14 at SF 50	50	14	-36	10.5	-25.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	ARI 3 at CHI 28	28	3	-25	4.5	-20.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	STL 30 at ARI 27	30	27	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	ARI 6 at CLE 44	44	6	-38	5.5	-32.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	ARI 15 at PIT 28	28	15	-13	7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 14 at ARI 17	14	17	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SF 13 at ARI 16	13	16	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 26 at ARI 18	26	18	-8	6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 7 at DAL 24	24	7	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 13 at STL 37	37	13	-24	11	-13	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	GB 13 at ARI 20	13	20	7	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1

Week 2	SEA 38 at ARI 0	38	0	-38	4,5	-33,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	ARI 24 at DET 42	42	24	-18	4	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 24 at SF 17	24	17	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	SF 31 at PHI 28	28	31	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ARI 14 at SF 50	14	50	36	-10,5	25,5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 13	SF 6 at BAL 44	44	6	-38	3	-35	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	SF 10 at GB 20	20	10	-10	3,5	-6,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 14 at SF 30	14	30	16	-4	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 10 at SF 30	10	30	20	4,5	24,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	SF 13 at ARI 16	16	13	-3	-7	-10	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	TB 7 at SF 24	7	24	17	4,5	21,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	SF 19 at SEA 20	20	19	-1	3,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DET 17 at SF 24	17	24	7	-7,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 7 at MIN 35	35	7	-28	-1	-29	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	CLE 13 at SF 12	13	12	-1	-7,5	-8,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CHI 7 at SF 49	7	49	42	-7	35	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 24 at SF 17	17	24	7	2,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ARI 10 at SEA 28	10	28	18	-15	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SEA 22 at STL 27	27	22	-5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	SEA 7 at MIN 34	34	7	-27	0	-27	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	CLE 7 at SEA 34	7	34	27	-6,5	20,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	DET 14 at SEA 35	14	35	21	-10,5	10,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SEA 20 at WAS 27	27	20	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PIT 16 at SEA 23	16	23	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 24 at CIN 27	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 17 at SEA 24	17	24	7	-11	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SF 19 at SEA 20	19	20	1	-3,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SEA 13 at GB 35	35	13	-22	1	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	STL 23 at SEA 24	23	24	1	-3	-2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SEA 38 at ARI 0	0	38	38	-4,5	33,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	NO 10 at SEA 27	10	27	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	STL 20 at DET 30	30	20	-10	-12,5	-22,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CIN 10 at STL 27	10	27	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SEA 22 at STL 27	22	27	5	-7	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 26 at CLE 20	20	26	6	-5,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 17 at STL 48	17	48	31	-6	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	STL 30 at ARI 27	27	30	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 23 at CHI 21	21	23	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BAL 22 at STL 33	22	33	11	-7	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 9	STL 10 at SF 30	30	10	-20	-4,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 8	STL 33 at PIT 21	21	33	12	1,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	GB 24 at STL 34	24	34	10	-4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	ATL 0 at STL 36	0	36	36	-10	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	ARI 13 at STL 37	13	37	24	-11	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	STL 23 at SEA 24	24	23	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	STL 13 at NYG 23	23	13	-10	0	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 03/04							77	40	53	25	77	36	53	27	75
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 9 at BUF 27	9	27	18	-7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	BUF 0 at GB 10	10	0	-10	7	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 13 at BUF 20	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 17 at NE 27	27	17	-10	3,5	-6,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 21 at BUF 38	21	38	17	2	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1

Week 5	KC 29 at NYJ 25	29	25	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	NYJ 3 at JAC 28	28	3	-25	3	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 3 at MIA 30	30	3	-27	6	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	NE 44 at NYJ 7	44	7	-37	-1	-38	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 37 at BUF 31	31	37	6	-3	3	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 31 at PIT 34	34	31	-3	8	5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	CLE 14 at BAL 13	14	13	-1	-2.5	-3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 23 at HOU 19	19	23	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NO 37 at BAL 25	37	25	-12	2.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	BAL 27 at CIN 23	23	27	4	-2.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 12 at BAL 13	12	13	1	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 7 at MIA 26	26	7	-19	4.5	-14.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 27 at BAL 38	27	38	11	-4.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 17 at ATL 20	20	17	-3	7.5	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 31 at BAL 18	31	18	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	JAC 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 20 at IND 22	22	20	-2	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 26 at CLE 21	21	26	5	6.5	11.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DEN 23 at BAL 34	23	34	11	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 2	TB 25 at BAL 0	25	0	-25	4.5	-20.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	BAL 7 at CAR 10	10	7	-3	-1.5	-4.5	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 9 at BUF 27	27	9	-18	7	-11		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NO 13 at CIN 20	13	20	7	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	JAC 29 at CIN 15	29	15	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 31 at CAR 52	52	31	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	BAL 27 at CIN 23	27	23	-4	2.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 21 at PIT 29	29	21	-8	10.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CLE 27 at CIN 20	27	20	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 27 at BAL 38	38	27	-11	4.5	-6.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 38 at HOU 3	3	38	35	3	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	TEN 30 at CIN 24	30	24	-6	5	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 34 at CIN 7	34	7	-27	6	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	CIN 21 at IND 28	28	21	-7	13.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 4	TB 35 at CIN 7	35	7	-28	7	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	CIN 3 at ATL 30	30	3	-27	7.5	-19.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	CIN 7 at CLE 20	20	7	-13	4	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SD 34 at CIN 6	34	6	-28	-3	-31	0		0		1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ATL 16 at CLE 24	16	24	8	2.5	10.5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	CLE 14 at BAL 13	13	14	1	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	IND 28 at CLE 23	28	23	-5	2	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CLE 21 at JAC 20	20	21	1	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 13 at CLE 6	13	6	-7	-7.5	-14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CLE 24 at NO 15	15	24	9	5.5	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	CLE 27 at CIN 20	20	27	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PIT 23 at CLE 20	23	20	-3	3.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 24 at NYJ 21	21	24	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	HOU 17 at CLE 34	17	34	17	-9	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CLE 3 at TB 17	17	3	-14	7	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 26 at CLE 21	26	21	-5	-6.5	-11.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CLE 13 at PIT 16	16	13	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CLE 31 at TEN 28	28	31	3	4.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 7 at CLE 20	7	20	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	KC 40 at CLE 39	40	39	-1	-1	-2	0		0		0		0		0

Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 31 at PIT 34	31	34	3	-8	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PIT 17 at TB 7	7	17	10	4,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	CAR 14 at PIT 30	14	30	16	-9	7	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	HOU 24 at PIT 6	24	6	-18	-14	-32	0	0	0	1	0
Week 13	PIT 25 at JAC 23	23	25	2	-3	-1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 21 at PIT 29	21	29	8	-10,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 23 at TEN 31	31	23	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	ATL 34 at PIT 34	34	34	0	-5	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PIT 23 at CLE 20	20	23	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 31 at BAL 18	18	31	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 10 at PIT 28	10	28	18	-4,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	1
Week 6	PIT 34 at CIN 7	7	34	27	-6	21	1	0	1	0	1
Week 4	CLE 13 at PIT 16	13	16	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 30 at PIT 17	30	17	-13	-3,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 14 at NE 30	30	14	-16	-2,5	-18,5	0	0	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	HOU	Difference	HOU Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TEN 13 at HOU 3	13	3	-10	9,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	HOU 10 at WAS 26	26	10	-16	6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 15	BAL 23 at HOU 19	23	19	-4	3	-1	0	1	0	0	0
Week 14	HOU 24 at PIT 6	6	24	18	14	32	1	0	0	0	1
Week 13	HOU 3 at IND 19	19	3	-16	10	-6	0	0	0	1	0
Week 12	NYG 14 at HOU 16	14	16	2	5,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	JAC 24 at HOU 21	24	21	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	HOU 10 at TEN 17	17	10	-7	9,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	CIN 38 at HOU 3	38	3	-35	-3	-38	0	0	0	1	0
Week 8	HOU 21 at JAC 19	19	21	2	11	13	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	HOU 17 at CLE 34	34	17	-17	9	-8	0	0	0	1	0
Week 4	HOU 17 at PHI 35	35	17	-18	19	1	0	0	0	1	1
Week 3	IND 23 at HOU 3	23	3	-20	11	-9	0	0	0	1	0
Week 2	HOU 3 at SD 24	24	3	-21	13,5	-7,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 1	DAL 10 at HOU 19	10	19	9	9,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 13 at IND 20	13	20	7	-8,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYG 44 at IND 27	44	27	-17	-4,5	-21,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 15	IND 28 at CLE 23	23	28	5	-2	3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 17 at TEN 27	27	17	-10	0	-10	0	1	0	0	0
Week 13	HOU 3 at IND 19	3	19	16	-10	6	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	IND 23 at DEN 20	20	23	3	6,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 3 at IND 20	3	20	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 35 at PHI 13	13	35	22	9,5	31,5	1	0	1	0	1
Week 9	TEN 23 at IND 15	23	15	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	IND 21 at WAS 26	26	21	-5	-1	-6	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 10 at PIT 28	28	10	-18	4,5	-13,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 6	BAL 20 at IND 22	20	22	2	-7	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CIN 21 at IND 28	21	28	7	-13,5	-6,5	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	IND 23 at HOU 3	3	23	20	-11	9	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	MIA 21 at IND 13	21	13	-8	-1,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	IND 28 at JAC 25	25	28	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 13 at IND 20	20	13	-7	8,5	1,5	0	0	1	0	0
Week 16	TEN 28 at JAC 10	28	10	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	1	0
Week 15	JAC 29 at CIN 15	15	29	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CLE 21 at JAC 20	21	20	-1	-2,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 25 at JAC 23	25	23	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 19 at DAL 21	21	19	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0

Week 9	PHI 19 at CHI 13	19	13	-6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 7 at MIN 25	25	7	-18	2	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 20 at DET 23	23	20	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	GB 34 at CHI 21	34	21	-13	-1	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 27 at BUF 33	33	27	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 29 at CHI 23	29	23	-6	-1.5	-7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 14 at ATL 13	13	14	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 23 at CHI 27	23	27	4	-4.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 38 at DET 36	38	36	-2	3.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 16	DET 15 at ATL 36	36	15	-21	11	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	TB 23 at DET 20	23	20	-3	9.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DET 20 at ARI 23	23	20	-3	0	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NE 20 at DET 12	20	12	-8	6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 17 at CHI 20	20	17	-3	5.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 31 at DET 14	31	14	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 14 at GB 40	40	14	-26	10	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	DAL 7 at DET 9	7	9	2	-3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 17 at BUF 24	24	17	-7	7.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 20 at DET 23	20	23	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DET 24 at MIN 31	31	24	-7	4.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 21 at DET 26	21	26	5	8.5	13.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	GB 37 at DET 31	37	31	-6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	DET 7 at CAR 31	31	7	-24	3	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	DET 21 at MIA 49	49	21	-28	9	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	GB 17 at NYJ 42	42	17	-25	1.5	-23.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	BUF 0 at GB 10	0	10	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	GB 20 at SF 14	14	20	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIN 22 at GB 26	22	26	4	-9.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CHI 20 at GB 30	20	30	10	-9.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 7 at TB 21	21	7	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 21 at MIN 31	31	21	-10	-7	-17	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 14 at GB 40	14	40	26	-10	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	MIA 10 at GB 24	10	24	14	-4.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 9 at GB 30	9	30	21	-7	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	GB 28 at NE 10	10	28	18	6	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	GB 34 at CHI 21	21	34	13	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	CAR 14 at GB 17	14	17	3	-6.5	-3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	GB 37 at DET 31	31	37	6	-8	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	GB 20 at NO 35	35	20	-15	-1.5	-16.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ATL 34 at GB 37	34	37	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 38 at DET 36	36	38	2	-3.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	MIA 17 at MIN 20	17	20	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 32 at NO 31	31	32	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIN 22 at GB 26	26	22	-4	9.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 30 at MIN 24	30	24	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 17 at NE 24	24	17	-7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 21 at MIN 31	21	31	10	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	NYG 27 at MIN 20	27	20	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIN 24 at TB 38	38	24	-14	7.5	-6.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 7 at MIN 25	7	25	18	-2	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	MIN 7 at NYJ 20	20	7	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DET 24 at MIN 31	24	31	7	-4.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 4	MIN 23 at SEA 48	48	23	-25	3	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 13	JAC 14 at CIN 10	14	10	-4	-1	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TB 16 at CIN 13	16	13	-3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 11	CIN 0 at CLE 18	18	0	-18	4	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 10	TEN 20 at CIN 7	20	7	-13	-1	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 13 at JAC 30	30	13	-17	4	-13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 31 at DET 27	27	31	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 6	CHI 24 at CIN 0	24	0	-24	-1.5	-25.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 5	CLE 14 at CIN 24	14	24	10	-2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 7 at PIT 16	16	7	-9	4	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CIN 14 at SD 28	28	14	-14	6	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BAL 10 at CIN 21	10	21	11	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	NE 17 at CIN 23	17	23	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) < -14.67	(2) < -19.67	(3)			
Week 17	CLE 7 at PIT 28	28	7	-21	5.5	-15.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CLE 41 at TEN 38	38	41	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 15	CLE 7 at GB 30	30	7	-23	7.5	-15.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	JAC 15 at CLE 10	15	10	-5	-2	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CLE 16 at NE 27	27	16	-11	5.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 31 at CLE 15	31	15	-16	1	-15	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 0 at CLE 18	0	18	18	-4	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	CLE 27 at BAL 17	17	27	10	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	CLE 21 at CHI 27	27	21	-6	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 14 at CLE 24	14	24	10	7.5	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	CLE 14 at CIN 24	24	14	-10	2	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SD 16 at CLE 20	16	20	4	3.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CLE 23 at JAC 14	14	23	9	8.5	17.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	DET 14 at CLE 24	14	24	10	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) < -14.67	(2) < -19.67	(3)			
Week 17	CLE 7 at PIT 28	7	28	21	-5.5	15.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PIT 23 at CIN 26	26	23	-3	-8	-11	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DET 14 at PIT 47	14	47	33	-10	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	PIT 26 at BAL 21	21	26	5	-3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYJ 7 at PIT 18	7	18	11	-3.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 16 at PIT 21	16	21	5	-8.5	-3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 34 at TEN 24	24	34	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	JAC 7 at PIT 20	7	20	13	-7.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BAL 13 at PIT 10	13	10	-3	-1	-4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 7	TEN 7 at PIT 34	7	34	27	-2.5	24.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	PIT 17 at TB 10	10	17	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PIT 20 at KC 17	17	20	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 7 at PIT 16	7	16	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PIT 20 at BUF 3	3	20	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 1	PIT 3 at JAC 21	21	3	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) < -14.67	(2) < -19.67	(3)			
Week 17	DEN 10 at IND 29	10	29	19	-2	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 16	IND 17 at STL 42	42	17	-25	12	-13	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	NYJ 29 at IND 28	29	28	-1	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 27 at IND 41	27	41	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 13	IND 6 at MIA 41	41	6	-35	4.5	-30.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 12	IND 27 at BAL 39	39	27	-12	6	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SF 40 at IND 21	40	21	-19	-2.5	-21.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 20 at NO 34	34	20	-14	6	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIA 27 at IND 24	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	IND 30 at BUF 14	14	30	16	-3	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 35 at KC 28	28	35	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 6	NE 38 at IND 17	38	17	-21	-10	-31	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0

Week 4	DAL 21 at OAK 28	28	21	-7	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	DAL 18 at PHI 40	40	18	-22	14	-8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	SD 32 at DAL 21	32	21	-11	4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 10 at DAL 6	10	6	-4	9,5	5,5	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	GB 34 at NYG 25	34	25	-9	3	-6		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NYG 21 at PHI 24	24	21	-3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ARI 13 at NYG 17	13	17	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYG 13 at DAL 20	20	13	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 28 at NYG 10	28	10	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 16 at MIN 28	28	16	-12	2	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYG 17 at ARI 10	10	17	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DAL 24 at NYG 27	24	27	3	-10	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYG 21 at WAS 35	35	21	-14	-8	-22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PHI 10 at NYG 9	10	9	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 14 at STL 15	15	14	-1	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 13 at NYG 21	13	21	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 13 at KC 3	3	13	10	-1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYG 20 at DEN 31	31	20	-11	7	-4	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PHI 17 at TB 13	13	17	4	4	8		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NYG 21 at PHI 24	21	24	3	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PHI 3 at SF 13	13	3	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 20 at WAS 6	6	20	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SD 14 at PHI 24	14	24	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 23 at KC 10	10	23	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	WAS 13 at PHI 3	13	3	-10	-7	-17	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 36 at DAL 3	3	36	33	-7,5	25,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	MIN 17 at PHI 48	17	48	31	-4,5	26,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	PHI 21 at ARI 7	7	21	14	-6,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	OAK 20 at PHI 10	20	10	-10	0	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PHI 10 at NYG 9	9	10	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 21 at PHI 20	21	20	-1	-14	-15	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 18 at PHI 40	18	40	22	-14	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	PHI 27 at SEA 3	3	27	24	-2,5	21,5	1		1		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ARI 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-4	-1		1		1		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 40 at NO 10	10	40	30	5	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	CHI 20 at WAS 15	20	15	-5	0	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 20 at WAS 6	20	6	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	WAS 20 at ARI 10	10	20	10	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DAL 20 at WAS 14	20	14	-6	-8	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	WAS 13 at PHI 3	3	13	10	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	WAS 17 at DEN 10	10	17	7	8,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	SEA 14 at WAS 27	14	27	13	2,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	NYG 21 at WAS 35	21	35	14	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	CAR 14 at WAS 17	14	17	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	WAS 7 at DAL 9	9	7	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	KC 45 at WAS 13	45	13	-32	3	-29	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	WAS 0 at GB 37	37	0	-37	10	-27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	WAS 3 at SD 30	30	3	-27	3	-24	0		0		1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 13 at CHI 33	13	33	20	-4,5	15,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	CHI 24 at DET 0	0	24	24	-5,5	18,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	CHI 20 at WAS 15	15	20	5	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 3 at CHI 27	3	27	24	-1,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Week 13	CHI 7 at GB 17	17	7	-10	4,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	DET 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	CHI 13 at MIN 6	6	13	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	CHI 27 at TB 24	24	27	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	GB 20 at CHI 12	20	12	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	CLE 21 at CHI 27	21	27	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	SF 31 at CHI 37	31	37	6	-2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	CHI 24 at CIN 0	0	24	24	1,5	25,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 5	ARI 13 at CHI 20	13	20	7	-7,5	-0,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	CHI 31 at ATL 3	3	31	28	3	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 2	MIN 10 at CHI 17	10	17	7	3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	CHI 6 at BAL 17	17	6	-11	9,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 10 at DET 15	10	15	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 16	CHI 24 at DET 0	24	0	-24	5,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 15	DET 14 at PIT 47	47	14	-33	10	-23	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 14	MIN 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	DET 12 at TB 15	15	12	-3	7,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	DET 10 at CHI 13	13	10	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	GB 29 at DET 27	29	27	-2	6,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	DET 38 at ARI 45	45	38	-7	1,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	TB 20 at DET 17	20	17	-3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	CIN 31 at DET 27	31	27	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	TEN 27 at DET 24	27	24	-3	4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	DET 26 at MIN 31	31	26	-5	10,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 4	STL 35 at DET 0	35	0	-35	14	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 2	DET 14 at CLE 24	24	14	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	DET 6 at GB 28	28	6	-22	6,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	GB 34 at NYG 25	25	34	9	-3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	MIN 13 at GB 24	13	24	11	-13	-2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	CLE 7 at GB 30	7	30	23	-7,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 14	GB 20 at TEN 26	26	20	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	CHI 7 at GB 17	7	17	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	GB 28 at JAC 21	21	28	7	-4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	GB 29 at DET 27	27	29	2	-6,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	ATL 23 at GB 20	23	20	-3	-10,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	GB 20 at CHI 12	12	20	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	TB 20 at GB 21	20	21	1	-6	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	GB 13 at MIN 35	35	13	-22	-3,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 5	BAL 23 at GB 31	23	31	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	GB 10 at TB 14	14	10	-4	2,5	-1,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	GB 28 at CAR 7	7	28	21	-4	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 2	WAS 0 at GB 37	0	37	37	-10	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 1	DET 6 at GB 28	6	28	22	-6,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 3 at BAL 19	19	3	-16	12,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	MIN 13 at GB 24	24	13	-11	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 15	JAC 33 at MIN 3	33	3	-30	-3	-33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 14	MIN 24 at DET 27	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	TEN 24 at MIN 42	24	42	18	2	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 12	MIN 16 at PIT 21	21	16	-5	8,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	CHI 13 at MIN 6	13	6	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	NYG 16 at MIN 28	16	28	12	-2	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 9	MIN 17 at PHI 48	48	17	-31	4,5	-26,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 7	MIN 14 at TB 41	41	14	-27	3	-24	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	

