

Popular By Association: Analysing Team Size Effects in Blaseball

Fish (AKAFishy#6676) (she/her)* *Wild Wings Enthusiast

ABSTRACT An analysis of four Blaseball related events, Blessings, the Coffee Cup, the Blaseball Hall of Fame, and Blaseball: The Card Game, in relation to team size, with the goal of accurately assessing how team size effects the game.

KEYWORDS Discord Team Size Fan Events

INTRODUCTION

As of the time of writing, there are 24 different Blaseball teams your average Blaseball participant can be a fan of¹. However, fans are not evenly distributed among teams: currently, there are 1,448 more fans on the largest team than the smallest, according to Discord numbers.

All the way back in the early Discipline Era, there were complaints and comments about how team sizes effected different varieties of the Blaseball experience, from in-game effects to perception by fans. However, little work has been done in seeing if these claims hold any merit past coincidence.

In this paper, I aim to look at a myriad of Blaseball events in order to determine both if and how team sizes have an affect. I look at blessing patterns for a solely in-game perspective, the Coffee Cup for idolization effects, the Blaseball Hall of Fame for out-ofgame events based on statistics, and Blaseball: The Card Game for out-of-game events more separated from statistics.

BIASES AND SHORTCOMINGS

Before getting into the study sections, I want to address any biases I may have and possible shortcomings of the paper.

As a fan of one of the four smallest teams in Blaseball since season 3, I have heard and am thus biased towards believing that team size does influence my team negatively. I have tried to address this in a few ways. First of all, by spreading my net wide and covering many different Blaseball events, I hope to prevent accidental cherrypicking. This paper has also gone through a peer review process by members of many teams in order to help catch any mistakes or oversights I missed in my initial drafting.

In addition, I acknowledge that basing my metrics off of Discord team counts is inherently flawed, as there are many fans that do not participate in the main Blaseball Discord. However, I do not know of any other way to approximate team sizes at this time. Future research could be done into trying to create predicted team counts based off a mix of vote counts, Discord team counts, and other criteria, but that is beyond the scope of this paper. If that does happen, I will happily plug the new numbers in to see if

Finally, I feel it important to state that despite any outcome of any part of this paper, I hold no ill will towards any parties mentioned in the slightest. If I was actually mad enough about this to the point of real emotion, not only would I not be partaking in all of these events², I probably would not be writing this paper at all. I think this paper serves more as a reflection than a call to action. Group dynamics are deeply built into the core of Blaseball and thus it is interesting to examine aspects of that. Succinctly put, I am doing this for fun because I love Blaseball just as much as I love making spreadsheets³.

PART 1: BLESSINGS

anything changes.

Methods

In order to examine if team sizes effected Blessing patterns, first I had to estimate team sizes at elections. To do this, I used the data set of Discord team sizes⁴ in order to create a trend line for each team. Each of these lines is a 4th degree polynomial trend line. They were chosen as they consistently gave R^2 values above 0.9 (Table A-9). This includes the expansion teams, each of which start their data with the 3/16/2021 team size, the one right before the first counted election they participated in. The Crabs are an exception, as the same method resulted in a lower R^2 that I did



Copyright © 2022 by the Society for Internet Blaseball Research

Manuscript compiled: Saturday 20th August, 2022

¹ The people who are still fans of the SIBR Data Witches are not 'average' Blaseball participants.

² I have spent way too much money on Blaseball and Blaseball-related content.

³ As many a Wild Wing can tell you, I make spreadsheets for fun much too often.

⁴ That I compiled from the monthly mod posts from the Blaseball Discord and continue to update.

not feel accurately described their team's growth patterns⁵. I thus used 2 separate lines for them, one with data pre-season 10, and one with data post-season 10. This more accurately represented the Crabs as a whole, as seen with the R^2 values. With these line formulas, I generated the team sizes for each team at each election date for the most accurate assessments of team size on those dates possible.

