The LRMC Tool for NCAA Tournament Selection and Seeding
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LRMC predicts more winners

Head-to-head prediction results (LRMC vs. others) in games where predictions disagree.
LRMC picks good bubble teams

Winning percentage of teams ranked 37-48 (equivalent to 10, 11, and 12 seeds) in NCAA tournament, 2000-06
LRMC sorts out the top teams

Percentage of correct predictions in each round, 2000-06. LRMC is highest in 5 of the 6 rounds, with large advantages in rounds 4-6.
Example: Ranking Gonzaga

Gonzaga has been one of the toughest teams to accurately assess, advancing to the Sweet 16 as a low-ranked team (`00,`01) and losing early as a high-ranked team (`02,`04,`05).

Only LRMC has been successful at assessing Gonzaga.

Table 1. Seeds, rankings, and tournament performance of Gonzaga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LRMC</th>
<th>Seeds</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>ESPN</th>
<th>Massey</th>
<th>Sagarin</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sweet 16 (9-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sweet 16 (9-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>First round (33-64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Second round (17-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Second round (17-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Second round (17-32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sweet 16 (9-16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Final Four Surprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>LRMC</th>
<th>Seeds</th>
<th>RPI</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>ESPN</th>
<th>Massey</th>
<th>Sagarin</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Final Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Final Four</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Seeds and rankings of “surprise” Final Four teams correctly identified by LRMC

LRMC has correctly identified a “surprise” Final Four team in 5 of the last 7 years.

Of course, some surprises (George Mason `06, North Carolina and Wisconsin `00) aren’t predicted by anyone.
Example: Double-digit Sweet 16

Of the 15 double-digit seeds in the Sweet 16 from 2000-06, LRMC has ranked more than 25% in its pre-tournament Top 20. (The most recent was N.C. State `05.)
How does LRMC work?

- Basic input data (location, winner, score)
- Same components as RPI (team performance, schedule strength)
  - Deeper schedule analysis
  - Ties together outcome and opponent strength (not separate as in RPI)
- Close games give less-definitive information than non-close games
Summary of LRMC

• Picks good bubble teams
  – Teams ranked 37-48 (equivalent to 10-12 seeds) have higher win %

• Good at sorting out top teams
  – More correct predictions in 5 of 6 rounds
  – Large advantages in rounds 4, 5, 6

• Specific LRMC examples
  – Final Four surprises correctly predicted in 5 of last 7 years
  – 25% of double-digit Sweet 16 teams ranked in LRMC Top 20
  – Correctly assesses “hard” teams like Gonzaga
Recommendation

• LRMC can be a helpful tool
  – Recommend “bubble” teams with good potential for success
  – Suggest seedings for tournament teams that are likely to do well
  – Assesses the potential of “hard” teams (like Gonzaga has been)