Week 8	DEN 21 at CIN 31	21	31	10	10,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 7	CIN 0 at PIT 15	15	0	-15	7,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 23 at CIN 14	23	14	-9	9,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 31 at CIN 16	31	16	-15	7	-8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 0 at BAL 37	37	0	-37	12,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	CIN 0 at JAC 13	13	0	-13	13,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	CLE 24 at CIN 7	24	7	-17	-6	-23	0				1				0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 16	TEN 24 at CLE 0	24	0	-24	16	-8		0		0		0		0	
Week 15	PHI 35 at CLE 24	35	24	-11	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	CLE 0 at JAC 48	48	0	-48	15	-33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	CLE 7 at BAL 44	44	7	-37	17	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	CLE 10 at TEN 24	24	10	-14	16	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 11 at CLE 19	11	19	8	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 10	NYG 24 at CLE 3	24	3	-21	10,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	CIN 12 at CLE 3	12	3	-9	3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 0 at PIT 22	22	0	-22	12,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 7	CLE 10 at DEN 44	44	10	-34	12,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 6	CLE 21 at ARI 29	29	21	-8	4,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 12 at CLE 0	12	0	-12	8	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CLE 10 at OAK 36	36	10	-26	10	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	PIT 20 at CLE 23	20	23	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CLE 24 at CIN 7	7	24	17	6	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 1	JAC 27 at CLE 7	27	7	-20	10	-10	0				1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PIT 34 at SD 21	21	34	13	-4	9		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 3 at PIT 24	3	24	21	-2	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 15	PIT 10 at NYG 30	30	10	-20	3,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	OAK 20 at PIT 21	20	21	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 48 at CIN 28	28	48	20	-4,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	JAC 34 at PIT 24	34	24	-10	-3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PHI 26 at PIT 23	26	23	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PIT 7 at TEN 9	9	7	-2	7,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PIT 9 at BAL 6	6	9	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 0 at PIT 22	0	22	22	-12,5	9,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 0 at PIT 15	0	15	15	-7,5	7,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 20 at NYJ 3	3	20	17	7	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	PIT 24 at JAC 13	13	24	11	10,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	TEN 23 at PIT 20	23	20	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PIT 20 at CLE 23	23	20	-3	-2	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	BAL 16 at PIT 0	16	0	-16	3	-13	0				1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 10 at IND 31	10	31	21	-6,5	14,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	IND 20 at MIA 13	13	20	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 20 at IND 44	20	44	24	-7	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	IND 17 at NYJ 27	27	17	-10	2	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 17 at IND 14	17	14	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	IND 24 at GB 26	26	24	-2	-4,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 15 at IND 23	15	23	8	-6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 24 at CHI 27	27	24	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DET 18 at IND 30	18	30	12	-7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 23 at IND 30	23	30	7	-8,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 37 at SEA 24	24	37	13	-6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	IND 16 at NE 24	24	16	-8	-3,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	IND 18 at BUF 16	16	18	2	2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 14 at IND 43	14	43	29	-3,5	25,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Week 14	KC 24 at NE 30	30	24	-6	0	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 16 at SD 17	17	16	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 21 at KC 17	21	17	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 7 at SF 21	21	7	-14	-4	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 31 at OAK 49	49	31	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 24 at SEA 19	19	24	5	-3.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	STL 34 at KC 54	34	54	20	7	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	OAK 20 at KC 17	20	17	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SEA 17 at KC 24	17	24	7	-4.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 23 at DEN 22	22	23	1	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 10 at KC 42	10	42	32	-6	26	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	KC 14 at TEN 17	17	14	-3	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	IND 27 at KC 14	27	14	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	CAR 9 at OAK 52	9	52	43	-10.5	32.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	OAK 24 at SEA 27	27	24	-3	-7	-10	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYJ 7 at OAK 31	7	31	24	-3.5	20.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	OAK 20 at PIT 21	21	20	-1	-3	-4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 14 at OAK 41	14	41	27	-12	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	OAK 31 at NO 22	22	31	9	-3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 24 at DEN 27	27	24	-3	3.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 31 at OAK 49	31	49	18	-3	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	OAK 15 at SD 13	13	15	2	-7	-5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 3 at OAK 31	3	31	28	-7	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	OAK 20 at KC 17	17	20	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 34 at SF 28	28	34	6	-4.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CLE 10 at OAK 36	10	36	26	-10	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	DEN 33 at OAK 24	33	24	-9	-3	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 38 at IND 31	31	38	7	6.5	13.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	SD 6 at OAK 9	6	9	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	PIT 34 at SD 21	34	21	-13	4	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	SD 22 at CAR 30	30	22	-8	7.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 3 at BAL 24	24	3	-21	15	-6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	SF 45 at SD 17	45	17	-28	3	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	KC 16 at SD 17	16	17	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SD 37 at DEN 38	38	37	-1	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIA 17 at SD 7	17	7	-10	5.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 15 at SEA 17	17	15	-2	3.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	OAK 15 at SD 13	15	13	-2	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SD 24 at BUF 27	27	24	-3	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DEN 21 at SD 7	21	7	-14	7	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 31 at STL 57	57	31	-26	17	-9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 4	SEA 20 at SD 12	20	12	-8	2.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 10 at KC 42	42	10	-32	6	-26	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	NO 28 at SD 27	28	27	-1	-5.5	-6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SD 6 at OAK 9	9	6	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	DAL 0 at TEN 31	31	0	-31	14	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYG 17 at DAL 13	17	13	-4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 13 at DAL 32	13	32	19	6.5	25.5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 14	DAL 7 at TB 27	27	7	-20	10.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	MIN 27 at DAL 15	27	15	-12	7.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DAL 0 at BAL 27	27	0	-27	8	-19	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	CIN 6 at DAL 23	6	23	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 23 at DAL 17	23	17	-6	-3.5	-9.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Week 8	ARI 7 at DAL 48	7	48	41	-6.5	34.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	DAL 14 at NYG 19	19	14	-5	3.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 16 at CAR 13	13	16	3	6.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 41 at DAL 24	41	24	-17	-6.5	-23.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 27 at WAS 21	21	27	6	10.5	16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	DAL 31 at ARI 32	32	31	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	PHI 41 at DAL 14	41	14	-27	-6	-33	0				1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 25 at NYG 28	25	28	3	-3.5	-0.5			0		0		0		0
Week 16	NYG 17 at DAL 13	13	17	4	-7	-3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 10 at NYG 30	10	30	20	-3.5	16.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	NYG 9 at WAS 7	7	9	2	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYG 31 at ARI 7	7	31	24	-7.5	16.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	DET 31 at NYG 21	31	21	-10	-6.5	-16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 38 at NYG 24	38	24	-14	1.5	-12.5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 24 at CLE 3	3	24	21	-10.5	10.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PHI 7 at NYG 24	7	24	17	-3.5	13.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	DAL 14 at NYG 19	14	19	5	-3.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYG 13 at ATL 6	6	13	7	-1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 14 at TEN 28	28	14	-14	4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 16 at NYG 6	16	6	-10	-2	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 14 at CHI 7	7	14	7	1.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 33 at PHI 18	18	33	15	3	18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	ARI 16 at NYG 21	16	21	5	-7	-2	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 7 at PHI 16	7	16	9	-10.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PHI 35 at CLE 24	24	35	11	-14	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TEN 15 at PHI 13	15	13	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 23 at WAS 20	20	23	3	6.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 9 at PHI 34	9	34	25	-8	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	PHI 26 at PIT 23	23	26	3	3.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	PHI 7 at NYG 24	24	7	-17	3.5	-13.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 9 at PHI 13	9	13	4	-7	-3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 33 at ARI 14	14	33	19	-2.5	16.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	ATL 10 at PHI 38	10	38	28	-3	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	PHI 21 at NO 7	7	21	14	1.5	15.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	PHI 3 at GB 6	6	3	-3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 33 at PHI 18	33	18	-15	-3	-18	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PHI 41 at DAL 14	14	41	27	6	33	1		1		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ARI 3 at WAS 20	3	20	17	-7	10			0		0		1		1
Week 16	WAS 3 at PIT 24	24	3	-21	2	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	WAS 13 at DAL 32	32	13	-19	-6.5	-25.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYG 9 at WAS 7	9	7	-2	-6	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 23 at WAS 20	23	20	-3	-6.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	WAS 33 at STL 20	20	33	13	6	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	WAS 15 at ARI 16	16	15	-1	-9.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 27 at WAS 21	27	21	-6	-3.5	-9.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	WAS 35 at JAC 16	16	35	19	-4	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	BAL 3 at WAS 10	3	10	7	-3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TB 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 16 at NYG 6	6	16	10	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 27 at WAS 21	27	21	-6	-10.5	-16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 10 at DET 15	15	10	-5	-5.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CAR 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-10	-7	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)

Week 17	CHI 23 at DET 20	20	23	3	9	12	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 16	CHI 0 at SF 17	17	0	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 15	NE 17 at CHI 24	17	24	7	-2	5	0	0	0	0	1	0
Week 14	GB 28 at CHI 6	28	6	-22	2,5	-19,5	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 12	TB 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	1	0
Week 11	CHI 3 at BUF 20	20	3	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 10	IND 24 at CHI 27	24	27	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 9 at PHI 13	13	9	-4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIN 28 at CHI 16	28	16	-12	7	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NO 31 at CHI 10	31	10	-21	-3,5	-24,5	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 5	CHI 27 at GB 24	24	27	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DET 21 at CHI 14	21	14	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 14 at CHI 7	14	7	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 0 at TB 41	41	0	-41	7	-34	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 1	CHI 27 at MIN 30	30	27	-3	4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)	
Week 17	CHI 23 at DET 20	23	20	-3	-9	-12	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	DET 10 at NYJ 7	7	10	3	6,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	DET 13 at GB 26	26	13	-13	4	-9	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	DET 17 at MIN 24	24	17	-7	8,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	NE 9 at DET 34	9	34	25	-6,5	18,5	1	0	1	0	0	
Week 12	DET 31 at NYG 21	21	31	10	6,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	ATL 10 at DET 13	10	13	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	MIA 23 at DET 8	23	8	-15	-2,5	-17,5	0	0	0	1	0	
Week 9	DET 18 at IND 30	30	18	-12	7	-5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	DET 28 at TB 14	14	28	14	8,5	22,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	GB 24 at DET 31	24	31	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	MIN 31 at DET 24	31	24	-7	1,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	DET 21 at CHI 14	14	21	7	2,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 3	TB 31 at DET 10	31	10	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	1	0	
Week 2	WAS 10 at DET 15	10	15	5	5,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	DET 14 at NO 10	10	14	4	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)	
Week 16	GB 33 at MIN 28	28	33	5	8,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	DET 13 at GB 26	13	26	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	GB 28 at CHI 6	6	28	22	-2,5	19,5	1	0	1	0	0	
Week 13	GB 14 at CAR 31	31	14	-17	-2,5	-19,5	0	0	0	1	0	
Week 12	IND 24 at GB 26	24	26	2	4,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	GB 15 at TB 20	20	15	-5	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	MIN 20 at GB 26	20	26	6	3,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	GB 20 at MIA 28	28	20	-8	3,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	SF 28 at GB 31	28	31	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	GB 24 at DET 31	31	24	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	CHI 27 at GB 24	27	24	-3	-6	-9	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 4	GB 29 at ARI 3	3	29	26	2,5	28,5	1	0	1	0	0	
Week 3	PHI 3 at GB 6	3	6	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	GB 18 at BUF 27	27	18	-9	6,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	NYJ 20 at GB 16	20	16	-4	-2,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)	
Week 17	MIN 10 at IND 31	31	10	-21	6,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	GB 33 at MIN 28	33	28	-5	-8,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	MIN 29 at STL 40	40	29	-11	3,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	DET 17 at MIN 24	17	24	7	-8,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	MIN 27 at DAL 15	15	27	12	-7,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	CAR 17 at MIN 31	17	31	14	-9,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	ARI 14 at MIN 31	14	31	17	-13,5	3,5	1	0	0	0	0	

Week 10	MIN 20 at GB 26	26	20	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	MIN 13 at TB 41	41	13	-28	3	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 8	BUF 27 at MIN 31	27	31	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	MIN 28 at CHI 16	16	28	12	-7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	TB 23 at MIN 30	23	30	7	-2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	MIN 31 at DET 24	24	31	7	-1,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	MIN 21 at NE 13	13	21	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	MIA 7 at MIN 13	7	13	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	CHI 27 at MIN 30	27	30	3	-4,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	KC 13 at ATL 29	13	29	16	4,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 16	ATL 7 at NO 23	23	7	-16	10	-6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 14	SEA 30 at ATL 10	30	10	-20	-1	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 13	ATL 14 at OAK 41	41	14	-27	12	-15	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 12	ATL 6 at SF 16	16	6	-10	6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	ATL 10 at DET 13	13	10	-3	7,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	TB 27 at ATL 14	27	14	-13	8,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	CAR 12 at ATL 13	12	13	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	NO 21 at ATL 19	21	19	-2	2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 7	ATL 29 at STL 45	45	29	-16	17,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 6	NYG 13 at ATL 6	13	6	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	ATL 10 at PHI 38	38	10	-28	3	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 4	STL 41 at ATL 20	41	20	-21	7	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 3	ATL 15 at CAR 10	10	15	5	5,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 2	ATL 14 at DEN 42	42	14	-28	4	-24	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 1	SF 28 at ATL 36	28	36	8	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CAR 9 at OAK 52	52	9	-43	10,5	-34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	SD 22 at CAR 30	22	30	8	-7,5	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 15	CAR 14 at KC 15	15	14	-1	2,5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	STL 3 at CAR 16	3	16	13	8	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 13	GB 14 at CAR 31	14	31	17	2,5	48	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 12	CAR 17 at MIN 31	31	17	-14	9,5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	NO 20 at CAR 10	20	10	-10	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	CAR 27 at STL 24	24	27	3	13,5	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 9	CAR 12 at ATL 13	13	12	-1	-3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	SF 16 at CAR 34	16	34	18	-3	52	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 7	CAR 6 at NO 24	24	6	-18	1,5	-12	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Week 6	SEA 3 at CAR 26	3	26	23	-3,5	49	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 5	DAL 16 at CAR 13	16	13	-3	-6,5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	ATL 15 at CAR 10	15	10	-5	-5,5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	CAR 38 at SF 22	22	38	16	-3	54	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 1	CAR 17 at WAS 20	20	17	-3	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	STL 26 at NO 21	26	21	-5	4	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	ATL 7 at NO 23	7	23	16	-10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	NO 31 at SF 27	27	31	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 14	DEN 38 at NO 23	38	23	-15	-1	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 13	NO 31 at STL 24	24	31	7	13,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 12	OAK 31 at NO 22	31	22	-9	3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	NO 20 at CAR 10	10	20	10	1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	SF 15 at NO 31	15	31	16	-5	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	NO 21 at ARI 10	10	21	11	-6,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	NO 21 at ATL 19	19	21	2	-2,5	-0,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	CAR 6 at NO 24	6	24	18	-1,5	16,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 6	NO 31 at CHI 10	10	31	21	3,5	24,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	

Week 15	SEA 24 at DEN 31	31	24	-7	10,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SEA 30 at ATL 10	10	30	20	1	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	DEN 38 at SEA 31	38	31	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SEA 28 at JAC 21	21	28	7	8,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	SD 15 at SEA 17	15	17	2	-3,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 24 at SEA 19	24	19	-5	3,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 3 at OAK 31	31	3	-28	7	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 7	IND 37 at SEA 24	37	24	-13	6	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 3 at CAR 26	26	3	-23	3,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	SEA 17 at KC 24	24	17	-7	4,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SEA 20 at SD 12	12	20	8	-2,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 10 at SEA 20	10	20	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	STL 37 at SEA 34	37	34	-3	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	SEA 0 at MIA 23	23	0	-23	3	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	STL 26 at NO 21	21	26	5	-4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	STL 35 at TB 38	38	35	-3	-2,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 29 at STL 40	29	40	11	-3,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 3 at CAR 16	16	3	-13	-8	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 31 at STL 24	31	24	-7	-13,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	WAS 33 at STL 20	33	20	-13	-6	-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 38 at NYG 24	24	38	14	-1,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CAR 27 at STL 24	27	24	-3	-13,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 34 at SF 24	24	34	10	-6,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 8	STL 34 at KC 54	54	34	-20	-7	-27	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 7	ATL 29 at STL 45	29	45	16	-17,5	-1,5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 31 at STL 57	31	57	26	-17	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	STL 41 at ATL 20	20	41	21	-7	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	STL 37 at SEA 34	34	37	3	-8	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DEN 36 at STL 41	36	41	5	-6,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 00/01							72	27	45	18	71	36	44	16	75
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	IND 6 at BUF 31	6	31	25	2,5	27,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 31 at ARI 21	21	31	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYG 19 at BUF 17	19	17	-2	-8	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 7 at BUF 17	7	17	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BUF 7 at NYJ 17	17	7	-10	-2,5	-12,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 3 at BUF 23	3	23	20	-3	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	BUF 34 at WAS 17	17	34	17	4	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	BUF 13 at BAL 10	10	13	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BUF 16 at SEA 26	26	16	-10	2,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 20 at BUF 14	20	14	-6	-4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PIT 21 at BUF 24	21	24	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	BUF 23 at MIA 18	18	23	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PHI 0 at BUF 26	0	26	26	-12	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	NYJ 3 at BUF 17	3	17	14	-3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	BUF 14 at IND 31	31	14	-17	-3	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIA 10 at WAS 21	21	10	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYJ 38 at MIA 31	38	31	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 9 at MIA 12	9	12	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 20 at NYJ 28	28	20	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	IND 37 at MIA 34	37	34	-3	-2	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIA 0 at DAL 20	20	0	-20	1	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	NE 17 at MIA 27	17	27	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	MIA 3 at BUF 23	23	3	-20	3	-17	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 9	TEN 0 at MIA 17	0	17	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	MIA 16 at OAK 9	9	16	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 13 at MIA 16	13	16	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 31 at NE 30	30	31	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 34 at IND 31	31	34	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	BUF 23 at MIA 18	23	18	-5	-6	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	ARI 16 at MIA 19	16	19	3	-9.5	-6.5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIA 38 at DEN 21	21	38	17	5.5	22.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 3 at NE 20	3	20	17	2.5	19.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 15	NE 9 at PHI 24	24	9	-15	-4.5	-19.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NE 15 at IND 20	20	15	-5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 6 at NE 13	6	13	7	-2.5	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 7 at BUF 17	17	7	-10	4.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 17 at MIA 27	27	17	-10	4.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYJ 24 at NE 17	24	17	-7	-6	-13	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 27 at ARI 3	3	27	24	-3	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	DEN 23 at NE 24	23	24	1	-3.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 31 at NE 30	31	30	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NE 14 at KC 16	16	14	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 14 at NE 16	14	16	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	IND 28 at NE 31	28	31	3	-3.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 30 at NYJ 28	28	30	2	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 9 at NYJ 19	9	19	10	-1.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYJ 38 at MIA 31	31	38	7	3.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYJ 22 at DAL 21	21	22	1	5.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 20 at NYJ 28	20	28	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYJ 28 at NYG 41	41	28	-13	-3	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BUF 7 at NYJ 17	7	17	10	2.5	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYJ 24 at NE 17	17	24	7	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	ARI 7 at NYJ 12	7	12	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYJ 23 at OAK 24	24	23	-1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	JAC 16 at NYJ 6	16	6	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYJ 21 at DEN 13	13	21	8	5.5	13.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	WAS 27 at NYJ 20	27	20	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYJ 3 at BUF 17	17	3	-14	3.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 30 at NYJ 28	30	28	-2	-8	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 3 at NE 20	20	3	-17	-2.5	-19.5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CIN 0 at BAL 22	0	22	22	-7	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	NO 8 at BAL 31	8	31	23	-9.5	13.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	BAL 31 at PIT 24	24	31	7	1.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TEN 14 at BAL 41	14	41	27	3	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	BAL 34 at CIN 31	31	34	3	-5.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BAL 3 at JAC 6	6	3	-3	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 41 at CLE 9	9	41	32	-3.5	28.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	BUF 13 at BAL 10	13	10	-3	3.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	KC 35 at BAL 8	35	8	-27	1	-26	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	BAL 11 at TEN 14	14	11	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	BAL 19 at ATL 13	13	19	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CLE 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	-12.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	BAL 10 at STL 27	27	10	-17	0	-17	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 7 at JAC 24	24	7	-17	10	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CIN 0 at BAL 22	22	0	-22	7	-15	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 7	CIN 10 at IND 31	10	31	21	-11	10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	MIA 34 at IND 31	34	31	-3	0	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	IND 27 at SD 19	19	27	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	IND 28 at NE 31	31	28	-3	3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	BUF 14 at IND 31	14	31	17	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CIN 7 at JAC 24	7	24	17	-10	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 16	JAC 14 at TEN 41	41	14	-27	-3	-30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 15	JAC 24 at CLE 14	14	24	10	-14	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	DEN 24 at JAC 27	24	27	3	-9,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	PIT 6 at JAC 20	6	20	14	-10,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	NO 23 at JAC 41	23	41	18	-13	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	BAL 3 at JAC 6	3	6	3	-13	-10	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	JAC 30 at ATL 7	7	30	23	-6,5	16,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 8	JAC 41 at CIN 10	10	41	31	-11,5	19,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 6	CLE 7 at JAC 24	7	24	17	-17,5	-0,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	JAC 16 at NYJ 6	6	16	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	JAC 17 at PIT 3	3	17	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	TEN 20 at JAC 19	20	19	-1	-9,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	JAC 22 at CAR 20	20	22	2	-9,5	-7,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	SF 3 at JAC 41	3	41	38	-6,5	31,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TEN 47 at PIT 36	36	47	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	JAC 14 at TEN 41	14	41	27	3	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 15	ATL 17 at TEN 30	17	30	13	-10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	OAK 14 at TEN 21	14	21	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 13	TEN 14 at BAL 41	41	14	-27	-3	-30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 12	TEN 33 at CLE 21	21	33	12	-9,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	PIT 10 at TEN 16	10	16	6	-4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	TEN 24 at CIN 14	14	24	10	-9,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 9	TEN 0 at MIA 17	17	0	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 8	STL 21 at TEN 24	21	24	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	BAL 11 at TEN 14	11	14	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	TEN 22 at SF 24	24	22	-2	1,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	TEN 20 at JAC 19	19	20	1	9,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	CLE 9 at TEN 26	9	26	17	-14,5	2,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	CIN 35 at TEN 36	35	36	1	-10	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SD 12 at DEN 6	12	6	-6	-7	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	DEN 17 at DET 7	7	17	10	4,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 15	SEA 30 at DEN 36	30	36	6	-1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	DEN 24 at JAC 27	27	24	-3	9,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	KC 16 at DEN 10	16	10	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	OAK 21 at DEN 27	21	27	6	-2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	DEN 17 at SEA 20	20	17	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	DEN 33 at SD 17	17	33	16	-1	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 7	DEN 23 at NE 24	24	23	-1	3,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	GB 10 at DEN 31	10	31	21	3,5	24,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 5	DEN 16 at OAK 13	13	16	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	NYJ 21 at DEN 13	21	13	-8	-5,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	DEN 10 at KC 26	26	10	-16	-4	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 1	MIA 38 at DEN 21	38	21	-17	-5,5	-22,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	OAK 41 at KC 38	41	38	-3	-4,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	KC 14 at SEA 23	23	14	-9	3	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	PIT 19 at KC 35	19	35	16	-8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Week 15	CIN 26 at IND 39	39	26	-13	4	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 33 at CIN 20	33	20	-13	5,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 34 at CIN 17	34	17	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	BAL 20 at CIN 13	20	13	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 3 at MIN 24	24	3	-21	11	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	CIN 11 at JAC 24	24	11	-13	10,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 33 at CIN 26	33	26	-7	11,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 8	CIN 10 at OAK 27	27	10	-17	2,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 14 at TEN 44	44	14	-30	3	-27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 6	PIT 20 at CIN 25	20	25	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 24 at BAL 31	31	24	-7	4,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 34 at DET 28	28	34	6	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TEN 23 at CIN 14	23	14	-9	1	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	PIT 3 at JAC 21	21	3	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CIN 25 at PIT 24	25	24	-1	-10,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 3 at TB 16	16	3	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NE 23 at PIT 9	23	9	-14	-6	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 16 at DET 19	19	16	-3	-2	-5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 15 at PIT 30	15	30	15	-3	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 14 at TEN 23	23	14	-9	1,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	GB 20 at PIT 27	20	27	7	3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 41 at PIT 31	41	31	-10	-5,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 20 at KC 13	13	20	7	6,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	BAL 6 at PIT 16	6	16	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 20 at CIN 25	25	20	-5	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PIT 0 at MIA 21	21	0	-21	2,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	CHI 12 at PIT 17	12	17	5	-11	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 20 at BAL 13	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	CAR 27 at IND 19	27	19	-8	-6,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	IND 23 at SEA 27	27	23	-4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CIN 26 at IND 39	26	39	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 21 at ATL 28	28	21	-7	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	IND 31 at BAL 38	38	31	-7	6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	IND 11 at BUF 34	34	11	-23	7	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	NYJ 23 at IND 24	23	24	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 14 at MIA 27	27	14	-13	9	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 21 at IND 16	21	16	-5	5,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 31 at SF 34	34	31	-3	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	BUF 31 at IND 24	31	24	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 12 at IND 17	12	17	5	-1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 19 at IND 13	19	13	-6	0	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	IND 6 at NYJ 44	44	6	-38	8,5	-29,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	IND 6 at NE 29	29	6	-23	10,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	MIA 24 at IND 15	24	15	-9	4,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)			
Week 17	PIT 3 at JAC 21	3	21	18	-3	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 16	JAC 10 at MIN 50	50	10	-40	13,5	-26,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	TEN 16 at JAC 13	16	13	-3	-4	-7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DET 22 at JAC 37	22	37	15	-7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 34 at CIN 17	17	34	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 12	JAC 15 at PIT 30	30	15	-15	3	-12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	TB 24 at JAC 29	24	29	5	-6,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 11 at JAC 24	11	24	13	-10,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 45 at BAL 19	19	45	26	-3,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Week 8	JAC 24 at DEN 37	37	24	-13	8	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	JAC 16 at BUF 17	17	16	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	JAC 27 at TEN 22	22	27	5	-2,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	BAL 10 at JAC 24	10	24	14	-6,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	KC 16 at JAC 21	16	21	5	-4,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	JAC 24 at CHI 23	23	24	1	-10	-9	0				0			0	
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 26 at TEN 16	26	16	-10	7	-3		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	TEN 22 at GB 30	30	22	-8	6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 16 at JAC 13	13	16	3	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 14 at TEN 16	14	16	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TEN 18 at SEA 20	20	18	-2	2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 12	NYJ 24 at TEN 3	24	3	-21	-1	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	PIT 14 at TEN 23	14	23	9	-1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TEN 31 at TB 22	22	31	9	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 41 at PIT 31	31	41	10	5,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	CHI 23 at TEN 20	23	20	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 14 at TEN 44	14	44	30	-3	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	TEN 12 at BAL 8	8	12	4	3,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 27 at TEN 22	27	22	-5	2,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TEN 16 at NE 27	27	16	-11	6,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SD 13 at TEN 7	13	7	-6	-8	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TEN 23 at CIN 14	14	23	9	-1	8	0				0			0	
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 21 at DEN 28	21	28	7	-10,5	-3,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	DEN 21 at MIA 31	31	21	-10	-5	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DEN 16 at NYG 20	20	16	-4	-13	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	KC 31 at DEN 35	31	35	4	-13,5	-9,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DEN 31 at SD 16	16	31	15	-13,5	1,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	OAK 14 at DEN 40	14	40	26	-11,5	14,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	DEN 30 at KC 7	7	30	23	-4	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	SD 10 at DEN 27	10	27	17	-16	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 33 at CIN 26	26	33	7	-11,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	JAC 24 at DEN 37	24	37	13	-8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DEN 21 at SEA 16	16	21	5	-6	-1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PHI 16 at DEN 41	16	41	25	-14,5	10,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DEN 38 at WAS 16	16	38	22	-6	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	DEN 34 at OAK 17	17	34	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DAL 23 at DEN 42	23	42	19	-7	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 21 at DEN 27	21	27	6	-8,5	-2,5	0				0			0	
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	KC 31 at OAK 24	24	31	7	3	10		0		0		1		1	
Week 16	KC 7 at NYG 28	28	7	-21	1,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	DAL 17 at KC 20	17	20	3	-2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	KC 31 at DEN 35	35	31	-4	13,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 24 at KC 34	24	34	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	KC 37 at SD 38	38	37	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 30 at KC 7	30	7	-23	4	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	KC 12 at SEA 24	24	12	-12	3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYJ 20 at KC 17	20	17	-3	-4,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 20 at KC 13	20	13	-7	-6,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	KC 10 at NE 40	40	10	-30	3	-27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	SEA 6 at KC 17	6	17	11	-4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 24 at PHI 21	21	24	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 7 at KC 23	7	23	16	-10,5	5,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	KC 16 at JAC 21	21	16	-5	4,5	-0,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Week 1	OAK 8 at KC 28	8	28	20	-7,5	12,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK lIne	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	KC 31 at OAK 24	31	24	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 16	OAK 17 at SD 10	10	17	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 15	OAK 21 at BUF 44	44	21	-23	8,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	MIA 27 at OAK 17	27	17	-10	2,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	WAS 29 at OAK 19	29	19	-10	-7	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	OAK 14 at DEN 40	40	14	-26	11,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	SEA 17 at OAK 20	17	20	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	OAK 10 at BAL 13	13	10	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	OAK 31 at SEA 18	18	31	13	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	CIN 10 at OAK 27	10	27	17	-2,5	14,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	SD 6 at OAK 7	6	7	1	-5,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	OAK 23 at ARI 20	20	23	3	2,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	OAK 13 at DAL 12	12	13	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 3	DEN 34 at OAK 17	34	17	-17	7	-10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 17 at OAK 20	17	20	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	OAK 8 at KC 28	28	8	-20	7,5	-12,5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	SD 13 at ARI 16	16	13	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	OAK 17 at SD 10	17	10	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 17 at SEA 38	38	17	-21	7	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	SD 20 at WAS 24	24	20	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DEN 31 at SD 16	31	16	-15	13,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	KC 37 at SD 38	37	38	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 13 at SD 14	13	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 10 at DEN 27	27	10	-17	16	-1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SD 6 at OAK 7	7	6	-1	5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 12 at IND 17	17	12	-5	1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 34 at SD 16	34	16	-18	1,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 7 at KC 23	23	7	-16	10,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SD 13 at TEN 7	7	13	6	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	WAS 7 at DAL 23	7	23	16	1,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 9 at DAL 13	9	13	4	-10,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 17 at KC 20	20	17	-3	2,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DAL 3 at NO 22	22	3	-19	-6,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 46 at DAL 36	46	36	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 22 at DAL 30	22	30	8	-5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 35 at ARI 28	28	35	7	-4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 6 at DAL 16	6	16	10	-8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 34 at PHI 0	0	34	34	-7	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	DAL 12 at CHI 13	13	12	-1	-3	-4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 31 at WAS 10	10	31	21	1,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	OAK 13 at DAL 12	13	12	-1	-5	-6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 31 at NYG 7	7	31	24	4	28	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 2	DAL 23 at DEN 42	42	23	-19	7	-12	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 10 at DAL 38	10	38	28	-5,5	22,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	NYG 20 at PHI 10	10	20	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	KC 7 at NYG 28	7	28	21	-1,5	19,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	DEN 16 at NYG 20	16	20	4	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	NYG 23 at ARI 19	19	23	4	4,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	NYG 7 at SF 31	31	7	-24	13,5	-10,5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	PHI 0 at NYG 20	0	20	20	-6	14	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 11	GB 37 at NYG 3	37	3	-34	7	-27	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 12	CAR 24 at STL 20	24	20	-4	-1,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 3 at NO 24	24	3	-21	2,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	STL 20 at CHI 12	12	20	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 9	STL 15 at ATL 37	37	15	-22	7	-15	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 8	SF 28 at STL 10	28	10	-18	9,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 7	STL 0 at MIA 14	14	0	-14	7	-7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYJ 10 at STL 30	10	30	20	3	23	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	ARI 20 at STL 17	20	17	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	STL 34 at BUF 33	33	34	1	4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 38 at STL 31	38	31	-7	7,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 24 at STL 17	24	17	-7	-4	-11	0							