For this analysis, 3 seasons were excluded. The Season 1 elections were notoriously run 3 times, resulting in a variety of spicy results and glitches that make it a clear outlier to be excluded. Season 11 happened under Fair Play, so each team won one Blessing. This caused the Blaseball website to read fun things like "The Wild Wings had 0% of the Votes and were the highest bidders" (TheWikiTeam (2022)) and thus makes it another outlier. Finally, Season 24 did not have elections due to the destruction of the immaterial plane. This makes it definitively an outlier.

It is also important to note that several elections had differing numbers of teams participating. Seasons 12-23 all had 24 teams participate. Seasons 2-6, 8, and 9 had 20 teams participate. In season 10, 19 teams participated due to the Crabs' ascension. In season 7, 16 teams participated, due to the Decree Bless Off, which passed at the end of season 7 and prevented the top 4 teams' votes counting on blessings. This all is pictured in Figure A-3.

I gathered counts of the number of blessings won and blessing majorities each team had per season from (TheWikiTeam (2022)). With these data, I ran Pearson Correlation tests for each season, as well as for each era and for Blaseball as a whole. I used both team ranking (with 1 as the smallest) and actual team size for the seasonal tests, and average team rank for the era-wide tests. For each section, data analysis was done with Google Sheets and graphing was done in RStudio (R Core Team (2021)).



Figure 1 Blessing Win Rate and Majority Rate by Team Size Rank for all Eras

Results

With team ranks, 15 of 21 seasons showed a significant positive correlation between team size rank and blessing majorities, while 4 of 21 seasons showed a significant positive correlation between team size rank and blessings won (Table 1). For team size counts, blessing majority correlation significance only differs in 3 places, while win rate differs in 2, shown in Table A-4.



Figure 2 Blessing Win Rate and Majority Rate by Team Size Rank for the Discipline Era (top) and Expansion Era (bottom)

Overall, for each era (Figure 2) and for Blaseball as a whole (Figure 1), there was a significant positive correlation between team size rank/count and blessing majorities/blessings won (Table 1).

Discussion

I believe that these results show that larger team sizes, on a season per season basis, are more likely to secure majorities on blessings. While this doesn't often add up to significant correlation for winning each season, over the course of many seasons, these results support that larger teams average out to win more blessings than smaller ones. A correlation test also shows that majority rates are correlated positively with win rates, which I interpret to mean that success in gaining majorities raises the odds to win blessings⁶ (see Table A-6).

It is interesting how team size count and team size rank end up with very similar significance results. It seems like the disparity between teams close to each other in size ranking matters less than the difference between teams on opposite ends of the spectrum.

⁶ I know. Real rocket science here. But legitimately it could have been disconnected and fully down to luck.



⁵ Due to their Ascension and removal from the Blaseball website from October 18th, 2020 to March 4th, 2021

	0		
Season	Sample Size	Majority Rate	Win Rate
2	20	0.010	0.165
3	20	0.374	0.115
4	20	0.595	0.064
5	20	0.514	0.362
6	20	0.638	0.231
7	16	0.564	0.211
8	20	0.588	0.225
9	20	0.310	0.293
10	19	0.638	0.498
12	24	0.332	0.376
13	24	0.426	0.439
14	24	0.465	0.327
15	24	0.533	0.129
16	24	0.364	0.269
17	24	0.488	0.371
18	24	0.609	0.044
19	24	0.541	0.635
20	24	0.516	0.212
21	24	0.629	0.222
22	24	0.591	0.405
23	24	0.331	-0.110
Discipline	20	0.726	0.609
Expansion	24	0.764	0.785
All	24	0.798	0.807
p < 0.05	holded in < 0 (1 holded and its	licized

 Table 1 Blessing Rate Pearson's Correlation Test Results

p < 0.05 **bolded**, p < 0.01 *bolded and italicized*

THE COFFEE CUP

The Teams

During the Coffee Cup, players from the current 20 teams⁷ were sorted via their coffee preference into 13 different teams. The teams were decided as such (AKAFishy#6676 and theslinchorthesluginch#7184 (2020)):

- 1) The best pitcher and best batter (second best if the best is also the top pitcher) by star rating become team captains.
- **2)** Players are grouped into batting and pitching by determining which star rating is higher
- 3) Place the top 4* most Idolized remaining pitchers into rotation
 - * Unless there aren't 4 players in the pitching group
- 4) Place the 8* most Idolized remaining batters into lineup
 - * Unless there aren't 8 players in batting group

⁷ The original 20 except for the Crabs, having been replaced by the Lift.