Total98/99							65	34	48	26	65	35	48	28	61
------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BUF 21 at GB 31	31	21	-10	11	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	JAC 20 at BUF 14	20	14	-6	4,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 3 at CHI 20	20	3	-17	-1	-18	0	0	0	1	0
Week 14	NYJ 10 at BUF 20	10	20	10	1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	BUF 14 at TEN 31	31	14	-17	3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 12	BUF 13 at MIA 30	30	13	-17	6	-11	0	0	0	1	0
Week 11	NE 31 at BUF 10	31	10	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	1	0
Week 10	MIA 6 at BUF 9	6	9	3	-1,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 23 at BUF 20	23	20	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BUF 9 at IND 6	6	9	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	BUF 6 at NE 33	33	6	-27	8	-19	0	0	0	1	0
Week 6	DET 13 at BUF 22	13	22	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	IND 35 at BUF 37	35	37	2	-7	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BUF 16 at KC 22	22	16	-6	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 28 at NYJ 22	22	28	6	4,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	MIN 34 at BUF 13	34	13	-21	-2,5	-23,5	0			1	1

Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NE 14 at MIA 12	14	12	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	MIA 0 at IND 41	41	0	-41	-3,5	-44,5	0	1	0	0	1
Week 14	MIA 34 at OAK 16	16	34	18	-2	16	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 24 at NE 27	27	24	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 13 at MIA 30	13	30	17	-6	11	1	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 17 at MIA 24	17	24	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 6 at BUF 9	9	6	-3	1,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 36 at MIA 33	36	33	-3	-8,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIA 24 at BAL 13	13	24	11	-1	10	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIA 31 at NYJ 20	20	31	11	3,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIA 21 at TB 31	31	21	-10	3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	MIA 18 at GB 23	23	18	-5	12,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TEN 13 at MIA 16	13	16	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NE 14 at MIA 12	12	14	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PIT 24 at NE 21	24	21	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NE 26 at JAC 20	20	26	6	6,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 17 at NE 20	17	20	3	-11,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 24 at NE 27	24	27	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 7 at TB 27	27	7	-20	-1,5	-21,5	0	1	0	1	1
Week 11	NE 31 at BUF 10	10	31	21	-3	18	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	NE 18 at MIN 23	23	18	-5	-1,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 28 at NE 10	28	10	-18	-1,5	-19,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 8	NE 19 at NYJ 24	24	19	-5	-3,5	-8,5	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	BUF 6 at NE 33	6	33	27	-8	19	1	0	1	0	1
Week 6	NE 13 at DEN 34	34	13	-21	5,5	-15,5	0	1	0	1	0

Week 4	CHI 3 at NE 31	3	31	28	-12,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	NYJ 24 at NE 27	24	27	3	-10	-7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 31 at IND 6	6	31	25	-5	20	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	SD 7 at NE 41	7	41	34	-8	26	1		1		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYJ 10 at DET 13	13	10	-3	7,5	4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	TB 0 at NYJ 31	0	31	31	2	33	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	IND 22 at NYJ 14	22	14	-8	-6	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYJ 10 at BUF 20	20	10	-10	-1,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 21 at NYJ 23	21	23	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYJ 23 at CHI 15	15	23	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 17 at MIA 24	24	17	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BAL 16 at NYJ 19	16	19	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 19 at NYJ 24	19	24	5	3,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIA 31 at NYJ 20	31	20	-11	-3,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYJ 16 at IND 12	12	16	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYJ 31 at CIN 14	14	31	17	4	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	OAK 22 at NYJ 23	22	23	1	-1,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 24 at NE 27	27	24	-3	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 28 at NYJ 22	28	22	-6	-4,5	-10,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 41 at SEA 3	3	41	38	4	42	1		1		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 14 at CIN 16	16	14	-2	6,5	4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	TEN 19 at BAL 21	19	21	2	2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SEA 24 at BAL 31	24	31	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 27 at JAC 29	29	27	-2	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 16 at BAL 13	16	13	-3	-5	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 10 at BAL 10	10	10	0	-2,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 0 at PIT 37	37	0	-37	7	-30	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 10	BAL 16 at NYJ 19	19	16	-3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 20 at WAS 17	17	20	3	5,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIA 24 at BAL 13	24	13	-11	1	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 42 at BAL 34	42	34	-8	1,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 17 at SD 21	21	17	-4	2,5	-1,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	BAL 36 at TEN 10	10	36	26	3,5	29,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	BAL 24 at NYG 23	23	24	1	2,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 10 at BAL 23	10	23	13	1,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	JAC 28 at BAL 27	28	27	-1	3	2	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 14 at CIN 16	16	14	-2	-6,5	-4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	DAL 24 at CIN 31	24	31	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 14 at CIN 41	14	41	27	2,5	29,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	CIN 42 at PHI 44	44	42	-2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 26 at CIN 31	26	31	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 3 at PIT 20	20	3	-17	8,5	-8,5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 28 at IND 13	13	28	15	-3	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 31 at CIN 38	31	38	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 27 at NYG 29	29	27	-2	5,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 26 at CIN 10	26	10	-16	4,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 7 at TEN 30	30	7	-23	1,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 6	CIN 13 at JAC 21	21	13	-8	7	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYJ 31 at CIN 14	14	31	17	-4	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 20 at DEN 38	38	20	-18	11	-7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 10 at BAL 23	23	10	-13	-1,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 21 at CIN 24	21	24	3	-8,5	-5,5	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)

Week 17	PIT 6 at TEN 16	16	6	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PIT 24 at NE 21	21	24	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DEN 24 at PIT 35	24	35	11	-1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 20 at PHI 23	23	20	-3	-3	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 3 at PIT 20	3	20	17	-8,5	8,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 0 at PIT 37	0	37	37	-7	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Week 9	JAC 17 at PIT 23	17	23	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 26 at CIN 10	10	26	16	-4,5	11,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 22 at PIT 24	22	24	2	-11,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 42 at BAL 34	34	42	8	-1,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TEN 24 at PIT 37	24	37	13	-6,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PIT 21 at JAC 30	30	21	-9	4	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 13 at PIT 14	13	14	1	-6,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 37 at PIT 7	37	7	-30	1	-29	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	IND 28 at MIN 39	39	28	-11	4,5	-6,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	MIA 0 at IND 41	0	41	41	3,5	44,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Week 15	IND 22 at NYJ 14	14	22	8	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	IND 17 at NE 20	20	17	-3	11,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 13	IND 10 at DET 32	32	10	-22	8,5	-13,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 12	GB 38 at IND 41	38	41	3	12,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 11	CIN 28 at IND 13	28	13	-15	3	-12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 10	TB 31 at IND 28	31	28	-3	5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 9	IND 19 at SD 35	35	19	-16	6	-10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 8	BUF 9 at IND 6	9	6	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 22 at PIT 24	24	22	-2	11,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYJ 16 at IND 12	16	12	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	IND 35 at BUF 37	37	35	-2	7	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 3	SEA 31 at IND 3	31	3	-28	-2,5	-30,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	NE 31 at IND 6	31	6	-25	5	-20	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	JAC 20 at OAK 9	9	20	11	-4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	JAC 20 at BUF 14	14	20	6	-4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NE 26 at JAC 20	26	20	-6	-6,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 27 at JAC 29	27	29	2	-8	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 26 at CIN 31	31	26	-5	-5	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 9 at JAC 17	9	17	8	-5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 10 at JAC 24	10	24	14	-6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	JAC 30 at TEN 24	24	30	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 17 at PIT 23	23	17	-6	4	-2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 21 at JAC 38	21	38	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	CIN 13 at JAC 21	13	21	8	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	JAC 12 at WAS 24	24	12	-12	2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PIT 21 at JAC 30	21	30	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 13 at JAC 40	13	40	27	-3,5	23,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Week 1	JAC 28 at BAL 27	27	28	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	PIT 6 at TEN 16	6	16	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	TEN 19 at BAL 21	21	19	-2	-2,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 14 at CIN 41	41	14	-27	-2,5	-29,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	TEN 27 at DAL 14	14	27	13	5,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	BUF 14 at TEN 31	14	31	17	-3,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	TEN 9 at JAC 17	17	9	-8	5,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYG 6 at TEN 10	6	10	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	JAC 30 at TEN 24	30	24	-6	1	-5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 41 at ARI 14	14	41	27	1	28	1	0	1	0	0	0	1

Week 8	WAS 14 at TEN 28	14	28	14	-1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	CIN 7 at TEN 30	7	30	23	-1,5	21,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 6	TEN 13 at SEA 16	16	13	-3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	TEN 24 at PIT 37	37	24	-13	6,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	BAL 36 at TEN 10	36	10	-26	-3,5	-29,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 2	TEN 13 at MIA 16	16	13	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	OAK 21 at TEN 24	21	24	3	3,5	6,5	0		0		0		0		
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SD 3 at DEN 38	3	38	35	-15,5	19,5		0		0		1		0	
Week 16	DEN 17 at SF 34	34	17	-17	3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DEN 24 at PIT 35	35	24	-11	1	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DEN 38 at SD 28	28	38	10	-9,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	OAK 3 at DEN 31	3	31	28	-10,5	17,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	DEN 22 at KC 24	24	22	-2	-4	-6	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CAR 0 at DEN 34	0	34	34	-7	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	SEA 27 at DEN 30	27	30	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 23 at BUF 20	20	23	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DEN 25 at OAK 28	28	25	-3	-5	-8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NE 13 at DEN 34	13	34	21	-5,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	DEN 29 at ATL 21	21	29	8	-11,5	-3,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 20 at DEN 38	20	38	18	-11	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	STL 14 at DEN 35	14	35	21	-14	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DEN 35 at SEA 14	14	35	21	-6	15	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	KC 3 at DEN 19	3	19	16	-9	7	1		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NO 13 at KC 25	13	25	12	-8	4		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	KC 29 at SD 7	7	29	22	-9,5	12,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	OAK 0 at KC 30	0	30	30	-8	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	SF 9 at KC 44	9	44	35	3	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	KC 19 at SEA 14	14	19	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DEN 22 at KC 24	22	24	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 10 at JAC 24	24	10	-14	6	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 28 at STL 20	20	28	8	-5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SD 3 at KC 31	3	31	28	-5,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	SEA 17 at KC 20	17	20	3	-5,5	-2,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 35 at CAR 14	14	35	21	5,5	26,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	BUF 16 at KC 22	16	22	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	KC 28 at OAK 27	27	28	1	5,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	KC 3 at DEN 19	19	3	-16	9	-7	0		0		1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	JAC 20 at OAK 9	20	9	-11	4	-7		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	SEA 22 at OAK 21	22	21	-1	-2,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	OAK 0 at KC 30	30	0	-30	8	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	MIA 34 at OAK 16	34	16	-18	2	-16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	OAK 3 at DEN 31	31	3	-28	10,5	-17,5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	OAK 38 at SD 13	13	38	25	-2,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	NO 13 at OAK 10	13	10	-3	-9,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	OAK 14 at CAR 38	38	14	-24	3	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	OAK 34 at SEA 45	45	34	-11	2	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DEN 25 at OAK 28	25	28	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 6	SD 25 at OAK 10	25	10	-15	-6,5	-21,5	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 17 at OAK 35	17	35	18	-7,5	10,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	OAK 22 at NYJ 23	23	22	-1	1,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	OAK 36 at ATL 31	31	36	5	-4,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	KC 28 at OAK 27	28	27	-1	-5,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	OAK 21 at TEN 24	24	21	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0		0		0		0		0

Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SD 3 at DEN 38	38	3	-35	15,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	KC 29 at SD 7	29	7	-22	9,5	-12,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 15	ATL 14 at SD 3	14	3	-11	1,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DEN 38 at SD 28	38	28	-10	9,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SD 10 at SF 17	17	10	-7	14,5	7,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 12	OAK 38 at SD 13	38	13	-25	2,5	-22,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 11	SEA 37 at SD 31	37	31	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 31 at CIN 38	38	31	-7	0	-7	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	IND 19 at SD 35	19	35	16	-6	10	1	0	0	0	1
Week 8	SD 3 at KC 31	31	3	-28	5,5	-22,5	0	1	0	1	0
Week 6	SD 25 at OAK 10	10	25	15	6,5	21,5	1	0	0	0	1
Week 5	BAL 17 at SD 21	17	21	4	-2,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SD 22 at SEA 26	26	22	-4	6	2	0	0	0	1	0
Week 3	CAR 26 at SD 7	26	7	-19	0	-19	0	0	0	1	0
Week 2	SD 20 at NO 6	6	20	14	2,5	16,5	0	0	0	1	1
Week 1	SD 7 at NE 41	41	7	-34	8	-26	0	0	1	1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYG 20 at DAL 7	20	7	-13	-3,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	DAL 24 at CIN 31	31	24	-7	5,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CAR 23 at DAL 13	23	13	-10	-7	-17	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TEN 27 at DAL 14	27	14	-13	-5,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 17 at GB 45	45	17	-28	6	-22	0	0	1	1	0
Week 12	WAS 14 at DAL 17	14	17	3	-6	-3	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 6 at DAL 24	6	24	18	-9	9	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DAL 10 at SF 17	17	10	-7	6,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 16 at WAS 21	21	16	-5	-2,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DAL 17 at NYG 20	20	17	-3	-7,5	-10,5	0	1	1	0	0
Week 5	CHI 3 at DAL 27	3	27	24	-14	10	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	PHI 20 at DAL 21	20	21	1	-9,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DAL 22 at ARI 25	25	22	-3	-10,5	-13,5	0	1	1	0	0
Week 1	DAL 37 at PIT 7	7	37	30	-1	29	1	1	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NYG 20 at DAL 7	7	20	13	3,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	WAS 10 at NYG 30	10	30	20	-3	17	1	0	1	0	1
Week 15	NYG 31 at PHI 21	21	31	10	6	16	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	TB 20 at NYG 8	20	8	-12	0	-12	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYG 7 at WAS 7	7	7	0	5,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 10 at NYG 19	10	19	9	-5	4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYG 6 at TEN 10	10	6	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 27 at NYG 29	27	29	2	-5,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYG 26 at DET 20	20	26	6	6,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYG 27 at ARI 13	13	27	14	6,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	DAL 17 at NYG 20	17	20	3	7,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 9 at NYG 14	9	14	5	-4,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 3 at STL 13	13	3	-10	2,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BAL 24 at NYG 23	24	23	-1	-2,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 13 at JAC 40	40	13	-27	3,5	-23,5	0	0	1	1	0
Week 1	PHI 17 at NYG 31	17	31	14	3,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PHI 32 at WAS 35	35	32	-3	5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYG 31 at PHI 21	31	21	-10	-6	-16	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 42 at PHI 44	42	44	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 20 at PHI 23	20	23	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 10 at BAL 10	10	10	0	2,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SF 24 at PHI 12	24	12	-12	4	-8	0	0	0	0	0

Week 1	ATL 17 at DET 28	17	28	11	-7,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	BUF 21 at GB 31	21	31	10	-11	-1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	GB 31 at CAR 10	10	31	21	1,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Week 15	GB 17 at TB 6	6	17	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	GB 27 at MIN 11	11	27	16	-3	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 17 at GB 45	17	45	28	-6	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Week 12	GB 38 at IND 41	41	38	-3	-12,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 7 at GB 17	7	17	10	-14,5	-4,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 28 at NE 10	10	28	18	1,5	19,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	GB 24 at CHI 23	23	24	1	-11,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TB 16 at GB 21	16	21	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	GB 15 at DET 26	26	15	-11	-7	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIN 32 at GB 38	32	38	6	-11	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	MIA 18 at GB 23	18	23	5	-12,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	GB 9 at PHI 10	10	9	-1	-7,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CHI 24 at GB 38	24	38	14	-16,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	IND 28 at MIN 39	28	39	11	-4,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	DET 14 at MIN 13	14	13	-1	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 17 at SF 28	28	17	-11	9,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	GB 27 at MIN 11	27	11	-16	3	-13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 21 at NYJ 23	23	21	-2	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 15 at DET 38	38	15	-23	0	-23	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	CHI 22 at MIN 29	22	29	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NE 18 at MIN 23	18	23	5	1,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIN 10 at TB 6	6	10	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CAR 14 at MIN 21	14	21	7	-4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIN 20 at ARI 19	19	20	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PHI 19 at MIN 28	19	28	9	-2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIN 32 at GB 38	38	32	-6	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 28 at MIN 14	28	14	-14	-4	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 27 at CHI 24	24	27	3	-1,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 34 at BUF 13	13	34	21	2,5	23,5	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	ATL 26 at ARI 29	29	26	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	ATL 14 at SD 3	3	14	11	-1,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 24 at SEA 17	17	24	7	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	NO 3 at ATL 20	3	20	17	-4	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ATL 27 at STL 21	21	27	6	3,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 11	TB 31 at ATL 10	31	10	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 8	SF 35 at ATL 28	35	28	-7	10,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ATL 23 at NO 17	17	23	6	1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DEN 29 at ATL 21	29	21	-8	11,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 4	ATL 7 at SF 34	34	7	-27	14	-13	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	OAK 36 at ATL 31	36	31	-5	4,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ATL 17 at DET 28	28	17	-11	7,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)		
Week 17	STL 30 at CAR 18	30	18	-12	-5	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	GB 31 at CAR 10	31	10	-21	-1,5	-22,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	CAR 23 at DAL 13	13	23	10	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	NO 16 at CAR 13	16	13	-3	-9	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 16 at STL 10	10	16	6	-3,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CAR 19 at SF 27	27	19	-8	9,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 11	CAR 0 at DEN 34	34	0	-34	7	-27	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	OAK 14 at CAR 38	14	38	24	-3	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	1

Week 8	CAR 13 at NO 0	0	13	13	-5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	CAR 14 at MIN 21	21	14	-7	4	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	SF 34 at CAR 21	34	21	-13	3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	KC 35 at CAR 14	35	14	-21	-5,5	-26,5	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 3	CAR 26 at SD 7	7	26	19	0	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 1	WAS 24 at CAR 10	24	10	-14	-4	-18	0				0		0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NO 13 at KC 35	35	13	-22	8	-14		1		0		0		0	
Week 16	ARI 10 at NO 27	10	27	17	-1,5	15,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	STL 34 at NO 27	34	27	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NO 16 at CAR 13	13	16	3	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 3 at ATL 20	20	3	-17	4	-13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 17 at NO 20	17	20	3	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NO 13 at OAK 10	10	13	3	9,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 9	SF 23 at NO 0	23	0	-23	13,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 8	CAR 13 at NO 0	13	0	-13	5	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ATL 23 at NO 17	23	17	-6	-1,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NO 20 at CHI 17	17	20	3	3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 9 at NYG 14	14	9	-5	4,5	-0,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DET 17 at NO 35	17	35	18	5,5	23,5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 3	NO 7 at SF 33	33	7	-26	11	-15	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	SD 20 at NO 6	20	6	-14	-2,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 24 at STL 38	38	24	-14	4	-10	0				0		0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CHI 15 at TB 31	15	31	16	-7	9		0		0		1		1	
Week 16	TB 0 at NYJ 31	31	0	-31	-2	-33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	GB 17 at TB 6	17	6	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 20 at NYG 8	8	20	12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TB 7 at CHI 13	13	7	-6	-5,5	-11,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 7 at TB 27	7	27	20	1,5	21,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	TB 31 at ATL 10	10	31	21	-3	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	TB 31 at IND 28	28	31	3	-5,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIN 10 at TB 6	10	6	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DET 27 at TB 9	27	9	-18	-5,5	-23,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TB 16 at GB 21	21	16	-5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 18 at TB 19	18	19	1	-7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIA 21 at TB 31	21	31	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 28 at MIN 14	14	28	14	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	TB 24 at DET 17	17	24	7	4,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SF 6 at TB 13	6	13	7	6,5	13,5	0				0		0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ATL 26 at ARI 29	26	29	3	3	6		0		0		1		0	
Week 16	ARI 10 at NO 27	27	10	-17	1,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 38 at ARI 28	38	28	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 16 at BAL 13	13	16	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 10 at NYG 19	19	10	-9	5	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 6 at DAL 24	24	6	-18	9	-9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 21 at ARI 31	21	31	10	3,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 9	TEN 41 at ARI 14	41	14	-27	-1	-28	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 8	ARI 10 at PHI 13	13	10	-3	7,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYG 27 at ARI 13	27	13	-14	-6,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIN 20 at ARI 19	20	19	-1	-2	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 18 at TB 19	19	18	-1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ARI 13 at WAS 19	19	13	-6	7,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DAL 22 at ARI 25	22	25	3	10,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	ARI 21 at CIN 24	24	21	-3	8,5	5,5	0				0		0	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	SF 9 at SEA 38	38	9	-29	3	-26	1	0	0	0	0				
Week 16	DEN 17 at SF 34	17	34	17	-3.5	13.5	1	0	0	0	1				
Week 15	MIN 17 at SF 28	17	28	11	-9.5	1.5	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 14	SF 9 at KC 44	44	9	-35	-3	-38	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 13	SD 10 at SF 17	10	17	7	-14.5	-7.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 12	CAR 19 at SF 27	19	27	8	-9.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	SF 24 at PHI 12	12	24	12	-4	8	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 10	DAL 10 at SF 17	10	17	7	-6.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 9	SF 23 at NO 0	0	23	23	-13.5	9.5	1	0	1	0	0				
Week 8	SF 35 at ATL 28	28	35	7	-10.5	-3.5	0	1	0	1	0				
Week 7	STL 10 at SF 30	10	30	20	-14	6	1	0	1	0	0				
Week 5	SF 34 at CAR 21	21	34	13	-3.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 4	ATL 7 at SF 34	7	34	27	-14	13	1	0	1	0	0				
Week 3	NO 7 at SF 33	7	33	26	-11	15	1	0	1	0	1				
Week 2	SF 15 at STL 12	12	15	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 1	SF 6 at TB 13	13	6	-7	-6.5	-13.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	SF 9 at SEA 38	9	38	29	-3	26	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 16	SEA 22 at OAK 21	21	22	1	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 15	SEA 24 at BAL 31	31	24	-7	0	-7	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 14	ATL 24 at SEA 17	24	17	-7	-7	-14	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 13	KC 19 at SEA 14	19	14	-5	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 12	SEA 17 at NO 20	20	17	-3	-6	-9	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	SEA 37 at SD 31	31	37	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 10	SEA 27 at DEN 30	30	27	-3	9	6	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 9	OAK 34 at SEA 45	34	45	11	-2	9	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 8	SEA 17 at STL 9	9	17	8	-2.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 6	TEN 13 at SEA 16	13	16	3	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 5	SEA 17 at KC 20	20	17	-3	5.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 4	SD 22 at SEA 26	22	26	4	-6	-2	0	1	0	1	0				
Week 3	SEA 31 at IND 3	3	31	28	2.5	30.5	1	0	1	0	1				
Week 2	DEN 35 at SEA 14	35	14	-21	6	-15	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 1	NYJ 41 at SEA 3	41	3	-38	-4	-42	0	0	1	1	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	STL 30 at CAR 18	18	30	12	5	17	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 16	CHI 13 at STL 10	13	10	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 15	STL 34 at NO 27	27	34	7	2.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 14	STL 23 at WAS 20	20	23	3	8.5	11.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 13	CAR 16 at STL 10	16	10	-6	3.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 12	ATL 27 at STL 21	27	21	-6	-3.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	STL 7 at GB 17	17	7	-10	14.5	4.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 9	KC 28 at STL 20	28	20	-8	5.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 8	SEA 17 at STL 9	17	9	-8	2.5	-5.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 7	STL 10 at SF 30	30	10	-20	14	-6	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 5	STL 17 at OAK 35	35	17	-18	7.5	-10.5	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 4	NYG 3 at STL 13	3	13	10	-2.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	1				
Week 3	STL 14 at DEN 35	35	14	-21	14	-7	0	0	0	1	0				
Week 2	SF 15 at STL 12	15	12	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 1	NO 24 at STL 38	24	38	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0				
Total97/98							68	35	45	20	67	33	45	21	68
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)				
Week 17	KC 9 at BUF 20	9	20	11	-5	6	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 16	BUF 14 at MIA 16	16	14	-2	-2.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 15	BUF 18 at SEA 26	26	18	-8	-4.5	-12.5	0	0	0	0	0				
Week 14	BUF 10 at IND 13	13	10	-3	-3	-6	0	1	0	1	0				

Week 7	NYJ 17 at JAC 21	21	17	-4	8,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 6	OAK 34 at NYJ 13	34	13	-21	4	-17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	NYJ 16 at WAS 31	31	16	-15	8,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 13 at NYJ 6	13	6	-7	-2	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 27 at MIA 36	36	27	-9	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	IND 21 at NYJ 7	21	7	-14	4,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 6 at DEN 31	31	6	-25	8	-17	0				1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TEN 24 at BAL 21	24	21	-3	-3	-6		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	BAL 16 at CAR 27	27	16	-11	8,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 14 at CIN 21	21	14	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PIT 17 at BAL 31	17	31	14	4,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	JAC 28 at BAL 25	28	25	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BAL 20 at SF 38	38	20	-18	12	-6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 27 at JAC 30	30	27	-3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 24 at BAL 21	24	21	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 31 at BAL 37	31	37	6	-7	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BAL 21 at IND 26	26	21	-5	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NE 46 at BAL 38	46	38	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 3	BAL 13 at TEN 29	29	13	-16	3,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BAL 17 at PIT 31	31	17	-14	4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	OAK 14 at BAL 19	14	19	5	-2,5	2,5	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	IND 24 at CIN 31	24	31	7	0	7		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	CIN 21 at TEN 13	13	21	8	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 14 at CIN 21	14	21	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 27 at JAC 30	30	27	-3	2,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 31 at CIN 41	31	41	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 17 at BUF 31	31	17	-14	7	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 24 at CIN 34	24	34	10	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	CIN 24 at BAL 21	21	24	3	3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 21 at CIN 28	21	28	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CIN 21 at SF 28	28	21	-7	14,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 30 at CIN 27	30	27	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DEN 14 at CIN 10	14	10	-4	3	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 15 at CIN 30	15	30	15	-3	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 14 at SD 27	27	14	-13	6,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CIN 16 at STL 26	26	16	-10	3	-7	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PIT 14 at CAR 18	18	14	-4	7	3		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	SF 25 at PIT 15	25	15	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 3 at PIT 16	3	16	13	-10,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PIT 17 at BAL 31	31	17	-14	-4,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 24 at MIA 17	17	24	7	2,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 3 at PIT 28	3	28	25	-10,5	14,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	PIT 24 at CIN 34	34	24	-10	-4	-14	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	STL 6 at PIT 42	6	42	36	-13,5	22,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	PIT 20 at ATL 17	17	20	3	-5,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 13 at TEN 23	23	13	-10	-2,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 17 at KC 7	7	17	10	4,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 5	TEN 16 at PIT 30	16	30	14	-5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BUF 6 at PIT 24	6	24	18	-3	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	BAL 17 at PIT 31	17	31	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 9 at JAC 24	24	9	-15	-3,5	-18,5	0				1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)

Week 17	IND 24 at CIN 31	31	24	-7	0	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 16	IND 24 at KC 19	19	24	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 15	PHI 10 at IND 37	10	37	27	4,5	31,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1		
Week 14	BUF 10 at IND 13	10	13	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 13	IND 13 at NE 27	27	13	-14	6,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 12	NYJ 29 at IND 34	29	34	5	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 11	IND 16 at MIA 37	37	16	-21	4	-17	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		
Week 10	SD 26 at IND 19	26	19	-7	-6	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 9	IND 16 at WAS 31	31	16	-15	2,5	-12,5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
Week 8	NE 27 at IND 9	27	9	-18	-3	-21	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
Week 7	BAL 21 at IND 26	21	26	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 6	IND 13 at BUF 16	16	13	-3	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 4	MIA 6 at IND 10	6	10	4	-2,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 3	IND 25 at DAL 24	24	25	1	10,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 2	IND 21 at NYJ 7	7	21	14	-4,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week 1	ARI 13 at IND 20	13	20	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ATL 17 at JAC 19	17	19	2	-10	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	SEA 13 at JAC 20	13	20	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	JAC 23 at TEN 17	17	23	6	6,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	CIN 27 at JAC 30	27	30	3	-2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	JAC 28 at BAL 25	25	28	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 12	JAC 3 at PIT 28	28	3	-25	10,5	-14,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	
Week 11	BAL 27 at JAC 30	27	30	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	JAC 21 at CIN 28	28	21	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	JAC 14 at STL 17	17	14	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NYJ 17 at JAC 21	17	21	4	-8,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	JAC 13 at NO 17	17	13	-4	2	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	CAR 14 at JAC 24	14	24	10	2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	JAC 25 at NE 28	28	25	-3	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	JAC 3 at OAK 17	17	3	-14	6,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	TEN 34 at JAC 27	34	27	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	PIT 9 at JAC 24	9	24	15	3,5	18,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TEN 24 at BAL 21	21	24	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	CIN 21 at TEN 13	21	13	-8	-4	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	JAC 23 at TEN 17	23	17	-6	-6,5	-12,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	TEN 35 at NYJ 10	10	35	25	-3	22	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 13	CAR 31 at TEN 6	31	6	-25	-4,5	-29,5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	
Week 12	MIA 23 at TEN 20	23	20	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	TEN 31 at NO 14	14	31	17	-4,5	12,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	TEN 16 at SEA 23	23	16	-7	-1	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	SF 10 at TEN 9	10	9	-1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	PIT 13 at TEN 23	13	23	10	2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	TEN 23 at ATL 13	13	23	10	1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	TEN 30 at CIN 27	27	30	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	TEN 16 at PIT 30	30	16	-14	5	-9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	BAL 13 at TEN 29	13	29	16	-3,5	12,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	TEN 34 at JAC 27	27	34	7	2,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	KC 20 at TEN 19	20	19	-1	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DEN 10 at SD 16	16	10	-6	-1,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	OAK 19 at DEN 24	19	24	5	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	DEN 6 at GB 41	41	6	-35	10	-25	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	
Week 14	SEA 7 at DEN 34	7	34	27	-11,5	15,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 13	DEN 21 at MIN 17	17	21	4	-5,5	-1,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	

Week 5	KC 19 at SD 22	19	22	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	SD 40 at OAK 34	34	40	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 3	SD 10 at GB 42	42	10	-32	9	-23	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 2	CIN 14 at SD 27	14	27	13	-6,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	SEA 7 at SD 29	7	29	22	-4	18	1		1		0		0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 10 at WAS 37	37	10	-27	3,5	-23,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NE 6 at DAL 12	6	12	6	-5,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 10 at ARI 6	6	10	4	-9,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	WAS 10 at DAL 21	10	21	11	-9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 6 at NYG 20	20	6	-14	-9	-23	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 6 at DAL 21	6	21	15	-4,5	10,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 20 at SF 17	17	20	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 31 at DAL 21	31	21	-10	-9	-19	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 29 at MIA 10	10	29	19	-3	16	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	ATL 28 at DAL 32	28	32	4	-15	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ARI 3 at DAL 17	3	17	14	-14,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 23 at PHI 19	19	23	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DAL 7 at BUF 10	10	7	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	IND 25 at DAL 24	25	24	-1	-10,5	-11,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 0 at DAL 27	0	27	27	-10	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 1	DAL 6 at CHI 22	22	6	-16	-3	-19	0		0		1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NE 23 at NYG 22	23	22	-1	9,5	8,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NO 17 at NYG 3	17	3	-14	-7,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYG 17 at MIA 7	7	17	10	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 14	NYG 0 at PHI 24	24	0	-24	6,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	DAL 6 at NYG 20	6	20	14	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	NYG 23 at ARI 31	31	23	-8	2	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYG 17 at CAR 27	27	17	-10	6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	ARI 8 at NYG 16	8	16	8	-5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYG 35 at DET 7	7	35	28	10	38	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 8	NYG 21 at WAS 31	31	21	-10	7	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 19 at NYG 10	19	10	-9	2,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIN 10 at NYG 15	10	15	5	5,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 13 at NYJ 6	6	13	7	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	WAS 31 at NYG 10	31	10	-21	2	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	NYG 0 at DAL 27	27	0	-27	10	-17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	BUF 23 at NYG 20	23	20	-3	6,5	3,5	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ARI 19 at PHI 29	19	29	10	-5,5	4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	PHI 21 at NYJ 20	20	21	1	-7,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PHI 10 at IND 37	37	10	-27	-4,5	-31,5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	NYG 0 at PHI 24	0	24	24	-6,5	17,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	PHI 30 at ARI 36	36	30	-6	-4,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	WAS 26 at PHI 21	26	21	-5	-6	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BUF 24 at PHI 17	24	17	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 31 at DAL 21	21	31	10	9	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	CAR 9 at PHI 20	9	20	11	-5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIA 28 at PHI 35	28	35	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 19 at NYG 10	10	19	9	-2,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 23 at PHI 19	23	19	-4	-3	-7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 33 at ATL 18	18	33	15	2,5	17,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	DET 17 at PHI 24	17	24	7	-1,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	PHI 13 at GB 39	39	13	-26	8,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	PHI 17 at WAS 14	14	17	3	1,5	4,5	0		0		0		0		0

Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 10 at WAS 37	10	37	27	-3,5	23,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	WAS 26 at ARI 27	27	26	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 10 at TB 24	24	10	-14	-3	-17	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	WAS 10 at DAL 21	21	10	-11	9	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SF 19 at WAS 16	19	16	-3	5,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	WAS 26 at PHI 21	21	26	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 37 at WAS 34	37	34	-3	-10	-13	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 13 at BUF 38	38	13	-25	3,5	-21,5	0	1	0	1	0
Week 9	IND 16 at WAS 31	16	31	15	-2,5	12,5	1	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYG 21 at WAS 31	21	31	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 27 at NE 22	22	27	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYJ 16 at WAS 31	16	31	15	-8,5	6,5	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 17 at STL 10	10	17	7	1,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	WAS 31 at NYG 10	10	31	21	-2	19	1	0	1	0	0
Week 2	CHI 3 at WAS 10	3	10	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PHI 17 at WAS 14	17	14	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CHI 19 at TB 34	34	19	-15	2,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	SD 14 at CHI 27	14	27	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	STL 9 at CHI 35	9	35	26	-6,5	19,5	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	CHI 17 at GB 28	28	17	-11	10	-1	0	1	0	0	0
Week 13	DET 14 at CHI 31	14	31	17	-3	14	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CHI 10 at KC 14	14	10	-4	8,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CHI 12 at DEN 17	17	12	-5	10	5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TB 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 15 at MIN 13	13	15	2	6,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 24 at NO 27	27	24	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	GB 37 at CHI 6	37	6	-31	8,5	-22,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 5	OAK 17 at CHI 19	17	19	2	-1,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 16 at DET 35	35	16	-19	5,5	-13,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 3	MIN 20 at CHI 14	20	14	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 3 at WAS 10	10	3	-7	-1	-8	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 6 at CHI 22	6	22	16	3	19	1	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DET 14 at SF 24	24	14	-10	9,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	GB 31 at DET 3	31	3	-28	8	-20	0	0	0	1	0
Week 15	MIN 24 at DET 22	24	22	-2	-2	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	KC 28 at DET 24	28	24	-4	2	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DET 14 at CHI 31	31	14	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	1	0
Week 12	SEA 16 at DET 17	16	17	1	-4,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DET 21 at SD 27	27	21	-6	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 18 at GB 28	28	18	-10	12	2	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	NYG 35 at DET 7	35	7	-28	-10	-38	0	0	0	1	0
Week 7	DET 21 at OAK 37	37	21	-16	2,5	-13,5	0	0	0	1	0
Week 6	ATL 24 at DET 28	24	28	4	-10	-6	0	1	0	1	0
Week 5	DET 27 at TB 0	0	27	27	-6,5	20,5	1	0	1	0	0
Week 4	CHI 16 at DET 35	16	35	19	-5,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DET 17 at PHI 24	24	17	-7	1,5	-5,5	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 6 at DET 21	6	21	15	-12	3	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 13 at MIN 17	17	13	-4	2	-2	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1) > 14.67	(1) > 19.67	(2) <-14.67	(2) <-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 10 at GB 38	10	38	28	-11,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	GB 31 at DET 3	3	31	28	-8	20	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	DEN 6 at GB 41	6	41	35	-10	25	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	CHI 17 at GB 28	17	28	11	-10	1	0	0	0	0	0

Week 8	NO 7 at CAR 19	7	19	12	-7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	STL 13 at CAR 45	13	45	32	-7	25	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 6	CAR 12 at MIN 14	14	12	-2	6,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	CAR 14 at JAC 24	24	14	-10	-2,5	-12,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	SF 7 at CAR 23	7	23	16	10	26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 2	CAR 22 at NO 20	20	22	2	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	ATL 6 at CAR 29	6	29	23	3	26	1		1		0		0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NO 13 at STL 14	14	13	-1	5,5	4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	NO 17 at NYG 3	3	17	14	7,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 15	ATL 31 at NO 15	31	15	-16	-2	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 26 at NO 10	26	10	-16	-3	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 7 at TB 13	13	7	-6	6,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NO 15 at ATL 17	17	15	-2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	TEN 31 at NO 14	31	14	-17	4,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 24 at NO 17	24	17	-7	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NO 7 at CAR 19	19	7	-12	7	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 24 at NO 27	24	27	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	JAC 13 at NO 17	13	17	4	-2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 10 at BAL 17	17	10	-7	5,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 28 at NO 14	28	14	-14	-7,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 15 at CIN 30	30	15	-15	3	-12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CAR 22 at NO 20	22	20	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 11 at SF 27	27	11	-16	12	-4	0			0		1		0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CHI 19 at TB 34	19	34	15	-2,5	12,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	TB 10 at MIN 21	21	10	-11	6	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 10 at TB 24	10	24	14	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 14	TB 0 at CAR 24	24	0	-24	6,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	NO 7 at TB 13	7	13	6	-6,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TB 25 at SD 17	17	25	8	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	OAK 17 at TB 20	17	20	3	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TB 10 at CHI 13	13	10	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TB 7 at GB 13	13	7	-6	17,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TB 9 at ARI 13	13	9	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIN 13 at TB 24	13	24	11	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 5	DET 27 at TB 0	27	0	-27	6,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 4	SEA 17 at TB 13	17	13	-4	1,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 23 at DEN 27	27	23	-4	13,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 6 at DET 21	21	6	-15	12	-3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	GB 34 at TB 3	34	3	-31	7	-24	0			0		1		1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	ARI 19 at PHI 29	29	19	-10	5,5	-4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 26 at ARI 27	26	27	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 10 at ARI 6	10	6	-4	9,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	ARI 17 at MIN 41	41	17	-24	4,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	PHI 30 at ARI 36	30	36	6	4,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYG 23 at ARI 31	23	31	8	-2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 37 at WAS 34	34	37	3	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	ARI 8 at NYG 16	16	8	-8	5	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYJ 31 at ARI 21	31	21	-10	-3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TB 9 at ARI 13	9	13	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ARI 3 at DAL 17	17	3	-14	14,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 28 at ARI 31	28	31	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 28 at NO 14	14	28	14	7,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 3	ARI 0 at NE 31	31	0	-31	10	-21	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 2	MIA 38 at ARI 10	38	10	-28	6	-22	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	ARI 13 at IND 20	20	13	-7	9	2	0		0		0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DET 14 at SF 24	14	24	10	-9,5	0,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	SF 25 at PIT 15	15	25	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CAR 30 at SF 24	30	24	-6	-10	-16	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SF 34 at ATL 10	10	34	24	-10,5	13,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	SF 19 at WAS 16	16	19	3	-5,5	-2,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BAL 20 at SF 38	20	38	18	-12	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 20 at SF 17	20	17	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 24 at NO 17	17	24	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SF 10 at TEN 9	9	10	1	-5	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CIN 21 at SF 28	21	28	7	-14,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SF 20 at GB 23	23	20	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SF 28 at STL 11	11	28	17	-10,5	6,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ATL 17 at SF 39	17	39	22	-12	10	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 7 at CAR 23	23	7	-16	-10	-26	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	STL 0 at SF 34	0	34	34	-12,5	21,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	NO 11 at SF 27	11	27	16	-12	4	1		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 28 at OAK 21	21	28	7	3,5	10,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	SEA 13 at JAC 20	20	13	-7	6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 18 at SEA 26	18	26	8	4,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	SEA 7 at DEN 34	34	7	-27	11,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	OAK 27 at SEA 21	27	21	-6	-2	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 16 at DET 17	17	16	-1	4,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIN 23 at SEA 42	23	42	19	-1,5	17,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	TEN 16 at SEA 23	16	23	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SD 13 at SEA 32	13	32	19	-2,5	16,5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 8	SEA 16 at KC 34	34	16	-18	9	-9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 22 at MIA 15	15	22	7	7,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 5	GB 31 at SEA 10	31	10	-21	10	-11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 4	SEA 17 at TB 13	13	17	4	-1,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 3	KC 35 at SEA 17	35	17	-18	3,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DEN 30 at SEA 20	30	20	-10	2	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SEA 7 at SD 29	29	7	-22	4	-18	0		0		1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	NO 13 at STL 14	13	14	1	-5,5	-4,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	STL 34 at ATL 27	27	34	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	STL 9 at CHI 35	35	9	-26	6,5	-19,5	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	STL 26 at NO 10	10	26	16	3	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 13	GB 24 at STL 9	24	9	-15	10	-5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CAR 20 at STL 10	20	10	-10	3	-7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ATL 16 at STL 59	16	59	43	2,5	45,5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 10	STL 6 at PIT 42	42	6	-36	13,5	-22,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	STL 31 at BAL 37	37	31	-6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	JAC 14 at STL 17	14	17	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	STL 13 at CAR 45	45	13	-32	7	-25	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 6	SF 28 at STL 11	28	11	-17	10,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 28 at ARI 31	31	28	-3	2	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 17 at STL 10	17	10	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	STL 0 at SF 34	34	0	-34	12,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	CIN 16 at STL 26	16	26	10	-3	7	0		0		0		0		0
Total 96/97							70	35	39	16	70	39	39	22	70
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	TEN 28 at BUF 17	28	17	-11	-3	-14		0		0		0		0	

Week 9	NYJ 10 at IND 17	17	10	-7	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	MIA 16 at NYJ 17	16	17	1	7,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NYJ 15 at CAR 26	26	15	-11	-1	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	NYJ 10 at BUF 29	29	10	-19	10,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 5	OAK 47 at NYJ 10	47	10	-37	7,5	-29,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 4	NYJ 3 at ATL 13	13	3	-10	5,5	-4,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	JAC 10 at NYJ 27	10	27	17	-7	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	IND 27 at NYJ 24	27	24	-3	2,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	NYJ 14 at MIA 52	52	14	-38	9,5	-28,5	0				1		1	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	BAL 21 at JAC 24	24	21	-3	-4	-7			1		0		0		
Week 16	CIN 10 at BAL 26	10	26	16	2	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 15	BAL 11 at MIN 27	27	11	-16	9,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 13 at SD 31	31	13	-18	6,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 20 at BAL 17	20	17	-3	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 31 at BAL 20	31	20	-11	5	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 3 at PIT 20	20	3	-17	5,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TEN 37 at BAL 10	37	10	-27	-6	-33	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	BAL 29 at CIN 26	26	29	3	-1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	JAC 23 at BAL 15	23	15	-8	-12,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 20 at DET 38	38	20	-18	-1	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BUF 22 at BAL 19	22	19	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 17 at BAL 35	17	35	18	-4	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	BAL 14 at TEN 7	7	14	7	-8	-1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 6 at BAL 22	6	22	16	-8	8	1				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 24 at CIN 27	24	27	3	5	8			0		0		1		0
Week 16	CIN 10 at BAL 26	26	10	-16	-2	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CHI 10 at CIN 16	10	16	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 10 at GB 24	24	10	-14	11	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CIN 17 at JAC 13	13	17	4	-3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	PIT 49 at CIN 31	49	31	-18	3,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 32 at TEN 25	25	32	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	OAK 20 at CIN 17	20	17	-3	6,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 29 at CIN 26	29	26	-3	1	-2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CIN 27 at PIT 9	9	27	18	7,5	25,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	CIN 16 at TB 19	19	16	-3	3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 26 at CIN 23	26	23	-3	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TEN 38 at CIN 28	38	28	-10	-6,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CIN 21 at SEA 24	24	21	-3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	JAC 17 at CIN 24	17	24	7	-8	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CIN 24 at IND 21	21	24	3	7	10	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PIT 19 at GB 24	24	19	-5	3,5	-1,5			1		0		0		0
Week 16	NE 27 at PIT 44	27	44	17	-9,5	7,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 29 at OAK 10	10	29	19	1	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 14	TEN 7 at PIT 21	7	21	14	-8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 20 at BAL 17	17	20	3	-6	-3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PIT 49 at CIN 31	31	49	18	-3,5	14,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	BAL 3 at PIT 20	3	20	17	-5,5	11,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PIT 37 at CHI 34	24	37	13	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 9	JAC 7 at PIT 24	7	24	17	-10	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 8	CIN 27 at PIT 9	27	9	-18	-7,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 16 at JAC 20	20	16	-4	-10,5	-14,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 16 at PIT 31	16	31	15	-1,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 4	MIN 44 at PIT 24	44	24	-20	-4,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Week 15	SEA 31 at DEN 27	31	27	-4	-7	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	JAC 23 at DEN 31	23	31	8	-13	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	DEN 33 at TEN 42	42	33	-9	-3	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	SD 27 at DEN 30	27	30	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	DEN 13 at PHI 31	31	13	-18	0	-18	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	
Week 10	ARI 6 at DEN 38	6	38	32	-8	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 8	KC 21 at DEN 7	21	7	-14	-3	-17	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	OAK 0 at DEN 27	0	27	27	3,5	30,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Week 6	DEN 37 at NE 3	3	37	34	-1,5	32,5	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 5	DEN 10 at SEA 27	27	10	-17	-3	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 4	DEN 6 at SD 17	17	6	-11	4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	WAS 31 at DEN 38	31	38	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	DEN 21 at DAL 31	31	21	-10	10,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	BUF 7 at DEN 22	7	22	15	-5,5	9,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 3 at KC 26	3	26	23	-7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	DEN 17 at KC 20	17	20	3	-6,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	KC 6 at MIA 13	13	6	-7	3,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	KC 29 at OAK 23	23	29	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 12 at DAL 24	24	12	-12	11	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 13 at KC 20	13	20	7	-9,5	-2,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 22 at SD 7	7	22	15	1,5	16,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	WAS 3 at KC 24	3	24	21	-8,5	12,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	KC 21 at DEN 7	7	21	14	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	NE 26 at KC 31	26	31	5	-7	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SD 23 at KC 29	23	29	6	-3,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	KC 24 at ARI 3	3	24	21	-2	19	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 4	KC 17 at BAL 35	35	17	-18	4	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	OAK 17 at KC 23	17	23	6	-2,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 17 at KC 20	17	20	3	-7	-4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	KC 34 at SEA 10	10	34	24	-1	23	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DEN 31 at OAK 28	31	28	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	OAK 10 at SEA 44	44	10	-34	-3,5	-37,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 15	PIT 29 at OAK 10	29	10	-19	-1	-20	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	KC 29 at OAK 23	29	23	-6	-2	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	OAK 6 at SD 12	12	6	-6	-1	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DAL 34 at OAK 21	34	21	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 17 at NYG 13	13	17	4	-6,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	OAK 20 at CIN 17	17	20	3	-6,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	IND 17 at OAK 30	17	30	13	-8	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 7	OAK 0 at DEN 27	27	0	-27	-3,5	-30,5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Week 6	SEA 14 at OAK 34	14	34	20	-10,5	9,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	OAK 47 at NYJ 10	10	47	37	-7,5	29,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	PHI 17 at OAK 48	17	48	31	-7	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	OAK 17 at KC 23	23	17	-6	2,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 20 at WAS 8	8	20	12	-5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SD 7 at OAK 17	7	17	10	-4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SD 27 at NYG 17	17	27	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	SD 27 at IND 24	24	27	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	ARI 25 at SD 28	25	28	3	-9	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 13 at SD 31	13	31	18	-6,5	11,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	OAK 6 at SD 12	6	12	6	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SD 27 at DEN 30	30	27	-3	3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 22 at SD 7	22	7	-15	-1,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Week 10	MIA 24 at SD 14	24	14	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	SD 35 at SEA 25	25	35	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	DAL 23 at SD 9	23	9	-14	0	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	SD 23 at KC 29	29	23	-6	3,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	SD 16 at PIT 31	31	16	-15	1,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Week 4	DEN 6 at SD 17	6	17	11	-4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	SD 27 at PHI 21	21	27	6	1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	SEA 10 at SD 14	10	14	4	-9	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	SD 7 at OAK 17	17	7	-10	4	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DAL 37 at ARI 13	13	37	24	-10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYG 20 at DAL 21	20	21	1	-15	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 17 at PHI 20	20	17	-3	-8,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	WAS 24 at DAL 17	24	17	-7	-17,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 12 at DAL 24	12	24	12	-11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DAL 34 at OAK 21	31	34	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SF 38 at DAL 20	38	20	-18	-13,5	-31,5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 12 at DAL 34	12	34	22	-15	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 28 at ATL 13	13	28	15	-10	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 23 at SD 9	9	23	14	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 6	GB 24 at DAL 34	24	34	10	-8,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 23 at WAS 27	27	23	-4	-13	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 20 at DAL 34	20	34	14	-14,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 23 at MIN 17	17	23	6	-8,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DEN 21 at DAL 31	21	31	10	-10,5	-0,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 35 at NYG 0	0	35	35	-7	28	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SD 27 at NYG 17	27	17	-10	4,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYG 20 at DAL 21	21	20	-1	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	WAS 13 at NYG 20	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYG 10 at ARI 6	6	10	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CHI 27 at NYG 24	27	24	-3	2,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYG 19 at PHI 28	28	19	-9	4	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 17 at NYG 13	17	13	-4	6,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 28 at SEA 30	30	28	-2	0	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYG 24 at WAS 15	15	24	9	3,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 17 at NYG 14	17	14	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	ARI 21 at NYG 27	21	27	6	-5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 6 at SF 20	20	6	-14	15,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 29 at NYG 45	29	45	16	-3	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 6 at GB 14	14	6	-8	6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 17 at KC 20	20	17	-3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	DAL 35 at NYG 0	35	0	-35	7	-28	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PHI 14 at CHI 20	20	14	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ARI 20 at PHI 21	20	21	1	-9,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 17 at PHI 20	17	20	3	8,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 14 at SEA 26	26	14	-12	-3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 14 at WAS 7	7	14	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYG 19 at PHI 28	19	28	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 13 at PHI 31	13	31	18	0	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Week 10	PHI 12 at DAL 34	34	12	-22	15	-7	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	STL 9 at PHI 20	9	20	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 17 at NYG 14	14	17	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 34 at PHI 37	34	37	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PHI 15 at NO 10	10	15	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0