Thus, the final Coffee Cup teams were directly influenced by idolization, making it a great way to examine how team sizes effect idolization by seeing how many players from each team got to play. However, we need a team to compare the Coffee Cup teams to, in order to ensure that differences in representation are not due to differences in statistical ability.

Luckily, before the Coffee Cup, teams were predicted using player's unrounded star counts (GizmoakaIfhbiff(he/him)#9315 (2020)). These teams were created as such:

- 1) All players on team were ranked by pitching and batting stars
- **2)** Players were assigned to pitching and batting via their rank as follows:
 - a) If a player would be good enough for both pitching and batting, they are assigned to the side in which they are ranked higher
 - **b)** If a player's ranks are equal, they are assigned to the side in which the raw stat is higher

This method creates a statistically strong team to use as a control.

Table 2 Coffee Cup Pearson's Correlation Test Results

Tean	Team Size Rank Team	
Predicted Rosters	-0.063	-0.106
Actual Rosters	0.789	0.755
p < 0.01	bolded and ita	licized



Figure 3 Appearances in Coffee Cup by Team Size Rank

Methods

Using the predicted and actual Coffee Cup teams, I summed up the amount of players from each ILB team present. I used the team counts from 10/27/2020 to determine the approximate size of the ILB teams when the Coffee Cup teams were created. I then ran a Pearson Correlation test on the two scenarios with both team size rank and team size count.

Results

The predicted Coffee Cup teams do not show a significant linear relationship with ILB team size rank or team size count, in fact, it



Figure 4 Predicted Appearances in Coffee Cup by Team Size Rank

shows almost no relationship at all, as seen in Figure 4. The actual Coffee Cup teams do show a significant positive linear relationship with team size rank and team size count (Figure 3). These can be seen in Table 2. The representation of each team during the coffee cup can be seen in Table A-1.

Discussion

These results clearly show that the team sizes affected what players were seen during the Coffee Cup. The larger teams overall have more players represented than the smaller ones. The most extreme example is that the fifth smallest team, the Breath Mints, had 4 players featured, while the second largest team, the Garages, had all 15. In addition, from the predicted teams, the teams that lost player representation were median size 15, while the teams that gained were median size 6.

In addition, one coffee preference, "Anything", was not included in the Coffee Cup, but was predicted for. As we do not know idolization numbers, we cannot simulate what this team would have looked like in reality, but the predicted player counts are reported in Table A-2 and the predicted representation including this team is pictured in Figure A-1.

I believe that these results show that larger team sizes have a large influence on what players are idolized and thus what players show up for in-game events, as many are determined on the amount of idolization. This has an implication for blessings that depend on idolization such as Lottery Pick, and what type of organization would be needed to pull the desired result off.

THE BLASEBALL HALL OF FAME

This section is still ongoing, as the Blaseball Hall of Fame project is projected to continue until Fall of 2022. The data presented here is accurate as of 8/20/2022.

Effective Player Count

To see if group voting was being effected by Team Size, I had to analyse which teams players inducted were on. I did this in two ways. The first and simpler method had me counting teams the players spent any amount of time on the active roster of. This means that I am counting a player "bouncing" through a team's active roster during elections (Jaylen with the Shoe Thieves, eg). The second method, which I am calling Effective Player Count (EPC), sums up the fraction of time each player spend on each team. For example, Rodriguez Internet would count as 1 for the Breath Mints, while Brock Forbes would count as 0.79 for the Baltimore Crabs and 0.21 for the Boston Flowers. This method attempts to balance out players who bounced to one team for a season and are not primarily associated with that team⁸.

Methods

After creating these stats, I used a Pearson Correlation Test comparing them to team sizes as I have in the previous two sections. The Team Sizes I used are from 5/4/2022.