Week 4	PHI 17 at OAK 48	48	17	-31	7	-24	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 3	SD 27 at PHI 21	27	21	-6	-1,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	PHI 31 at ARI 19	19	31	12	3,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Week 1	TB 21 at PHI 6	21	6	-15	-6,5	-21,5	0		0		1		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CAR 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-4,5	-1,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 35 at STL 23	23	35	12	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	WAS 13 at NYG 20	20	13	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	WAS 24 at DAL 17	17	24	7	17,5	24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	PHI 14 at WAS 7	14	7	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 27 at WAS 20	27	20	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 3 at KC 24	24	3	-21	8,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 9	NYG 24 at WAS 15	24	15	-9	-3,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 30 at WAS 36	30	36	6	1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 20 at ARI 24	24	20	-4	2,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 34 at PHI 37	37	34	-3	3,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 23 at WAS 27	23	27	4	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	WAS 6 at TB 14	14	6	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	WAS 31 at DEN 38	38	31	-7	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 20 at WAS 8	20	8	-12	5	-7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 7 at WAS 27	7	27	20	3,5	23,5	1		1		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	PHI 14 at CHI 20	14	20	6	-3	3		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	TB 10 at CHI 31	10	31	21	-6,5	14,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	CHI 10 at CIN 16	16	10	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CHI 7 at DET 27	27	7	-20	3	-17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 13	CHI 27 at NYG 24	24	27	3	-2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 24 at CHI 17	24	17	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CHI 28 at GB 35	35	28	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PIT 37 at CHI 34	37	34	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 14 at MIN 6	6	14	8	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TEN 32 at CHI 35	32	35	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 30 at JAC 27	27	30	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 27 at CHI 31	27	31	4	-13	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 28 at STL 34	34	28	-6	1	-5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CHI 25 at TB 6	6	25	19	1	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	GB 27 at CHI 24	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 14 at CHI 31	14	31	17	-3	14	1		0		0		0		1
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	DET 37 at TB 10	10	37	27	-7,5	19,5		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	JAC 0 at DET 44	0	44	44	-13,5	30,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	DET 24 at TEN 17	17	24	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CHI 7 at DET 27	7	27	20	-3	17	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	MIN 38 at DET 44	38	44	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 24 at CHI 17	17	24	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	TB 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 22 at ATL 34	34	22	-12	1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 16 at DET 24	16	24	8	-2,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 30 at WAS 36	36	30	-6	-1,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DET 21 at GB 30	30	21	-9	3,5	-5,5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 20 at DET 38	20	38	18	1	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 4	SF 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	10,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	ARI 20 at DET 17	20	17	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 10 at MIN 20	20	10	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 20 at PIT 23	23	20	-3	5,5	2,5	0		0		0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)

Week 17	PIT 19 at GB 24	19	24	5	-3,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	GB 34 at NO 23	23	34	11	-4,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	GB 10 at TB 13	13	10	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	CIN 10 at GB 24	10	24	14	-11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	TB 13 at GB 35	13	35	22	-9	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	GB 31 at BAL 20	20	31	11	-5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	CHI 28 at GB 35	28	35	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	GB 24 at MIN 27	27	24	-3	0	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	GB 16 at DET 24	24	16	-8	2,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	MIN 21 at GB 28	21	28	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	DET 21 at GB 30	21	30	9	-3,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	GB 24 at DAL 34	34	24	-10	8,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	GB 24 at JAC 14	14	24	10	-11	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	NYG 6 at GB 14	6	14	8	-6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	GB 27 at CHI 24	24	27	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	GB 14 at STL 17	17	14	-3	-7,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIN 24 at CIN 27	27	24	-3	-5	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	MIN 30 at SF 37	37	30	-7	13,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 11 at MIN 27	11	27	16	-9,5	6,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 17 at MIN 31	17	31	14	-8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 38 at DET 44	44	38	-6	3	-3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NO 24 at MIN 43	24	43	19	-5,5	13,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	MIN 30 at ARI 24	24	30	6	-2,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	GB 24 at MIN 27	24	27	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 14 at MIN 6	14	6	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIN 21 at GB 28	28	21	-7	4,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIN 17 at TB 20	20	17	-3	-2	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 17 at MIN 23	17	23	6	-10,5	-4,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIN 44 at PIT 24	24	44	20	4,5	24,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	DAL 23 at MIN 17	23	17	-6	8,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 10 at MIN 20	10	20	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 14 at CHI 31	31	14	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SF 27 at ATL 28	27	28	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ATL 17 at CAR 21	21	17	-4	-4	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NO 14 at ATL 19	14	19	5	-4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 20 at MIA 21	21	20	-1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 37 at ARI 40	40	37	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	STL 6 at ATL 31	6	31	25	-3,5	21,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	ATL 17 at BUF 23	23	17	-6	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 22 at ATL 34	22	34	12	-1	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 28 at ATL 13	28	13	-15	10	-5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 8	ATL 24 at TB 21	21	24	3	3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ATL 19 at STL 21	21	19	-2	3,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NE 17 at ATL 30	17	30	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYJ 3 at ATL 13	3	13	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ATL 27 at NO 24	24	27	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	ATL 10 at SF 41	41	10	-31	13	-18	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 1	CAR 20 at ATL 23	20	23	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	CAR 17 at WAS 20	20	17	-3	4,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ATL 17 at CAR 21	17	21	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	SF 31 at CAR 10	31	10	-21	15	-6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 14	IND 10 at CAR 13	10	13	3	4,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 26 at NO 34	34	26	-8	5	-3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Week 6	ARI 21 at NYG 27	27	21	-6	5	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	KC 24 at ARI 3	24	3	-21	2	-19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
Week 4	ARI 20 at DAL 34	34	20	-14	14,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	ARI 20 at DET 17	17	20	3	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	PHI 31 at ARI 19	31	19	-12	-3,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	ARI 7 at WAS 27	27	7	-20	-3,5	-23,5	0				1		1	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SF 27 at ATL 28	28	27	-1	-10	-11		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	MIN 30 at SF 37	30	37	7	-13,5	-6,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SF 31 at CAR 10	10	31	21	-15	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 17 at SF 27	17	27	10	-14	-4	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	STL 13 at SF 41	13	41	28	-14,5	13,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 12	SF 44 at MIA 20	20	44	24	2,5	26,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 11	SF 38 at DAL 20	20	38	18	13,5	31,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	CAR 13 at SF 7	13	7	-6	-12	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NO 11 at SF 7	11	7	-4	-13,5	-17,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SF 44 at STL 10	10	44	34	-3,5	30,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 7	SF 17 at IND 18	18	17	-1	-10	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 6 at SF 20	6	20	14	-15,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 24 at DET 27	27	24	-3	-10,5	-13,5	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NE 3 at SF 28	3	28	25	-11,5	13,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	ATL 10 at SF 41	10	41	31	-13	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 1	SF 24 at NO 22	22	24	2	-9	-7	0				0		0		0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	SEA 3 at KC 26	26	3	-23	7	-16		1		1		0		0	
Week 16	OAK 10 at SEA 44	10	44	34	3,5	37,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 15	SEA 31 at DEN 27	27	31	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 14 at SEA 26	14	26	12	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 13	NYJ 16 at SEA 10	16	10	-6	-7	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 27 at WAS 20	20	27	7	3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SEA 47 at JAC 30	30	47	17	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 10	NYG 28 at SEA 30	28	30	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SEA 14 at ARI 20	20	14	-6	4	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SD 35 at SEA 25	35	25	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SEA 21 at BUF 27	27	21	-6	7,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 6	SEA 14 at OAK 34	34	14	-20	10,5	-9,5	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 5	DEN 10 at SEA 27	10	27	17	3	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 3	CIN 21 at SEA 24	21	24	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SEA 10 at SD 14	14	10	-4	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	KC 34 at SEA 10	34	10	-24	1	-23	0				1		1		0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(1)	> 14.67	(1)	> 19.67	(2)	<-14.67	(2)	<-19.67	(3)
Week 17	MIA 41 at STL 22	41	22	-19	6	-13		0		0		0		0	
Week 16	WAS 35 at STL 23	35	23	-12	-3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 41 at STL 27	41	27	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 23 at NYJ 20	20	23	3	-1,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	STL 13 at SF 41	41	13	-28	14,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 12	STL 6 at ATL 31	31	6	-25	3,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 11	CAR 17 at STL 28	17	28	11	-7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	STL 10 at NO 19	19	10	-9	2	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 9 at PHI 20	20	9	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SF 44 at STL 10	44	10	-34	3,5	-30,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Week 7	ATL 19 at STL 21	19	21	2	-3,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 28 at STL 34	28	34	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	STL 31 at CAR 10	10	31	21	-3,5	17,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Week 2	NO 13 at STL 17	13	17	4	-1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	GB 14 at STL 17	14	17	3	7,5	10,5	0				0		0		0

Total95/96	63	35	30	16	63	32	30	13	64
------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

36	30	20	63	34	30	14	57	34	28	18	13	7	7	4	51	31	21	14	9	5	3	2	40
----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	----

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					1	1						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				

0				0	0										1	1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1					
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0			0	0	0	0								
0					0	0									1	
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)				
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	1	0			0	0	0	0								
0					0	0										
																1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0					
0	0	0			1	0	0	0								
0					0	0										
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)				

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0			1	1
0					0	0					1	1
0					0	0					1	
											1	1
											1	
											1	1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0						
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			1	1	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					1	1						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0					1	
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0						
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0			1	1
0					0	0	0	0			1	
0					0	0					1	1
											1	
											1	1
											1	
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			1 1
0					0	0						1 1
0					0	0						1 1
0												1
0												1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		1

	0	0	0	1	0	0	0				
	0			0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0		0	0	0	0			
	0				0	0					
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0		1	1	1	1			
	0				1	0					
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	1	0	0		0	0	0	0			
	0				0	0					

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0			1	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0					
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0					
1					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0					
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0					

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
1					0	0						
											1	
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0					1	

0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			1	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				1 1
0					1	1						1
												1 1
												1 1
												1 1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
												1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
												1
												1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
												1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					1	1						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			1	1	0	0			1	
0					0	0						
											1	1
											1	
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0	0	0				
					1	1						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0						
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
1					0	0						1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				1 1
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		

0	0	0			0	0	0	0						
0					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0					
1					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0					
0					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0			0	0	0	0	0					
0					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0			0	0	0	0						
0					0	0								
23	12	9	2	1	44	21	20	12	7	3	12	4	19	8
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)		(10)	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0			0	0	0	0						
0					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)		(10)	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0			0	0	0	0						
0					0	0								
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)		(10)	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
0	0	0			0	0	0	0			1	1		

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						1 1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			1	1	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1 1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		

0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
1					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1		
0	0	0			1	0	1	0				
0					1	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

3 or >	(7) 4 or >	(7) 5 or >	(8) 3 or >	(8) 4 or >	(8) 5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0			0	0	0		
0			0	0			

3 or >	(7) 4 or >	(7) 5 or >	(8) 3 or >	(8) 4 or >	(8) 5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0			0	0	0		
0			1	1			

3 or >	(7) 4 or >	(7) 5 or >	(8) 3 or >	(8) 4 or >	(8) 5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
0			0	0			

28	26	16	9	6	48	24	23	9	13	6	12	6	24	15	
3 or >	(7) 4 or >	(7) 5 or >	(8) 3 or >	(8) 4 or >	(8) 5 or >	(9)	(10)								
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
0	0	0			0	0	0	0		
0					0	0				

3 or > (7) 4 or > (7) 5 or > (8) 3 or > (8) 4 or > (8) 5 or > (9) (10)

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

3 or > (7) 4 or > (7) 5 or > (8) 3 or > (8) 4 or > (8) 5 or > (9) (10)

0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0			0	0	0	0		
0					0	0				

3 or > (7) 4 or > (7) 5 or > (8) 3 or > (8) 4 or > (8) 5 or > (9) (10)

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0			0	0	0	0			1	1
0					0	0					1	1
											1	
											1	
											1	1
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						
3 or >	(7)	4 or >	(7)	5 or >	(8)	3 or >	(8)	4 or >	(8)	5 or >	(9)	(10)
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1			0	0	0	0				
0					0	0						

25	14	9	4	3	42	24	17	12	4	1	12	8	20	10
----	----	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	----	---	----	----

Week	Results	Other team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	ref no.
Week 17	PIT 29 at BUF 24	29	24	-5	-9,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	3,34
Week 14	CLE 7 at BUF 37	7	37	30	-11,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	6,84
Week 11	STL 17 at BUF 37	17	37	20	-2	18	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	NYJ 17 at BUF 22	17	22	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	-8,4
Week 8	ARI 14 at BUF 38	14	38	24	-4,5	19,5	0	0	0	0	-10,4
Week 6	MIA 13 at BUF 20	13	20	7	-5	2	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	NE 31 at BUF 17	31	17	-14	5,5	-8,5	1	0	0	0	
Week 1	JAC 13 at BUF 10	13	10	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 16	CLE 7 at MIA 10	7	10	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	NE 28 at MIA 29	28	29	1	10	11	1	1	1	0	
Week 13	BUF 42 at MIA 32	42	32	-10	4,5	-5,5	1	0	0	0	
Week 9	ARI 24 at MIA 23	24	23	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	STL 14 at MIA 31	14	31	17	5	22	1	1	0	0	
Week 4	NYJ 17 at MIA 9	17	9	-8	6	-2	1	0	0	0	
Week 3	PIT 13 at MIA 3	13	3	-10	-2,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	TEN 17 at MIA 7	17	7	-10	3,5	-6,5	1	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 17	SF 7 at NE 21	7	21	14	-13	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	CIN 28 at NE 35	28	35	7	-10,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	BAL 3 at NE 24	3	24	21	-7	14	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	BUF 6 at NE 29	6	29	23	-7	16	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	SEA 20 at NE 30	20	30	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	MIA 10 at NE 24	10	24	14	-11	3	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 16	NE 23 at NYJ 7	23	7	-16	0	-16	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	SEA 14 at NYJ 37	14	37	23	-7	16	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	HOU 7 at NYJ 29	7	29	22	-7	15	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	BAL 20 at NYJ 17	20	17	-3	1	-2	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	MIA 14 at NYJ 41	14	41	27	-7	20	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	SF 14 at NYJ 22	14	22	8	-9,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	BUF 14 at NYJ 16	14	16	2	-6,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	CIN 24 at NYJ 31	24	31	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 17	MIA 23 at BAL 30	23	30	7	-11	-4	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	NYG 14 at BAL 37	14	37	23	-10,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	CIN 27 at BAL 26	27	26	-1	-7	-8	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	DAL 10 at BAL 30	10	30	20	-7,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	CLE 13 at BAL 27	13	27	14	-6	8	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	BUF 6 at BAL 20	6	20	14	-4,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	KC 27 at BAL 24	27	24	-3	-5,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	PIT 13 at BAL 30	13	30	17	-3,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 16	NYG 22 at CIN 23	22	23	1	-6	-5	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	BUF 33 at CIN 17	33	17	-16	3	-13	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	CLE 48 at CIN 58	48	58	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	DAL 3 at CIN 26	3	26	23	0	23	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	DEN 10 at CIN 23	10	23	13	7	20	1	1	1	0	
Week 3	BAL 23 at CIN 9	23	9	-14	2,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	MIA 13 at CIN 16	13	16	3	-5,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4	
Week 15	SD 21 at CLE 0	21	0	-21	9	-12	1	0	1	0	
Week 13	NE 42 at CLE 15	42	15	-27	11,5	-15,5	1	0	1	0	
Week 11	NYJ 10 at CLE 7	10	7	-3	1,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	PIT 24 at CLE 10	24	10	-14	3,5	-10,5	1	0	0	0	

Week 1	KC 24 at DEN 34	24	34	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	OAK 30 at KC 31	30	31	1	-9,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 15	DEN 17 at KC 45	17	45	28	3	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SD 34 at KC 31	34	31	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 27 at KC 19	27	19	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	IND 35 at KC 45	35	45	10	1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ATL 10 at KC 56	10	56	46	-3,5	42,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	HOU 24 at KC 21	24	21	-3	-7,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CAR 28 at KC 17	28	17	-11	-7	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	JAC 13 at OAK 6	13	6	-7	2,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 35 at OAK 40	35	40	5	-3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 34 at OAK 27	34	27	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SD 23 at OAK 17	23	17	-6	4,5	-1,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NO 31 at OAK 26	31	26	-5	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DEN 31 at OAK 3	31	3	-28	2,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 20 at OAK 30	20	30	10	-4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 10 at OAK 13	10	13	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	KC 17 at SD 24	17	24	7	7	14	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 24 at SD 31	24	31	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NO 17 at SD 43	17	43	26	-6,5	19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	OAK 14 at SD 42	14	42	28	-6,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	JAC 21 at SD 34	21	34	13	2,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TEN 17 at SD 38	17	38	21	3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYJ 34 at SD 28	34	28	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	WAS 10 at DAL 13	10	13	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NO 27 at DAL 13	27	13	-14	-7	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CHI 7 at DAL 21	7	21	14	-3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 49 at DAL 21	49	21	-28	7	-21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 21 at DAL 31	21	31	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 24 at DAL 20	24	20	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 26 at DAL 10	26	10	-16	-3,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CLE 12 at DAL 19	12	19	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	DAL 24 at NYG 28	24	28	4	-1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 33 at NYG 30	33	30	-3	10	7	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 27 at NYG 6	27	6	-21	7	-14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ATL 14 at NYG 10	14	10	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 28 at NYG 21	28	21	-7	-9	-16	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 7	DET 28 at NYG 13	28	13	-15	-7	-22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CLE 10 at NYG 27	10	27	17	-3,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 14 at NYG 20	14	20	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	CIN 38 at PHI 10	38	10	-28	3,5	-24,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 7 at PHI 12	7	12	5	-11	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 13	GB 17 at PHI 47	17	47	30	-5,5	24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	WAS 6 at PHI 28	6	28	22	-10	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 8	BAL 10 at PHI 15	10	15	5	-7,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 8 at PHI 30	8	30	22	-9,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 16 at PHI 27	16	27	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYG 17 at PHI 31	17	31	14	-8,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	MIN 18 at WAS 21	18	21	3	4,5	7,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week 9	OAK 27 at CAR 24	27	24	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SD 17 at CAR 6	17	6	-11	-3	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ATL 27 at CAR 10	27	10	-17	-3,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	GB 24 at CAR 14	24	14	-10	-3	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	ATL 13 at NO 26	13	26	13	-7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 32 at NO 21	32	21	-11	1,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 34 at NO 13	34	13	-21	6	-15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 20 at NO 27	20	27	7	3,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIN 38 at NO 31	38	31	-7	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TB 20 at NO 17	20	17	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SF 27 at NO 30	27	30	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SEA 21 at NO 7	21	7	-14	2,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	CAR 37 at TB 20	37	20	-17	-2,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NO 21 at TB 17	21	17	-4	-8	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 0 at TB 27	0	27	27	-2	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SF 3 at TB 35	3	35	32	-8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 31 at TB 34	31	34	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 7 at TB 19	7	19	12	-7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SEA 10 at TB 6	10	6	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	TB 7 at ARI 12	7	12	5	-4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	STL 7 at ARI 31	7	31	24	3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SF 31 at ARI 28	31	28	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYJ 13 at ARI 3	13	3	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 14 at ARI 17	14	17	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SEA 17 at ARI 25	17	25	8	7	15	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 10 at ARI 34	10	34	24	3,5	27,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 23 at ARI 12	23	12	-11	7,5	-3,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	BUF 41 at SF 7	41	7	-34	11	-23	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 26 at SF 16	26	16	-10	7	-3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIA 24 at SF 17	24	17	-7	-1	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CAR 37 at SF 27	37	27	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SEA 42 at SF 27	42	27	-15	7	-8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 28 at SF 31	28	31	3	-1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	STL 24 at SF 14	24	14	-10	3,5	-6,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ATL 21 at SF 19	21	19	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	ATL 26 at SEA 28	26	28	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ARI 21 at SEA 24	21	24	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 43 at SEA 39	43	39	-4	-7	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 38 at SEA 9	38	9	-29	-4,5	-33,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIA 17 at SEA 24	17	24	7	-9,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 8	CAR 17 at SEA 23	17	23	6	-8	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 33 at SEA 27	33	27	-6	-8	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SF 0 at SEA 34	0	34	34	-10	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	NYJ 29 at STL 32	29	32	3	3,5	6,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 7 at STL 20	7	20	13	-4,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SF 6 at STL 16	6	16	10	-11	-1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 10	SEA 12 at STL 23	12	23	11	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 40 at STL 22	40	22	-18	-2	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 28 at STL 25	28	25	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 10 at STL 17	10	17	7	-11	-4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Week 7	SD 26 at CLE 20	26	20	-6	-4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 7 at CLE 13	7	13	6	-3,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 21 at CLE 14	21	14	-7	-4,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	IND 9 at CLE 6	9	6	-3	-1,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	SD 24 at PIT 40	24	40	16	-6,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	OAK 7 at PIT 27	7	27	20	-4,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CIN 24 at PIT 20	24	20	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	ARI 15 at PIT 28	15	28	13	-7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	STL 33 at PIT 21	33	21	-12	-1,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CLE 33 at PIT 13	33	13	-20	-7	-27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TEN 30 at PIT 13	30	13	-17	-3	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	BAL 15 at PIT 34	15	34	19	-6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	HOU	Difference	HOU Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	IND 20 at HOU 17	20	17	-3	8,5	5,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 16	TEN 27 at HOU 24	27	24	-3	6,5	3,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 13 at HOU 17	13	17	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 23 at HOU 20	23	20	-3	5,5	2,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CAR 10 at HOU 14	10	14	4	6,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYJ 19 at HOU 14	19	14	-5	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 20 at HOU 24	20	24	4	2,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	KC 42 at HOU 14	42	14	-28	7,5	-20,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	DEN 31 at IND 17	31	17	-14	-7	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	ATL 7 at IND 38	7	38	31	-7,5	23,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NE 38 at IND 34	38	34	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 31 at IND 38	31	38	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	HOU 21 at IND 30	21	30	9	-13,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 6	CAR 23 at IND 20	23	20	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	JAC 13 at IND 23	13	23	10	-7,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TEN 7 at IND 33	7	33	26	-2,5	23,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	NO 19 at JAC 20	19	20	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	HOU 0 at JAC 27	0	27	27	-8,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 13	TB 10 at JAC 17	10	17	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 23 at JAC 28	23	28	5	6	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TEN 30 at JAC 17	30	17	-13	4,5	-8,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 24 at JAC 10	24	10	-14	3,5	-10,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 21 at JAC 27	21	27	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 38 at JAC 17	38	17	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	TB 13 at TEN 33	13	33	20	-4,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 26 at TEN 28	26	28	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 29 at TEN 27	29	27	-2	-4	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	JAC 3 at TEN 10	3	10	7	-9,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 10	MIA 7 at TEN 31	7	31	24	-5,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	HOU 17 at TEN 38	17	38	21	-9,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 3	NO 12 at TEN 27	12	27	15	-4,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 15	CLE 20 at DEN 23	20	23	3	-11	-8	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 14	KC 27 at DEN 45	27	45	18	-3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CHI 19 at DEN 10	19	10	-9	-10,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 11	SD 8 at DEN 37	8	37	29	-8,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 9	NE 30 at DEN 26	30	26	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 14 at DEN 17	14	17	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DET 16 at DEN 20	16	20	4	-11	-7	0	0	0	0	1	1	1

Week 15	SD 13 at BUF 20	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIA 21 at BUF 38	21	38	17	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 38 at BUF 7	38	7	-31	-3	-34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 17 at BUF 24	17	24	7	-7.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	OAK 49 at BUF 31	49	31	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 27 at BUF 33	27	33	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 37 at BUF 31	37	31	-6	3	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 15	OAK 17 at MIA 23	17	23	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CHI 9 at MIA 27	9	27	18	-10.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Week 12	SD 3 at MIA 30	3	30	27	-4	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 7 at MIA 26	7	26	19	-4.5	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BUF 23 at MIA 10	23	10	-13	-5.5	-18.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NE 13 at MIA 26	13	26	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 3 at MIA 30	3	30	27	-6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 21 at MIA 49	21	49	28	-9	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	MIA 24 at NE 27	24	27	3	2.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	NYJ 30 at NE 17	30	17	-13	-3.5	-16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 17 at NE 27	17	27	10	-3.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 17 at NE 24	17	24	7	-8	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DEN 24 at NE 16	24	16	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	GB 28 at NE 10	28	10	-18	-6	-24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	KC 38 at NE 41	38	41	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 1	PIT 14 at NE 30	14	30	16	2.5	18.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	GB 17 at NYJ 42	17	42	25	-1.5	23.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DEN 13 at NYJ 19	13	19	6	1.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 13 at NYJ 31	13	31	18	-3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 10 at NYJ 13	10	13	3	-2.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 24 at NYJ 21	24	21	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIN 7 at NYJ 20	7	20	13	-3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	KC 29 at NYJ 25	29	25	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 44 at NYJ 7	44	7	-37	-1	-38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	CLE 14 at BAL 13	14	13	-1	-2.5	-3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NO 37 at BAL 25	37	25	-12	2.5	-9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 12 at BAL 13	12	13	1	2.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 27 at BAL 38	27	38	11	-4.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 31 at BAL 18	31	18	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	JAC 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DEN 23 at BAL 34	23	34	11	9	20	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 25 at BAL 0	25	0	-25	4.5	-20.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	NO 13 at CIN 20	13	20	7	7	14	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 15	JAC 29 at CIN 15	29	15	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	BAL 27 at CIN 23	27	23	-4	2.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CLE 27 at CIN 20	27	20	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TEN 30 at CIN 24	30	24	-6	5	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 34 at CIN 7	34	7	-27	6	-21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TB 35 at CIN 7	35	7	-28	7	-21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SD 34 at CIN 6	34	6	-28	-3	-31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	ATL 16 at CLE 24	16	24	8	2.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	IND 28 at CLE 23	28	23	-5	2	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 13 at CLE 6	13	6	-7	-7.5	-14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week 10	NO 34 at CAR 24	34	24	-10	4,5	-5,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TB 12 at CAR 9	12	9	-3	8	5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 16 at CAR 13	16	13	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 7 at CAR 31	7	31	24	-3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	BAL 7 at CAR 10	7	10	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	CAR 10 at NO 6	10	6	-4	-6,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 32 at NO 31	32	31	-1	-7	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TB 20 at NO 23	20	23	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CLE 24 at NO 15	24	15	-9	-5,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	ATL 37 at NO 35	37	35	-2	-4	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SF 27 at NO 35	27	35	8	-1,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	GB 20 at NO 35	20	35	15	1,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	PIT 17 at TB 7	17	7	-10	-4,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 10 at TB 34	10	34	24	-3,5	20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 7 at TB 21	7	21	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CAR 10 at TB 23	10	23	13	-8,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 9	MIN 24 at TB 38	24	38	14	-7,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CLE 3 at TB 17	3	17	14	-7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	STL 14 at TB 26	14	26	12	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 26 at TB 20	26	20	-6	-6	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	SF 17 at ARI 14	17	14	-3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DET 20 at ARI 23	20	23	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	OAK 41 at ARI 20	41	20	-21	9	-12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SEA 27 at ARI 6	27	6	-21	-3	-24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 27 at ARI 14	27	14	-13	4	-9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 6 at ARI 9	6	9	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 7 at ARI 21	7	21	14	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 23 at ARI 15	23	15	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	GB 20 at SF 14	20	14	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SEA 24 at SF 31	24	31	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 12	PHI 38 at SF 17	38	17	-21	-7	-28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 13 at SF 17	13	17	4	-5,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	ARI 28 at SF 38	28	38	10	-8,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 13 at SF 37	13	37	24	-7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DEN 24 at SF 14	24	14	-10	-3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	STL 10 at SEA 30	10	30	20	-2,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 27 at SEA 20	27	20	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	KC 32 at SEA 39	32	39	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 31 at SEA 9	31	9	-22	5	-17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	WAS 14 at SEA 3	14	3	-11	-2,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SF 28 at SEA 21	28	21	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIN 23 at SEA 48	23	48	25	-3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	ARI 24 at SEA 13	24	13	-11	-3,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	SF 20 at STL 31	20	31	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	ARI 28 at STL 30	28	30	2	-11	-9	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 11	CHI 16 at STL 21	16	21	5	-10	-5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 10	SD 24 at STL 28	24	28	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SEA 20 at STL 37	20	37	17	-6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 13 at STL 28	13	28	15	8	23	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DAL 13 at STL 10	13	10	-3	-13	-16	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Week 2	NYG 26 at STL 21	26	21	-5	-12,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Total 02/03							35	21	16	10	32	17	13	8
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 14	NE 12 at BUF 9	12	9	-3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 24 at BUF 25	24	25	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIA 34 at BUF 27	34	27	-7	4,5	-2,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SEA 23 at BUF 20	23	20	-3	3,5	0,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	IND 30 at BUF 14	30	14	-16	3	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYJ 42 at BUF 36	42	36	-6	-4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PIT 20 at BUF 3	20	3	-17	3	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 24 at BUF 6	24	6	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	BUF 7 at MIA 34	7	34	27	-5,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	IND 6 at MIA 41	6	41	35	-4,5	30,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DEN 10 at MIA 21	10	21	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYJ 24 at MIA 0	24	0	-24	-5	-29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CAR 6 at MIA 23	6	23	17	-9	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 4	NE 10 at MIA 30	10	30	20	-8,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 15 at MIA 18	15	18	3	-1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	MIA 13 at NE 20	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CLE 16 at NE 27	16	27	11	-5,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NO 17 at NE 34	17	34	17	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	STL 24 at NE 17	24	17	-7	8	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BUF 11 at NE 21	11	21	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 26 at NE 29	26	29	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	IND 13 at NE 44	13	44	31	13	44	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYJ 10 at NE 3	10	3	-7	2	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	BUF 14 at NYJ 9	14	9	-5	-7	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 14 at NYJ 15	14	15	1	-8,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 12	NE 17 at NYJ 16	17	16	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 7 at NYJ 27	7	27	20	-3,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	STL 34 at NYJ 14	34	14	-20	7	-13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 17 at NYJ 21	17	21	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SF 19 at NYJ 17	19	17	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	IND 45 at NYJ 24	45	24	-21	2,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	MIN 3 at BAL 19	3	19	16	-12,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 15	CIN 0 at BAL 16	0	16	16	-10,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	PIT 26 at BAL 21	26	21	-5	3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	IND 27 at BAL 39	27	39	12	-6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CLE 27 at BAL 17	27	17	-10	-8	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	JAC 17 at BAL 18	17	18	1	-7,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	TEN 7 at BAL 26	7	26	19	-3,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CHI 6 at BAL 17	6	17	11	-9,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	PIT 23 at CIN 26	23	26	3	8	11	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 14 at CIN 10	14	10	-4	-1	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TB 16 at CIN 13	16	13	-3	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TEN 20 at CIN 7	20	7	-13	-1	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CHI 24 at CIN 0	24	0	-24	-1,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CLE 14 at CIN 24	14	24	10	-2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BAL 10 at CIN 21	10	21	11	7	18	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 17 at CIN 23	17	23	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4

Week 14	JAC 15 at CLE 10	15	10	-5	-2	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TEN 31 at CLE 15	31	15	-16	1	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 0 at CLE 18	0	18	18	-4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 14 at CLE 24	14	24	10	7,5	17,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 4	SD 16 at CLE 20	16	20	4	3,5	7,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 14 at CLE 24	14	24	10	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	CLE 7 at PIT 28	7	28	21	-5,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DET 14 at PIT 47	14	47	33	-10	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 13	NYJ 7 at PIT 18	7	18	11	-3,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 16 at PIT 21	16	21	5	-8,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 10	JAC 7 at PIT 20	7	20	13	-7,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BAL 13 at PIT 10	13	10	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	TEN 7 at PIT 34	7	34	27	-2,5	24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 7 at PIT 16	7	16	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	DEN 10 at IND 29	10	29	19	-2	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYJ 29 at IND 28	29	28	-1	-1	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 27 at IND 41	27	41	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SF 40 at IND 21	40	21	-19	-2,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIA 27 at IND 24	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NE 38 at IND 17	38	17	-21	-10	-31	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 5	OAK 23 at IND 18	23	18	-5	-3,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 26 at IND 42	26	42	16	-10	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	KC 30 at JAC 26	30	26	-4	-4,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 28 at JAC 21	28	21	-7	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CIN 13 at JAC 30	13	30	17	-4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BUF 13 at JAC 10	13	10	-3	-8,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 3	CLE 23 at JAC 14	23	14	-9	-8,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 2	TEN 6 at JAC 13	6	13	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 3 at JAC 21	3	21	18	-3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	CIN 23 at TEN 21	23	21	-2	-5,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CLE 41 at TEN 38	41	38	-3	-6	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	GB 20 at TEN 26	20	26	6	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 34 at TEN 24	34	24	-10	-2	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 16 at TEN 10	16	10	-6	2,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	JAC 24 at TEN 28	24	28	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIA 31 at TEN 23	31	23	-8	-6	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	OAK 17 at DEN 23	17	23	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SEA 7 at DEN 20	7	20	13	-6,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 17 at DEN 10	17	10	-7	-8,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 9	SD 16 at DEN 26	16	26	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NE 20 at DEN 31	20	31	11	-7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 6 at DEN 20	6	20	14	-10	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 3	BAL 20 at DEN 13	20	13	-7	-5,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYG 20 at DEN 31	20	31	11	-7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 14	DEN 23 at KC 26	23	26	3	-1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 23 at KC 10	23	10	-13	3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SEA 7 at KC 19	7	19	12	-2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 35 at KC 28	35	28	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PIT 20 at KC 17	20	17	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 13 at KC 3	13	3	-10	1	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	NYJ 24 at OAK 22	24	22	-2	-3,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 13 at OAK 10	13	10	-3	-5,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 26 at OAK 28	26	28	2	-9	-7	0	0	1	1
Week 12	ARI 34 at OAK 31	34	31	-3	-11,5	-14,5	0	0	1	1
Week 10	SD 24 at OAK 34	24	34	10	-8,5	1,5	0	0	1	0
Week 8	DEN 28 at OAK 38	28	38	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DAL 21 at OAK 28	21	28	7	-17	-10	0	0	1	1
Week 3	SEA 14 at OAK 38	14	38	24	-10,5	13,5	0	0	1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	SEA 25 at SD 22	25	22	-3	-2	-5	0	0	0	0
Week 14	OAK 13 at SD 6	13	6	-7	3,5	-3,5	1	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 20 at SD 17	20	17	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0
Week 8	KC 25 at SD 20	25	20	-5	-5,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BUF 24 at SD 27	24	27	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DEN 10 at SD 27	10	27	17	3	20	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CIN 14 at SD 28	14	28	14	-6	8	0	0	0	0
Week 1	WAS 3 at SD 30	3	30	27	-3	24	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	SF 21 at DAL 27	21	27	6	6	12	1	1	0	0
Week 13	NYG 13 at DAL 20	13	20	7	3,5	10,5	1	1	0	0
Week 11	DEN 26 at DAL 24	26	24	-2	7	5	1	1	1	0
Week 10	PHI 36 at DAL 3	36	3	-33	7,5	-25,5	1	0	1	0
Week 7	ARI 3 at DAL 17	3	17	14	2,5	16,5	0	0	0	0
Week 5	WAS 7 at DAL 9	7	9	2	-3	-1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SD 32 at DAL 21	32	21	-11	4	-7	1	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 10 at DAL 6	10	6	-4	9,5	5,5	1	1	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	GB 34 at NYG 25	34	25	-9	3	-6	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ARI 13 at NYG 17	13	17	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 28 at NYG 10	28	10	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DAL 24 at NYG 27	24	27	3	-10	-7	0	0	1	1
Week 6	PHI 10 at NYG 9	10	9	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 13 at NYG 21	13	21	8	-3	5	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	NYG 21 at PHI 24	21	24	3	-5	-2	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SD 14 at PHI 24	14	24	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0
Week 11	WAS 13 at PHI 3	13	3	-10	-7	-17	0	0	0	0
Week 9	MIN 17 at PHI 48	17	48	31	-4,5	26,5	0	0	0	0
Week 7	OAK 20 at PHI 10	20	10	-10	0	-10	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 21 at PHI 20	21	20	-1	-14	-15	0	0	1	1
Week 3	DAL 18 at PHI 40	18	40	22	-14	8	0	0	1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	ARI 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CHI 20 at WAS 15	20	15	-5	0	-5	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 20 at WAS 6	20	6	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DAL 20 at WAS 14	20	14	-6	-8	-14	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 14 at WAS 27	14	27	13	2,5	15,5	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYG 21 at WAS 35	21	35	14	8	22	1	1	1	0
Week 6	CAR 14 at WAS 17	14	17	3	3	6	0	0	0	0
Week 3	KC 45 at WAS 13	45	13	-32	3	-29	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	JAC 13 at CHI 33	13	33	20	-4,5	15,5	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 3 at CHI 27	3	27	24	-1,5	22,5	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 20 at CHI 12	20	12	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0

Week 8	CLE 21 at CHI 27	21	27	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SF 31 at CHI 37	31	37	6	-2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 13 at CHI 20	13	20	7	-7,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 10 at CHI 17	10	17	7	3,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	DAL 10 at DET 15	10	15	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CHI 24 at DET 0	24	0	-24	5,5	-18,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIN 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 29 at DET 27	29	27	-2	6,5	4,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TB 20 at DET 17	20	17	-3	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 31 at DET 27	31	27	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 27 at DET 24	27	24	-3	4,5	1,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	STL 35 at DET 0	35	0	-35	14	-21	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 16	MIN 13 at GB 24	13	24	11	-13	-2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 15	CLE 7 at GB 30	7	30	23	-7,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CHI 7 at GB 17	7	17	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	ATL 23 at GB 20	23	20	-3	-10,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 8	TB 20 at GB 21	20	21	1	-6	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	BAL 23 at GB 31	23	31	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 0 at GB 37	0	37	37	-10	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Week 1	DET 6 at GB 28	6	28	22	-6,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 15	JAC 33 at MIN 3	33	3	-30	-3	-33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TEN 24 at MIN 42	24	42	18	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CHI 13 at MIN 6	13	6	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 16 at MIN 28	16	28	12	-2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	GB 13 at MIN 35	13	35	22	3,5	25,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DET 26 at MIN 31	26	31	5	-10,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week 3	TB 16 at MIN 20	16	20	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CAR 24 at MIN 13	24	13	-11	-10,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 13	NO 28 at ATL 10	28	10	-18	3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	STL 35 at ATL 6	35	6	-29	7,5	-21,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 13 at ATL 20	13	20	7	-4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 24 at ATL 10	24	10	-14	-3	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SF 37 at ATL 31	37	31	-6	3,5	-2,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 31 at ATL 3	31	3	-28	-3	-31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ATL 34 at ARI 14	14	34	20	-3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CAR 16 at ATL 24	16	24	8	-3,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	NE 38 at CAR 6	38	6	-32	6,5	-25,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ARI 30 at CAR 7	30	7	-23	-2,5	-25,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	STL 38 at CAR 32	38	32	-6	12,5	6,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 25 at CAR 22	25	22	-3	7	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Week 7	NYJ 13 at CAR 12	13	12	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 27 at CAR 25	27	25	-2	6	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	GB 28 at CAR 7	28	7	-21	4	-17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4			
Week 17	SF 38 at NO 0	38	0	-38	2,5	-35,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	WAS 40 at NO 10	40	10	-30	-5	-35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 34 at NO 21	34	21	-13	6,5	-6,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CAR 23 at NO 27	23	27	4	-10	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Week 10	IND 20 at NO 34	20	34	14	-6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYJ 16 at NO 9	16	9	-7	-6	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	ATL 20 at NO 13	20	13	-7	-7	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week 4	MIN 15 at NO 28	15	28	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	PHI 17 at TB 13	17	13	-4	-4	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 16	BAL 10 at TB 22	10	22	12	-2.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	NO 21 at TB 48	21	48	27	-2.5	24.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	DET 12 at TB 15	12	15	3	-7.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	CHI 27 at TB 24	27	24	-3	-6	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	MIN 14 at TB 41	14	41	27	-3	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	PIT 17 at TB 10	17	10	-7	-5	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	GB 10 at TB 14	10	14	4	-2.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	DAL 10 at ARI 17	10	17	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	WAS 20 at ARI 10	20	10	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	DET 38 at ARI 45	38	45	7	-1.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	NYG 17 at ARI 10	17	10	-7	5.5	-1.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 8	PHI 21 at ARI 7	21	7	-14	6.5	-7.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	KC 16 at ARI 24	16	24	8	2.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	ATL 34 at ARI 14	34	14	-20	3	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	DEN 38 at ARI 17	38	17	-21	9	-12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	PHI 3 at SF 13	3	13	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	MIA 0 at SF 21	0	21	21	-4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	BUF 0 at SF 35	0	35	35	-8.5	26.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 9	NO 27 at SF 28	27	28	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	CAR 14 at SF 24	14	24	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	STL 30 at SF 26	30	26	-4	6.5	2.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	ATL 13 at SF 16	13	16	3	-3.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	KC 18 at SEA 21	18	21	3	-3.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	DAL 3 at SEA 29	3	29	26	-5.5	20.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	OAK 27 at SEA 34	27	34	7	6	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	MIA 24 at SEA 20	24	20	-4	2.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	DEN 21 at SEA 34	21	34	13	6	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	JAC 15 at SEA 24	15	24	9	-3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	PHI 27 at SEA 3	27	3	-24	2.5	-21.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	ATL 13 at STL 31	13	31	18	-15.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 16	IND 17 at STL 42	17	42	25	-12	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 13	SF 14 at STL 27	14	27	13	-7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	TB 24 at STL 17	24	17	-7	-10	-17	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week 9	CAR 14 at STL 48	14	48	34	-19.5	14.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 7	NO 34 at STL 31	34	31	-3	-10.5	-13.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Week 5	NYG 14 at STL 15	14	15	1	-12	-11	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
Week 3	MIA 10 at STL 42	10	42	32	-6	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total 01/02							41	25	15	10	35	19	16	9
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	NE 13 at BUF 10	13	10	-3	-4.5	-7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	MIA 33 at BUF 6	33	6	-27	-3	-30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	CHI 3 at BUF 20	3	20	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	NYJ 20 at BUF 23	20	23	3	-4.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	SD 24 at BUF 27	24	27	3	-10	-7	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week 5	IND 18 at BUF 16	18	16	-2	-2.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	GB 18 at BUF 27	18	27	9	-6.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	TEN 13 at BUF 16	13	16	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	IND 20 at MIA 13	20	13	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	PIT 34 at SD 21	34	21	-13	4	-9	1	0	0	0
Week 14	SF 45 at SD 17	45	17	-28	3	-25	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 16 at SD 17	16	17	1	3	4	0	0	0	0
Week 11	MIA 17 at SD 7	17	7	-10	5,5	-4,5	1	0	0	0
Week 9	OAK 15 at SD 13	15	13	-2	7	5	1	1	1	1
Week 6	DEN 21 at SD 7	21	7	-14	7	-7	1	0	1	0
Week 4	SEA 20 at SD 12	20	12	-8	2,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NO 28 at SD 27	28	27	-1	-5,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	NYG 17 at DAL 13	17	13	-4	7	3	1	1	1	0
Week 15	WAS 13 at DAL 32	13	32	19	6,5	25,5	1	1	0	0
Week 13	MIN 27 at DAL 15	27	15	-12	7,5	-4,5	1	0	1	0
Week 11	CIN 6 at DAL 23	6	23	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 23 at DAL 17	23	17	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0
Week 8	ARI 7 at DAL 48	7	48	41	-6,5	34,5	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 41 at DAL 24	41	24	-17	-6,5	-23,5	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PHI 41 at DAL 14	41	14	-27	-6	-33	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	JAC 25 at NYG 28	25	28	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0
Week 15	PIT 10 at NYG 30	10	30	20	-3,5	16,5	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 31 at NYG 21	31	21	-10	-6,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0
Week 11	STL 38 at NYG 24	38	24	-14	1,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PHI 7 at NYG 24	7	24	17	-3,5	13,5	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 14 at NYG 19	14	19	5	-3,5	1,5	0	0	0	0
Week 4	WAS 16 at NYG 6	16	6	-10	-2	-12	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 16 at NYG 21	16	21	5	-7	-2	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	CIN 7 at PHI 16	7	16	9	-10,5	-1,5	0	0	0	1
Week 14	TEN 15 at PHI 13	15	13	-2	3	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 9 at PHI 34	9	34	25	-8	17	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 9 at PHI 13	9	13	4	-7	-3	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ATL 10 at PHI 38	10	38	28	-3	25	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 33 at PHI 18	33	18	-15	-3	-18	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	ARI 3 at WAS 20	3	20	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYG 9 at WAS 7	9	7	-2	-6	-8	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 23 at WAS 20	23	20	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 27 at WAS 21	27	21	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BAL 3 at WAS 10	3	10	7	-3,5	3,5	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TB 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 27 at WAS 21	27	21	-6	-10,5	-16,5	0	0	0	1
Week 1	CAR 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-10	-7	0	0	0	1
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 15	NE 17 at CHI 24	17	24	7	-2	5	0	0	0	0
Week 14	GB 28 at CHI 6	28	6	-22	2,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TB 10 at CHI 13	10	13	3	7	10	1	1	1	1
Week 10	IND 24 at CHI 27	24	27	3	7	10	1	1	1	1
Week 7	MIN 28 at CHI 16	28	16	-12	7	-5	1	0	1	0
Week 6	NO 31 at CHI 10	31	10	-21	-3,5	-24,5	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DET 21 at CHI 14	21	14	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 14 at CHI 7	14	7	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	CHI 23 at DET 20	23	20	-3	-9	-12	0	0	0	1
Week 13	NE 9 at DET 34	9	34	25	-6,5	18,5	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ATL 10 at DET 13	10	13	3	-7,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0

Week 10	MIA 23 at DET 8	23	8	-15	-2.5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	GB 24 at DET 31	24	31	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIN 31 at DET 24	31	24	-7	1,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 31 at DET 10	31	10	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	WAS 10 at DET 15	10	15	5	5,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	DET 13 at GB 26	13	26	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	IND 24 at GB 26	24	26	2	4,5	6,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIN 20 at GB 26	20	26	6	3,5	9,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SF 28 at GB 31	28	31	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CHI 27 at GB 24	27	24	-3	-6	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PHI 3 at GB 6	3	6	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 20 at GB 16	20	16	-4	-2,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	GB 33 at MIN 28	33	28	-5	-8,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 14	DET 17 at MIN 24	17	24	7	-8,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 12	CAR 17 at MIN 31	17	31	14	-9,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	ARI 14 at MIN 31	14	31	17	-13,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 8	BUF 27 at MIN 31	27	31	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TB 23 at MIN 30	23	30	7	-2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIA 7 at MIN 13	7	13	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CHI 27 at MIN 30	27	30	3	-4,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	KC 13 at ATL 29	13	29	16	4,5	20,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SEA 30 at ATL 10	30	10	-20	-1	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	TB 27 at ATL 14	27	14	-13	8,5	-4,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CAR 12 at ATL 13	12	13	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NO 21 at ATL 19	21	19	-2	2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NYG 13 at ATL 6	13	6	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	STL 41 at ATL 20	41	20	-21	7	-14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SF 28 at ATL 36	28	36	8	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	SD 22 at CAR 30	22	30	8	-7,5	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 3 at CAR 16	3	16	13	8	29	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	GB 14 at CAR 31	14	31	17	2,5	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NO 20 at CAR 10	20	10	-10	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SF 16 at CAR 34	16	34	18	-3	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 3 at CAR 26	3	26	23	-3,5	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 16 at CAR 13	16	13	-3	-6,5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ATL 15 at CAR 10	15	10	-5	-5,5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	STL 26 at NO 21	26	21	-5	4	-1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ATL 7 at NO 23	7	23	16	-10	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 14	DEN 38 at NO 23	38	23	-15	-1	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	OAK 31 at NO 22	31	22	-9	3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 15 at NO 31	15	31	16	-5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CAR 6 at NO 24	6	24	18	-1,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 21 at NO 7	21	7	-14	-1,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 14 at NO 10	14	10	-4	-1	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	STL 35 at TB 38	35	38	3	2,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DAL 7 at TB 27	7	27	20	-10,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	BUF 17 at TB 31	17	31	14	-3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 15 at TB 20	15	20	5	-9	-4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 9	MIN 13 at TB 41	13	41	28	-3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 28 at TB 14	28	14	-14	-8,5	-22,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Week 4	NYJ 21 at TB 17	21	17	-4	-7,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 0 at TB 41	0	41	41	-7	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	BAL 13 at ARI 7	13	7	-6	16,5	10,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYG 31 at ARI 7	31	7	-24	7,5	-16,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 15 at ARI 16	15	16	1	9,5	10,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NO 21 at ARI 10	21	10	-11	6,5	-4,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 33 at ARI 14	33	14	-19	2,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CLE 21 at ARI 29	21	29	8	-4,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	GB 29 at ARI 3	29	3	-26	-2,5	-28,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DAL 31 at ARI 32	31	32	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	CHI 0 at SF 17	0	17	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NO 31 at SF 27	31	27	-4	-3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ATL 6 at SF 16	6	16	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	KC 7 at SF 21	7	21	14	4	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 34 at SF 24	34	24	-10	6,5	-3,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 34 at SF 28	34	28	-6	4,5	-1,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	ARI 20 at SF 27	20	27	7	-4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CAR 38 at SF 22	38	22	-16	3	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	BUF 42 at SEA 23	42	23	-19	-3	-22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	OAK 24 at SEA 27	24	27	3	7	10	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DEN 38 at SEA 31	38	31	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 15 at SEA 17	15	17	2	-3,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 24 at SEA 19	24	19	-5	3,5	-1,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	IND 37 at SEA 24	37	24	-13	6	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 10 at SEA 20	10	20	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	STL 37 at SEA 34	37	34	-3	8	5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	MIN 29 at STL 40	29	40	11	-3,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 31 at STL 24	31	24	-7	-13,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 12	WAS 33 at STL 20	33	20	-13	-6	-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CAR 27 at STL 24	27	24	-3	-13,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 7	ATL 29 at STL 45	29	45	16	-17,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 5	SD 31 at STL 57	31	57	26	-17	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	DEN 36 at STL 41	36	41	5	-6,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 00/01							46	24	27	16	38	21	23	9
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	IND 6 at BUF 31	6	31	25	2,5	27,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYG 19 at BUF 17	19	17	-2	-8	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NE 7 at BUF 17	7	17	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 3 at BUF 23	3	23	20	-3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 20 at BUF 14	20	14	-6	-4	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PIT 21 at BUF 24	21	24	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	PHI 0 at BUF 26	0	26	26	-12	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	NYJ 3 at BUF 17	3	17	14	-3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	NYJ 38 at MIA 31	38	31	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 9 at MIA 12	9	12	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	IND 37 at MIA 34	37	34	-3	-2	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 17 at MIA 27	17	27	10	-4,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 0 at MIA 17	0	17	17	-3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	PHI 13 at MIA 16	13	16	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 4	BUF 23 at MIA 18	23	18	-5	-6	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	ARI 16 at MIA 19	16	19	3	-9,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	BAL 3 at NE 20	3	20	17	2,5	19,5	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DAL 6 at NE 13	6	13	7	-2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYJ 24 at NE 17	24	17	-7	-6	-13	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DEN 23 at NE 24	23	24	1	-3,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIA 31 at NE 30	31	30	-1	-3	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 14 at NE 16	14	16	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 2	IND 28 at NE 31	28	31	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	SEA 9 at NYJ 19	9	19	10	-1,5	8,5	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 20 at NYJ 28	20	28	8	3	11	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BUF 7 at NYJ 17	7	17	10	2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0
Week 9	ARI 7 at NYJ 12	7	12	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0
Week 5	JAC 16 at NYJ 6	16	6	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0
Week 3	WAS 27 at NYJ 20	27	20	-7	1	-6	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 30 at NYJ 28	30	28	-2	-8	-10	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	CIN 0 at BAL 22	0	22	22	-7	15	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NO 8 at BAL 31	8	31	23	-9,5	13,5	0	0	1	0
Week 13	TEN 14 at BAL 41	14	41	27	3	30	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BUF 13 at BAL 10	13	10	-3	3,5	0,5	1	1	0	0
Week 7	KC 35 at BAL 8	35	8	-27	1	-26	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CLE 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	-12,5	-5,5	0	0	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 14	CLE 28 at CIN 44	28	44	16	-7	9	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SF 30 at CIN 44	30	44	14	-3,5	10,5	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 34 at CIN 31	34	31	-3	5,5	2,5	1	1	0	0
Week 10	TEN 24 at CIN 14	24	14	-10	9,5	-0,5	1	0	1	0
Week 8	JAC 41 at CIN 10	41	10	-31	11,5	-19,5	1	0	1	0
Week 6	PIT 17 at CIN 3	17	3	-14	5,5	-8,5	1	0	0	0
Week 4	STL 38 at CIN 10	38	10	-28	4	-24	1	0	0	0
Week 2	SD 34 at CIN 7	34	7	-27	-1	-28	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CLE	Difference	CLE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	IND 29 at CLE 28	29	28	-1	13,5	12,5	1	1	1	0
Week 15	JAC 24 at CLE 14	24	14	-10	14	4	1	1	1	0
Week 12	TEN 33 at CLE 21	33	21	-12	9,5	-2,5	1	0	1	0
Week 11	CAR 31 at CLE 17	31	17	-14	6	-8	1	0	0	0
Week 9	BAL 41 at CLE 9	41	9	-32	3,5	-28,5	1	0	0	0
Week 5	CIN 18 at CLE 17	18	17	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 43 at CLE 0	43	0	-43	6,5	-36,5	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	TEN 47 at PIT 36	47	36	-11	3	-8	0	0	0	0
Week 16	CAR 20 at PIT 30	20	30	10	3	13	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 31 at PIT 24	31	24	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 27 at PIT 20	27	20	-7	-9,5	-16,5	0	0	1	1
Week 10	CLE 16 at PIT 15	16	15	-1	-14	-15	0	0	1	1
Week 7	ATL 9 at PIT 13	9	13	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 17 at PIT 3	17	3	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SEA 29 at PIT 10	29	10	-19	-3,5	-22,5	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 15	WAS 21 at IND 24	21	24	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NE 15 at IND 20	15	20	5	-7	-2	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 17 at IND 25	17	25	8	-4,5	3,5	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DAL 24 at IND 34	24	34	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 10 at IND 31	10	31	21	-11	10	0	0	1	1
Week 5	MIA 34 at IND 31	34	31	-3	0	-3	0	0	0	0

Week 15	NYJ 22 at DAL 21	22	21	-1	-5.5	-6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PHI 10 at DAL 20	10	20	10	-8.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	MIA 0 at DAL 20	0	20	20	-1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	GB 13 at DAL 27	13	27	14	4	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 20 at DAL 38	20	38	18	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 7 at DAL 35	7	35	28	-7.5	20.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	ATL 7 at DAL 24	7	24	17	-6.5	10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	MIN 34 at NYG 17	34	17	-17	2	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYJ 28 at NYG 41	28	41	13	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 34 at NYG 24	34	24	-10	-6	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	IND 27 at NYG 19	27	19	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NO 3 at NYG 31	3	31	28	-3	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DAL 10 at NYG 13	10	13	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 15 at NYG 16	15	16	1	-9.5	-8.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 2	WAS 50 at NYG 21	50	21	-29	-2	-31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	STL 31 at PHI 38	31	38	7	8.5	15.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NE 9 at PHI 24	9	24	15	4.5	19.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	IND 44 at PHI 17	44	17	-27	7	-20	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 28 at PHI 35	28	35	7	6.5	13.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NYG 23 at PHI 17	23	17	-6	2.5	-3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 10 at PHI 13	10	13	3	10	13	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 19 at PHI 5	19	5	-14	7	-7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 25 at PHI 24	25	24	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	MIA 10 at WAS 21	10	21	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ARI 3 at WAS 28	3	28	25	-5	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-11	-8	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 11	NYG 13 at WAS 23	13	23	10	-4.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BUF 34 at WAS 17	34	17	-17	-4	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 22 at WAS 48	22	48	26	-8.5	17.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 4	CAR 36 at WAS 38	36	38	2	-8	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 41 at WAS 35	41	35	-6	-2.5	-8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	TB 20 at CHI 6	20	6	-14	3.5	-10.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DET 10 at CHI 28	10	28	18	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	GB 35 at CHI 19	35	19	-16	3.5	-12.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIN 27 at CHI 24	27	24	-3	6.5	3.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PHI 20 at CHI 16	20	16	-4	-6	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 10 at CHI 14	10	14	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SEA 14 at CHI 13	14	13	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	DEN 17 at DET 7	17	7	-10	-4.5	-14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	WAS 17 at DET 33	17	33	16	-3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CHI 17 at DET 21	17	21	4	-5.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 27 at DET 31	27	31	4	4	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TB 3 at DET 20	3	20	17	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIN 23 at DET 25	23	25	2	4.5	6.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 20 at DET 10	20	10	-10	-4.5	-14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	GB 15 at DET 23	15	23	8	5.5	13.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	ARI 24 at GB 49	24	49	25	-9	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 14	CAR 33 at GB 31	33	31	-2	-7	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DET 17 at GB 26	17	26	9	-5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 14 at GB 13	14	13	-1	-9	-10	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Week 8	SEA 27 at GB 7	27	7	-20	-5.5	-25.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	TB 23 at GB 26	23	26	3	-5.5	-2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	MIN 20 at GB 23	20	23	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	OAK 24 at GB 28	24	28	4	-8.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	GB 20 at MIN 24	20	24	4	-5.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SD 27 at MIN 35	27	35	8	-14	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 9	DAL 17 at MIN 27	17	27	10	-7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	SF 16 at MIN 40	16	40	24	-7.5	16.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CHI 24 at MIN 22	24	22	-2	-12	-14	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 2	OAK 22 at MIN 17	22	17	-5	-10.5	-15.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	SF 29 at ATL 34	29	34	5	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	ARI 14 at ATL 37	14	37	23	-2.5	20.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 12 at ATL 35	12	35	23	-4	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 30 at ATL 7	30	7	-23	6.5	-16.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CAR 20 at ATL 27	20	27	7	-2.5	4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	STL 41 at ATL 13	41	13	-28	4	-24	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	BAL 19 at ATL 13	19	13	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 17 at ATL 14	17	14	-3	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	NO 13 at CAR 45	13	45	32	-8.5	23.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 15	SF 24 at CAR 41	24	41	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	STL 34 at CAR 21	34	21	-13	7	-6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ATL 28 at CAR 34	28	34	6	-4.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PHI 7 at CAR 33	7	33	26	-4.5	21.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DET 24 at CAR 9	24	9	-15	-4	-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CIN 3 at CAR 27	3	27	24	-6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	JAC 22 at CAR 20	22	20	-2	9.5	7.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	DAL 24 at NO 31	24	31	7	9	16	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 30 at NO 14	30	14	-16	12	-4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 6 at NO 24	6	24	18	-1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TB 31 at NO 16	31	16	-15	3.5	-11.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CLE 21 at NO 16	21	16	-5	-9	-14	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 5	ATL 20 at NO 17	20	17	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	CAR 10 at NO 19	10	19	9	-3.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	GB 10 at TB 29	10	29	19	-3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DET 16 at TB 23	16	23	7	-3.5	3.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 17 at TB 24	17	24	7	2.5	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	ATL 10 at TB 19	10	19	9	-7.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 10 at TB 17	10	17	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 3 at TB 6	3	6	3	-9	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 1	NYG 17 at TB 13	17	13	-4	-6.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	BUF 31 at ARI 21	31	21	-10	3.5	-6.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 17 at ARI 21	17	21	4	-7	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DAL 9 at ARI 13	9	13	4	2.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 19 at ARI 23	19	23	4	3.5	7.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 27 at ARI 3	27	3	-24	3	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 24 at ARI 10	24	10	-14	4	-10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYG 3 at ARI 14	3	14	11	-2.5	8.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SF 24 at ARI 10	24	10	-14	2	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	WAS 26 at SF 20	26	20	-6	7	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0

Week 14	ATL 7 at SF 26	7	26	19	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 12	GB 20 at SF 3	20	3	-17	6	-11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	STL 23 at SF 7	23	7	-16	8,5	-7,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	PIT 27 at SF 6	27	6	-21	-2,5	-23,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	CAR 31 at SF 29	31	29	-2	-3,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	TEN 22 at SF 24	22	24	2	-1,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	NO 21 at SF 28	21	28	7	-10	-3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	KC 14 at SEA 23	14	23	9	-3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	SD 19 at SEA 16	19	16	-3	-9,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week 12	TB 16 at SEA 3	16	3	-13	-5,5	-18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	DEN 17 at SEA 20	17	20	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	CIN 20 at SEA 37	20	37	17	-13,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 7	BUF 16 at SEA 26	16	26	10	-2,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 4	OAK 21 at SEA 22	21	22	1	-3	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	DET 28 at SEA 20	28	20	-8	-9,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	CHI 12 at STL 34	12	34	22	-9,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 15	NYG 10 at STL 31	10	31	21	-10	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 12	NO 12 at STL 43	12	43	31	-14	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 10	CAR 10 at STL 35	10	35	25	-10,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 7	CLE 3 at STL 34	3	34	31	-19	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week 5	SF 20 at STL 42	20	42	22	-3,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	ATL 7 at STL 35	7	35	28	1,5	29,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	BAL 10 at STL 27	10	27	17	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total 99/00							41	20	15	7	40	22	17	8
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	NYJ 17 at BUF 10	17	10	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	OAK 21 at BUF 44	21	44	23	-8,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 12	IND 11 at BUF 34	11	34	23	-7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 9	MIA 24 at BUF 30	24	30	6	-2,5	3,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	JAC 16 at BUF 17	16	17	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 5	SF 21 at BUF 26	21	26	5	10	15	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	
Week 3	STL 34 at BUF 33	34	33	-1	-4,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	DEN 21 at MIA 31	21	31	10	5	15	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 15	NYJ 21 at MIA 16	21	16	-5	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	NO 10 at MIA 30	10	30	20	-7,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	IND 14 at MIA 27	14	27	13	-9	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 8	NE 9 at MIA 12	9	12	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	STL 0 at MIA 14	0	14	14	-7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	PIT 0 at MIA 21	0	21	21	-2,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	BUF 7 at MIA 13	7	13	6	-7	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	SF 21 at NE 24	21	24	3	7	10	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	
Week 13	BUF 21 at NE 25	21	25	4	-2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 10	ATL 41 at NE 10	41	10	-31	-5	-36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NYJ 24 at NE 14	24	14	-10	-6,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 6	KC 10 at NE 40	10	40	30	-3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 3	TEN 16 at NE 27	16	27	11	-6,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	IND 6 at NE 29	6	29	23	-10,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	NE 10 at NYJ 31	10	31	21	-7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	SEA 31 at NYJ 32	31	32	1	-7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 13	CAR 21 at NYJ 48	21	48	27	-9,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	
Week 10	BUF 12 at NYJ 34	12	34	22	-3,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Week 8	ATL 3 at NYJ 28	3	28	25	-6,5	18,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	MIA 9 at NYJ 20	9	20	11	-2,5	8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	IND 6 at NYJ 44	6	44	38	-8,5	29,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	BAL 24 at NYJ 10	24	10	-14	-5	-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	DET 10 at BAL 19	10	19	9	-2,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	IND 31 at BAL 38	31	38	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	OAK 10 at BAL 13	10	13	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 45 at BAL 19	45	19	-26	3,5	-22,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 12 at BAL 8	12	8	-4	-3,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CIN 24 at BAL 31	24	31	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	PIT 20 at BAL 13	20	13	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	TB 35 at CIN 0	35	0	-35	6	-29	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 33 at CIN 20	33	20	-13	5,5	-7,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 34 at CIN 17	34	17	-17	7	-10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BAL 20 at CIN 13	20	13	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 33 at CIN 26	33	26	-7	11,5	4,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 20 at CIN 25	20	25	5	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TEN 23 at CIN 14	23	14	-9	1	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	CIN 25 at PIT 24	25	24	-1	-10,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 14	NE 23 at PIT 9	23	9	-14	-6	-20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	JAC 15 at PIT 30	15	30	15	-3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	GB 20 at PIT 27	20	27	7	3,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 41 at PIT 31	41	31	-10	-5,5	-15,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BAL 6 at PIT 16	6	16	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CHI 12 at PIT 17	12	17	5	-11	-6	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	CAR 27 at IND 19	27	19	-8	-6,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CIN 26 at IND 39	26	39	13	-4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 23 at IND 24	23	24	1	7	8	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NE 21 at IND 16	21	16	-5	5,5	0,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BUF 31 at IND 24	31	24	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SD 12 at IND 17	12	17	5	-1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NO 19 at IND 13	19	13	-6	0	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIA 24 at IND 15	24	15	-9	4,5	-4,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	PIT 3 at JAC 21	3	21	18	-3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 16 at JAC 13	16	13	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	DET 22 at JAC 37	22	37	15	-7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	TB 24 at JAC 29	24	29	5	-6,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 11 at JAC 24	11	24	13	-10,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	BAL 10 at JAC 24	10	24	14	-6,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	KC 16 at JAC 21	16	21	5	-4,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	MIN 26 at TEN 16	26	16	-10	7	-3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BAL 14 at TEN 16	14	16	2	-6	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYJ 24 at TEN 3	24	3	-21	-1	-22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 14 at TEN 23	14	23	9	-1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CHI 23 at TEN 20	23	20	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CIN 14 at TEN 44	14	44	30	-3	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 27 at TEN 22	27	22	-5	2,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SD 13 at TEN 7	13	7	-6	-8	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	SEA 21 at DEN 28	21	28	7	-10,5	-3,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Week 14	KC 31 at DEN 35	31	35	4	-13,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 12	OAK 14 at DEN 40	14	40	26	-11,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	SD 10 at DEN 27	10	27	17	-16	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 8	JAC 24 at DEN 37	24	37	13	-8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	PHI 16 at DEN 41	16	41	25	-14,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 2	DAL 23 at DEN 42	23	42	19	-7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NE 21 at DEN 27	21	27	6	-8,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 15	DAL 17 at KC 20	17	20	3	-2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 24 at KC 34	24	34	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 30 at KC 7	30	7	-23	4	-19	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYJ 20 at KC 17	20	17	-3	-4,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 20 at KC 13	20	13	-7	-6,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	SEA 6 at KC 17	6	17	11	-4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 7 at KC 23	7	23	16	-10,5	5,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 1	OAK 8 at KC 28	8	28	20	-7,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	KC 31 at OAK 24	31	24	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 27 at OAK 17	27	17	-10	2,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	WAS 29 at OAK 19	29	19	-10	-7	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	SEA 17 at OAK 20	17	20	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	CIN 10 at OAK 27	10	27	17	-2,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SD 6 at OAK 7	6	7	1	-5,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DEN 34 at OAK 17	34	17	-17	7	-10	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NYG 17 at OAK 20	17	20	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	OAK 17 at SD 10	17	10	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DEN 31 at SD 16	31	16	-15	13,5	-1,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	KC 37 at SD 38	37	38	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	BAL 13 at SD 14	13	14	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 34 at SD 16	34	16	-18	1,5	-16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	WAS 7 at DAL 23	7	23	16	1,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 9 at DAL 13	9	13	4	-10,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 13	MIN 46 at DAL 36	46	36	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 22 at DAL 30	22	30	8	-5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 6 at DAL 16	6	16	10	-8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	OAK 13 at DAL 12	13	12	-1	-5	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 10 at DAL 38	10	38	28	-5,5	22,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYG	Difference	NYG Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 16	KC 7 at NYG 28	7	28	21	-1,5	19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DEN 16 at NYG 20	16	20	4	13	17	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 0 at NYG 20	0	20	20	-6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	GB 37 at NYG 3	37	3	-34	7	-27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ARI 7 at NYG 34	7	34	27	-2,5	24,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	ATL 34 at NYG 20	34	20	-14	-2	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	DAL 31 at NYG 7	31	7	-24	-4	-28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	WAS 24 at NYG 31	24	31	7	-2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	NYG 20 at PHI 10	20	10	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 14 at PHI 17	14	17	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DET 9 at PHI 10	9	10	1	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 34 at PHI 0	34	0	-34	7	-27	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 12 at PHI 17	12	17	5	2,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	KC 24 at PHI 21	24	21	-3	7,5	4,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SEA 38 at PHI 0	38	0	-38	5,5	-32,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	TB 16 at WAS 20	16	20	4	3	7	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SD 20 at WAS 24	20	24	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ARI 45 at WAS 42	45	42	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PHI 3 at WAS 28	3	28	25	-4	21	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYG 14 at WAS 21	14	21	7	2,5	9,5	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 31 at WAS 10	31	10	-21	-1,5	-22,5	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DEN 38 at WAS 16	38	16	-22	6	-16	1	0	0	0
Week 2	SF 45 at WAS 10	45	10	-35	6,5	-28,5	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	GB 16 at CHI 13	16	13	-3	6,5	3,5	1	1	0	0
Week 16	BAL 3 at CHI 24	3	24	21	1	22	0	0	0	0
Week 13	TB 31 at CHI 17	31	17	-14	3,5	-10,5	1	0	0	0
Week 10	STL 20 at CHI 12	20	12	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DAL 12 at CHI 13	12	13	1	3	4	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DET 27 at CHI 31	27	31	4	-2	2	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIN 31 at CHI 28	31	28	-3	5,5	2,5	1	1	0	0
Week 1	JAC 24 at CHI 23	24	23	-1	10	9	1	1	1	1
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 13	PIT 16 at DET 19	16	19	3	2	5	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CHI 3 at DET 26	3	26	23	-7	16	0	0	0	0
Week 9	ARI 17 at DET 15	17	15	-2	-6,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIN 34 at DET 13	34	13	-21	4,5	-16,5	1	0	0	0
Week 7	GB 20 at DET 27	20	27	7	7	14	1	1	1	1
Week 4	TB 6 at DET 27	6	27	21	2,5	23,5	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 34 at DET 28	34	28	-6	-7	-13	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	TEN 22 at GB 30	22	30	8	-6	2	0	0	0	0
Week 15	CHI 20 at GB 26	20	26	6	-13,5	-7,5	0	0	1	1
Week 13	PHI 16 at GB 24	16	24	8	-19	-11	0	0	1	1
Week 9	SF 22 at GB 36	22	36	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BAL 10 at GB 28	10	28	18	-11	7	0	0	1	0
Week 5	MIN 37 at GB 24	37	24	-13	-7	-20	0	0	0	0
Week 2	TB 15 at GB 23	15	23	8	-7	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 19 at GB 38	19	38	19	-9	10	0	0	1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	JAC 10 at MIN 50	10	50	40	-13,5	26,5	0	0	1	0
Week 14	CHI 22 at MIN 48	22	48	26	-16,5	9,5	0	0	1	0
Week 12	GB 14 at MIN 28	14	28	14	-3	11	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CIN 3 at MIN 24	3	24	21	-11	10	0	0	1	0
Week 10	NO 24 at MIN 31	24	31	7	-14	-7	0	0	1	1
Week 7	WAS 7 at MIN 41	7	41	34	-13	21	0	0	1	0
Week 3	DET 6 at MIN 29	6	29	23	-6,5	16,5	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 7 at MIN 31	7	31	24	-3	21	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 17	MIA 16 at ATL 38	16	38	22	-3	19	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 21 at ATL 28	21	28	7	-12	-5	0	0	1	1
Week 12	CHI 13 at ATL 20	13	20	7	-12	-5	0	0	1	1
Week 11	SF 19 at ATL 31	19	31	12	3	15	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 15 at ATL 37	15	37	22	-7	15	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NO 23 at ATL 31	23	31	8	-7	1	0	0	0	0
Week 5	CAR 23 at ATL 51	23	51	28	-3	25	0	0	0	0
Week 2	PHI 12 at ATL 17	12	17	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4
Week 16	STL 13 at CAR 20	13	20	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 28 at CAR 25	28	25	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0

Week 4	ARI 20 at STL 17	20	17	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 38 at STL 31	38	31	-7	7,5	0,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 24 at STL 17	24	17	-7	-4	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total98/99							44	23	20	12	36	16	27	14
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	JAC 20 at BUF 14	20	14	-6	4,5	-1,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NYJ 10 at BUF 20	10	20	10	1,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 31 at BUF 10	31	10	-21	3	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 6 at BUF 9	6	9	3	-1,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DEN 23 at BUF 20	23	20	-3	7	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	DET 13 at BUF 22	13	22	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	IND 35 at BUF 37	35	37	2	-7	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 34 at BUF 13	34	13	-21	-2,5	-23,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	NE 14 at MIA 12	14	12	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	BUF 13 at MIA 30	13	30	17	-6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYJ 17 at MIA 24	17	24	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 36 at MIA 33	36	33	-3	-8,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 2	TEN 13 at MIA 16	13	16	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	PIT 24 at NE 21	24	21	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	IND 17 at NE 20	17	20	3	-11,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 13	MIA 24 at NE 27	24	27	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 28 at NE 10	28	10	-18	-1,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BUF 6 at NE 33	6	33	27	-8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 3 at NE 31	3	31	28	-12,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	NYJ 24 at NE 27	24	27	3	-10	-7	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 1	SD 7 at NE 41	7	41	34	-8	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	TB 0 at NYJ 31	0	31	31	2	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	IND 22 at NYJ 14	22	14	-8	-6	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 21 at NYJ 23	21	23	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	BAL 16 at NYJ 19	16	19	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 19 at NYJ 24	19	24	5	3,5	8,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIA 31 at NYJ 20	31	20	-11	-3,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	OAK 22 at NYJ 23	22	23	1	-1,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BUF 28 at NYJ 22	28	22	-6	-4,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	TEN 19 at BAL 21	19	21	2	2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SEA 24 at BAL 31	24	31	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ARI 16 at BAL 13	16	13	-3	-5	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	PHI 10 at BAL 10	10	10	0	-2,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIA 24 at BAL 13	24	13	-11	1	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 42 at BAL 34	42	34	-8	1,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 10 at BAL 23	10	23	13	1,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	JAC 28 at BAL 27	28	27	-1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	BAL 14 at CIN 16	14	16	2	-6,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	DAL 24 at CIN 31	24	31	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	TEN 14 at CIN 41	14	41	27	2,5	29,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 26 at CIN 31	26	31	5	5	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 31 at CIN 38	31	38	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 26 at CIN 10	26	10	-16	4,5	-11,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NYJ 31 at CIN 14	31	14	-17	-4	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 21 at CIN 24	21	24	3	-8,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4

Week 5	ARI 18 at TB 19	18	19	1	-7	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIA 21 at TB 31	21	31	10	-3,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SF 6 at TB 13	6	13	7	6,5	13,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	ATL 26 at ARI 29	26	29	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 38 at ARI 28	38	28	-10	-1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 21 at ARI 31	21	31	10	3,5	13,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	TEN 41 at ARI 14	41	14	-27	-1	-28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	NYG 27 at ARI 13	27	13	-14	-6,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	MIN 20 at ARI 19	20	19	-1	-2	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DAL 22 at ARI 25	22	25	3	10,5	13,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	DEN 17 at SF 34	17	34	17	-3,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	MIN 17 at SF 28	17	28	11	-9,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 13	SD 10 at SF 17	10	17	7	-14,5	-7,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 12	CAR 19 at SF 27	19	27	8	-9,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 10	DAL 10 at SF 17	10	17	7	-6,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	STL 10 at SF 30	10	30	20	-14	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 4	ATL 7 at SF 34	7	34	27	-14	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 3	NO 7 at SF 33	7	33	26	-11	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	SF 9 at SEA 38	9	38	29	-3	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ATL 24 at SEA 17	24	17	-7	-7	-14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	KC 19 at SEA 14	19	14	-5	-3	-8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	OAK 34 at SEA 45	34	45	11	-2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 13 at SEA 16	13	16	3	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SD 22 at SEA 26	22	26	4	-6	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DEN 35 at SEA 14	35	14	-21	6	-15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NYJ 41 at SEA 3	41	3	-38	-4	-42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	CHI 13 at STL 10	13	10	-3	-4	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 16 at STL 10	16	10	-6	3,5	-2,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	ATL 27 at STL 21	27	21	-6	-3,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	KC 28 at STL 20	28	20	-8	5,5	-2,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 17 at STL 9	17	9	-8	2,5	-5,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 3 at STL 13	3	13	10	-2,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	SF 15 at STL 12	15	12	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	NO 24 at STL 38	24	38	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total97/98							36	22	12	9	33	18	17	8
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	KC 9 at BUF 20	9	20	11	-5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NYJ 10 at BUF 35	10	35	25	-9,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	CIN 17 at BUF 31	17	31	14	-7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	WAS 13 at BUF 38	13	38	25	-3,5	21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIA 21 at BUF 7	21	7	-14	-5,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	IND 13 at BUF 16	13	16	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DAL 7 at BUF 10	7	10	3	7	10	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NE 10 at BUF 17	10	17	7	-4,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	BUF 14 at MIA 16	14	16	2	2,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	NYG 17 at MIA 7	17	7	-10	-7	-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PIT 24 at MIA 17	24	17	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	IND 16 at MIA 37	16	37	21	-4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	DAL 29 at MIA 10	29	10	-19	3	-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SEA 22 at MIA 15	22	15	-7	-7,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYJ 27 at MIA 36	27	36	9	-13	-4	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1

Week 1	NE 10 at MIA 24	10	24	14	-2,5	11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	NYJ 10 at NE 34	10	34	24	-13	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	IND 13 at NE 27	13	27	14	-6,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DEN 34 at NE 8	34	8	-26	-2,5	-28,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	MIA 23 at NE 42	23	42	19	-4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	BUF 25 at NE 28	25	28	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	WAS 27 at NE 22	27	22	-5	-5	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	JAC 25 at NE 28	25	28	3	-8	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ARI 0 at NE 31	0	31	31	-10	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	MIA 31 at NYJ 28	31	28	-3	3,5	0,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	PHI 21 at NYJ 20	21	20	-1	7,5	6,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 14	TEN 35 at NYJ 10	35	10	-25	3	-22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NE 31 at NYJ 27	31	27	-4	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	BUF 25 at NYJ 22	25	22	-3	7	4	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 6	OAK 34 at NYJ 13	34	13	-21	4	-17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	NYG 13 at NYJ 6	13	6	-7	-2	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	IND 21 at NYJ 7	21	7	-14	4,5	-9,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	BAL	Difference	BAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	TEN 24 at BAL 21	24	21	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	PIT 17 at BAL 31	17	31	14	4,5	18,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	JAC 28 at BAL 25	28	25	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CIN 24 at BAL 21	24	21	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 31 at BAL 37	31	37	6	-7	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	NE 46 at BAL 38	46	38	-8	3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	NO 10 at BAL 17	10	17	7	-5,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	OAK 14 at BAL 19	14	19	5	-2,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CIN	Difference	CIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	IND 24 at CIN 31	24	31	7	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BAL 14 at CIN 21	14	21	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	ATL 31 at CIN 41	31	41	10	-5,5	4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	PIT 24 at CIN 34	24	34	10	4	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	JAC 21 at CIN 28	21	28	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 30 at CIN 27	30	27	-3	-1	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DEN 14 at CIN 10	14	10	-4	3	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NO 15 at CIN 30	15	30	15	-3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PIT	Difference	PIT Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	SF 25 at PIT 15	25	15	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	SD 3 at PIT 16	3	16	13	-10,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 12	JAC 3 at PIT 28	3	28	25	-10,5	14,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 10	STL 6 at PIT 42	6	42	36	-13,5	22,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 5	TEN 16 at PIT 30	16	30	14	-5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BUF 6 at PIT 24	6	24	18	-3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	BAL 17 at PIT 31	17	31	14	-4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	IND	Difference	IND Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	PHI 10 at IND 37	10	37	27	4,5	31,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	BUF 10 at IND 13	10	13	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYJ 29 at IND 34	29	34	5	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SD 26 at IND 19	26	19	-7	-6	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NE 27 at IND 9	27	9	-18	-3	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	BAL 21 at IND 26	21	26	5	-8	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	MIA 6 at IND 10	6	10	4	-2,5	1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 13 at IND 20	13	20	7	-9	-2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	JAC	Difference	JAC Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	ATL 17 at JAC 19	17	19	2	-10	-8	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Week 16	SEA 13 at JAC 20	13	20	7	-6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 14	CIN 27 at JAC 30	27	30	3	-2,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 11	BAL 27 at JAC 30	27	30	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 7	NYJ 17 at JAC 21	17	21	4	-8,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
Week 5	CAR 14 at JAC 24	14	24	10	2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 2	TEN 34 at JAC 27	34	27	-7	-2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Week 1	PIT 9 at JAC 24	9	24	15	3,5	18,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Week	Result	Other Team	TEN	Difference	TEN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	CIN 21 at TEN 13	21	13	-8	-4	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	JAC 23 at TEN 17	23	17	-6	-6,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	CAR 31 at TEN 6	31	6	-25	-4,5	-29,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIA 23 at TEN 20	23	20	-3	-3,5	-6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	SF 10 at TEN 9	10	9	-1	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	PIT 13 at TEN 23	13	23	10	2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	BAL 13 at TEN 29	13	29	16	-3,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	KC 20 at TEN 19	20	19	-1	5	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DEN	Difference	DEN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	OAK 19 at DEN 24	19	24	5	-6	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SEA 7 at DEN 34	7	34	27	-11,5	15,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 11	CHI 12 at DEN 17	12	17	5	-10	-5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 9	KC 7 at DEN 34	7	34	27	-3,5	23,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	SD 17 at DEN 28	17	28	11	-4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	TB 23 at DEN 27	23	27	4	-13,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 1	NYJ 6 at DEN 31	6	31	25	-8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	KC	Difference	KC Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	IND 24 at KC 19	24	19	-5	-5	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	SD 28 at KC 14	28	14	-14	-6,5	-20,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	CHI 10 at KC 14	10	14	4	-8,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 11	GB 20 at KC 27	20	27	7	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SEA 16 at KC 34	16	34	18	-9	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 6	PIT 17 at KC 7	17	7	-10	-4,5	-14,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	DEN 14 at KC 17	14	17	3	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 3 at KC 19	3	19	16	-6,5	9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	OAK	Difference	OAK Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	SEA 28 at OAK 21	28	21	-7	-3,5	-10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	KC 7 at OAK 26	7	26	19	-2,5	16,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	MIA 7 at OAK 17	7	17	10	-2,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	MIN 16 at OAK 13	16	13	-3	-6,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	DEN 22 at OAK 21	22	21	-1	-2	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DET 21 at OAK 37	21	37	16	-2,5	13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SD 40 at OAK 34	40	34	-6	-3	-9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	JAC 3 at OAK 17	3	17	14	-6,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	SD	Difference	SD Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	DEN 10 at SD 16	10	16	6	1,5	7,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	NE 45 at SD 7	45	7	-38	-1	-39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	TB 25 at SD 17	25	17	-8	-7	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DET 21 at SD 27	21	27	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	OAK 23 at SD 14	23	14	-9	-3,5	-12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	KC 19 at SD 22	19	22	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CIN 14 at SD 27	14	27	13	-6,5	6,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	SEA 7 at SD 29	7	29	22	-4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DAL	Difference	DAL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	NE 6 at DAL 12	6	12	6	-5,5	0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	WAS 10 at DAL 21	10	21	11	-9	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 12	GB 6 at DAL 21	6	21	15	-4,5	10,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PHI 31 at DAL 21	31	21	-10	-9	-19	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

Week 3	SD 10 at GB 42	10	42	32	-9	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 2	PHI 13 at GB 39	13	39	26	-8,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	TB 10 at MIN 21	10	21	11	-6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	ARI 17 at MIN 41	17	41	24	-4,5	19,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	DEN 21 at MIN 17	21	17	-4	5,5	1,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	KC 21 at MIN 6	21	6	-15	2	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 15 at MIN 13	15	13	-2	-6,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 12 at MIN 14	12	14	2	-6,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	GB 21 at MIN 30	21	30	9	7	16	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DET 13 at MIN 17	13	17	4	-2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	STL 34 at ATL 27	34	27	-7	-5	-12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	SF 34 at ATL 10	34	10	-24	10,5	-13,5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NO 15 at ATL 17	15	17	2	-4	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	CAR 17 at ATL 20	17	20	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	PIT 20 at ATL 17	20	17	-3	5,5	2,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	TEN 23 at ATL 13	23	13	-10	-1,5	-11,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	PHI 33 at ATL 18	33	18	-15	-2,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIN 23 at ATL 17	23	17	-6	-5	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CAR	Difference	CAR Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	PIT 14 at CAR 18	14	18	4	-7	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	BAL 16 at CAR 27	16	27	11	-8,5	2,5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 0 at CAR 24	0	24	24	-6,5	17,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	NYG 17 at CAR 27	17	27	10	-6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	NO 7 at CAR 19	7	19	12	-7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	STL 13 at CAR 45	13	45	32	-7	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 7 at CAR 23	7	23	16	10	26	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ATL 6 at CAR 29	6	29	23	3	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	NO	Difference	NO Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	ATL 31 at NO 15	31	15	-16	-2	-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	STL 26 at NO 10	26	10	-16	-3	-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	TEN 31 at NO 14	31	14	-17	4,5	-12,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	SF 24 at NO 17	24	17	-7	9	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 7	CHI 24 at NO 27	24	27	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	JAC 13 at NO 17	13	17	4	-2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	ARI 28 at NO 14	28	14	-14	-7,5	-21,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	CAR 22 at NO 20	22	20	-2	-3	-5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	TB	Difference	TB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	CHI 19 at TB 34	19	34	15	-2,5	12,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	WAS 10 at TB 24	10	24	14	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	NO 7 at TB 13	7	13	6	-6,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	OAK 17 at TB 20	17	20	3	5	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	MIN 13 at TB 24	13	24	11	6	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DET 27 at TB 0	27	0	-27	6,5	-20,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SEA 17 at TB 13	17	13	-4	1,5	-2,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	GB 34 at TB 3	34	3	-31	7	-24	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ARI	Difference	ARI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	WAS 26 at ARI 27	26	27	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	DAL 10 at ARI 6	10	6	-4	9,5	5,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 30 at ARI 36	30	36	6	4,5	10,5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYG 23 at ARI 31	23	31	8	-2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYJ 31 at ARI 21	31	21	-10	-3,5	-13,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TB 9 at ARI 13	9	13	4	-3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	STL 28 at ARI 31	28	31	3	-2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	MIA 38 at ARI 10	38	10	-28	6	-22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Week	Result	Other Team	SF	Difference	SF Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	DET 14 at SF 24	14	24	10	-9,5	0,5	0	0	1	0				
Week 15	CAR 30 at SF 24	30	24	-6	-10	-16	0	0	1	1				
Week 12	BAL 20 at SF 38	20	38	18	-12	6	0	0	1	0				
Week 11	DAL 20 at SF 17	20	17	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0				
Week 8	CIN 21 at SF 28	21	28	7	-14,5	-7,5	0	0	1	1				
Week 5	ATL 17 at SF 39	17	39	22	-12	10	0	0	1	0				
Week 2	STL 0 at SF 34	0	34	34	-12,5	21,5	0	0	1	0				
Week 1	NO 11 at SF 27	11	27	16	-12	4	0	0	1	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	SEA	Difference	SEA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 15	BUF 18 at SEA 26	18	26	8	4,5	12,5	1	1	0	0				
Week 13	OAK 27 at SEA 21	27	21	-6	-2	-8	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	MIN 23 at SEA 42	23	42	19	-1,5	17,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 10	TEN 16 at SEA 23	16	23	7	1	8	0	0	0	0				
Week 9	SD 13 at SEA 32	13	32	19	-2,5	16,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 5	GB 31 at SEA 10	31	10	-21	10	-11	1	0	0	0				
Week 3	KC 35 at SEA 17	35	17	-18	3,5	-14,5	1	0	0	0				
Week 2	DEN 30 at SEA 20	30	20	-10	2	-8	0	0	0	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	NO 13 at STL 14	13	14	1	-5,5	-4,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 13	GB 24 at STL 9	24	9	-15	10	-5	1	0	0	0				
Week 12	CAR 20 at STL 10	20	10	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	ATL 16 at STL 59	16	59	43	2,5	45,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 8	JAC 14 at STL 17	14	17	3	1,5	4,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 6	SF 28 at STL 11	28	11	-17	10,5	-6,5	1	0	0	0				
Week 4	WAS 17 at STL 10	17	10	-7	-1,5	-8,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 1	CIN 16 at STL 26	16	26	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0				
Total 96/97							39	26	16	9	41	18	19	8
Week	Result	Other Team	BUF	Difference	BUF Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	TEN 28 at BUF 17	28	17	-11	-3	-14	0	0	0	0				
Week 16	MIA 20 at BUF 23	20	23	3	-3,5	-0,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 13	NE 35 at BUF 25	35	25	-10	-6	-16	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	ATL 17 at BUF 23	17	23	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0				
Week 7	SEA 21 at BUF 27	21	27	6	-7,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 6	NYJ 10 at BUF 29	10	29	19	-10,5	8,5	0	0	1	0				
Week 3	IND 14 at BUF 20	14	20	6	-4	2	0	0	0	0				
Week 2	CAR 9 at BUF 31	9	31	22	-9,5	12,5	0	0	1	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	MIA	Difference	MIA Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 15	KC 6 at MIA 13	6	13	7	-3,5	3,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 14	ATL 20 at MIA 21	20	21	1	-7	-6	0	0	0	0				
Week 12	SF 44 at MIA 20	44	20	-24	-2,5	-26,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 11	NE 34 at MIA 17	34	17	-17	-9	-26	0	0	1	1				
Week 9	BUF 6 at MIA 23	6	23	17	-7	10	0	0	0	0				
Week 6	IND 27 at MIA 24	27	24	-3	-10,5	-13,5	0	0	1	1				
Week 3	PIT 10 at MIA 23	10	23	13	-7,5	5,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 1	NYJ 14 at MIA 52	14	52	38	-9,5	28,5	0	0	1	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	NE	Difference	NE Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 15	NYJ 28 at NE 31	28	31	3	-7	-4	0	0	0	0				
Week 14	NO 31 at NE 17	31	17	-14	-5,5	-19,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 12	IND 24 at NE 10	24	10	-14	-3,5	-17,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 9	CAR 20 at NE 17	20	17	-3	-9	-12	0	0	1	1				
Week 8	BUF 14 at NE 27	14	27	13	2	15	0	0	0	0				
Week 6	DEN 37 at NE 3	37	3	-34	1,5	-32,5	0	0	0	0				
Week 2	MIA 20 at NE 3	20	3	-17	2	-15	0	0	0	0				
Week	Result	Other Team	NYJ	Difference	NYJ Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	NO 12 at NYJ 0	12	0	-12	2,5	-9,5	0	0	0	0				

Week 4	NO 29 at NYG 45	29	45	16	-3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	DAL 35 at NYG 0	35	0	-35	7	-28	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	PHI	Difference	PHI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	ARI 20 at PHI 21	20	21	1	-9.5	-8.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Week 15	DAL 17 at PHI 20	17	20	3	8.5	11.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NYG 19 at PHI 28	19	28	9	-4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	DEN 13 at PHI 31	13	31	18	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	STL 9 at PHI 20	9	20	11	-3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	WAS 34 at PHI 37	34	37	3	-3.5	-0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	SD 27 at PHI 21	27	21	-6	-1.5	-7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	TB 21 at PHI 6	21	6	-15	-6.5	-21.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	WAS	Difference	WAS Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	CAR 17 at WAS 20	17	20	3	-4.5	-1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	PHI 14 at WAS 7	14	7	-7	3	-4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	SEA 27 at WAS 20	27	20	-7	-3.5	-10.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	NYG 24 at WAS 15	24	15	-9	-3.5	-12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	DET 30 at WAS 36	30	36	6	1.5	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DAL 23 at WAS 27	23	27	4	13	17	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	OAK 20 at WAS 8	20	8	-12	5	-7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	ARI 7 at WAS 27	7	27	20	3.5	23.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	CHI	Difference	CHI Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	PHI 14 at CHI 20	14	20	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	TB 10 at CHI 31	10	31	21	-6.5	14.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	DET 24 at CHI 17	24	17	-7	-3	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	PIT 37 at CHI 34	37	34	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	TEN 32 at CHI 35	32	35	3	-7.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	CAR 27 at CHI 31	27	31	4	-13	-9	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 2	GB 27 at CHI 24	27	24	-3	-3	-6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	MIN 14 at CHI 31	14	31	17	-3	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	DET	Difference	DET Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 16	JAC 0 at DET 44	0	44	44	-13.5	30.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 14	CHI 7 at DET 27	7	27	20	-3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 13	MIN 38 at DET 44	38	44	6	-3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	TB 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	-6	-3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	GB 16 at DET 24	16	24	8	-2.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	BAL 20 at DET 38	20	38	18	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	SF 24 at DET 27	24	27	3	10.5	13.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 3	ARI 20 at DET 17	20	17	-3	-7	-10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	GB	Difference	GB Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 17	PIT 19 at GB 24	19	24	5	-3.5	1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 14	CIN 10 at GB 24	10	24	14	-11	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Week 13	TB 13 at GB 35	13	35	22	-9	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 11	CHI 28 at GB 35	28	35	7	-3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	MIN 21 at GB 28	21	28	7	-4.5	2.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	DET 21 at GB 30	21	30	9	-3.5	5.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	NYG 6 at GB 14	6	14	8	-6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	MIN	Difference	MIN Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4
Week 15	BAL 11 at MIN 27	11	27	16	-9.5	6.5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Week 14	TB 17 at MIN 31	17	31	14	-8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 12	NO 24 at MIN 43	24	43	19	-5.5	13.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	GB 24 at MIN 27	24	27	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 9	CHI 14 at MIN 6	14	6	-8	-3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 6	TEN 17 at MIN 23	17	23	6	-10.5	-4.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Week 3	DAL 23 at MIN 17	23	17	-6	8.5	2.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Week 2	DET 10 at MIN 20	10	20	10	-3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	ATL	Difference	ATL Line	Dif + Line	(11)	> 3.34	(11)	> 6.84	(12)	< 8.4	(12)	< 10.4

Week 13	NYJ 16 at SEA 10	16	10	-6	-7	-13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 10	NYG 28 at SEA 30	28	30	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SD 35 at SEA 25	35	25	-10	3	-7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 5	DEN 10 at SEA 27	10	27	17	3	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 3	CIN 21 at SEA 24	21	24	3	-4	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	KC 34 at SEA 10	34	10	-24	1	-23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week	Result	Other Team	STL	Difference	STL Line	Dif + Line	(11) > 3.34	(11) > 6.84	(12) < 8.4	(12) < 10.4				
Week 17	MIA 41 at STL 22	41	22	-19	6	-13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 16	WAS 35 at STL 23	35	23	-12	-3	-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 15	BUF 41 at STL 27	41	27	-14	3	-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 11	CAR 17 at STL 28	17	28	11	-7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 8	SF 44 at STL 10	44	10	-34	3,5	-30,5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 7	ATL 19 at STL 21	19	21	2	-3,5	-1,5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 4	CHI 28 at STL 34	28	34	6	-1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 2	NO 13 at STL 17	13	17	4	-1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Week 1	GB 14 at STL 17	14	17	3	7,5	10,5	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Total95/96							48	29	21	15	42	25	24	15