Results

Currently, there is not a significant correlation between team size rank or team size count and team representation in the Blaseball Hall of Fame, both for player count (Figure 5) and EPC (Figure 6), as seen in Table 3.

Table 3 Blaseball Hall of Fame Pearson's Correlation Test Results

Tean	n Size Rank	Team Size Count
Player Count	0.262	0.290
Effective Player Count	0.220	0.226



Figure 5 Hall of Fame Player Counts by Team Size Rank

Discussion

One of the largest parts of the Blaseball Hall of Fame project is the time period allowed to discuss players before voting and through multiple rounds of voting. I believe this has helped the team representation in the hall be more even, as each player gets time to be delved into beyond a base level⁹.

BLASEBALL: THE CARD GAME

Methods

The same methods I used for the Blaseball Hall of Fame are used for my analysis here (aka player count and EPC). If the methods

⁹ I will be forced to declare this a moot point if the Wings have the least players in.



⁸ Cough cough season one Wild Wing Jessica Telephone cough cough



Figure 6 Blaseball Hall of Fame Effective Player Count by Team Size Rank

are updated for one of these sections, they will be updated for the other.

Of note is that as we do not know the full roster of the booster packs yet, only the base game is analysed here. Team representation is pictured in Table A-8. Team sizes used are from 2/8/2022, as the project was officially announced on 1/17/2022 and those team sizes were the closest in date.



Figure 7 Blaseball: The Card Game Player Count by Team Size Rank

Results

There is a significant positive correlation between team size rank and team representation in Blaseball: The Card Game, for both player count (Figure 7) and EPC (Figure 8), as seen in Table 4. This is the same for team size count.

Discussion

I believe that this significant correlation shows that larger teams end up with more recognizable players. Whether this is due to their larger fanbases, due to coincidence, or a mix of both is undetermined.



Figure 8 Blaseball: The Card Game Effective Player Count by Team Size Rank

Table 4 Blaseball: The Card Game Pearson's Correlation Test Results

Tear	m Size Rank	Team Size Count
Player Count	0.494	0.518
Effective Player Count	0.613	0.620
p < 0.01	holded and italiciz	zed

OVERALL RESULTS

Not every aspect of Blaseball looked at resulted in significant correlations. The predicted Coffee Cup teams and the Blaseball Hall of Fame showed no significant correlation, while blessing rates, the actual Coffee Cup teams, and Blaseball: The Card Game did.

One possible explanation is that both events that did not find significant correlation focused on player statistics and ability, rather than just on name recognition. The Coffee Cup predictions only looked at star count, and resulted in surprisingly even teams, especially when including the predicted but not real "Anything" team (as seen in Figure A-1). The Blaseball Hall of Fame project, while a popular vote at the end, is specifically built to allow for discussion of player accomplishments, with 79.6% of 269 responders saying that the arguments end up influencing their voting (BlaseballHallofFame (2022)). This implies that statistically, teams have similar amounts of recognizable, "good¹⁰" players, which in a perfect world would all be seen equally by the league. The events that focus on name recognition of players seem to depend more on team size, while voting on blessings directly corresponds to team size, as teams with more fans thus have more votes.

FUTURE WORK

More research could be done into vote counts in blessings. Looking at what blessings are more contested and who won those blessings could shed light on how blessing dynamics work in more detail.

More research could be done into different statistical predictions for Coffee Cup teams. Comparing different team-making algorithms could be interesting in and of itself.

The Blaseball Hall of Fame is still running. I plan to update



 $^{^{10}}$ Definition: Actually can play Blaseball with reasonable success.

data as it continues to see if it remains relatively team size neutral. In addition, using surveys to see what teams fans most associate players with could be experimented with, though that could be subject to sampling biases if one is not careful. However, that would have to be done after the Hall of Fame Project is finished.

As the booster packs for Blaseball: The Card Game are revealed, it would be interesting to see if they even out team representation¹¹. Otherwise, similar player-team affiliation measures could be experimented with, as mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Overall, Blaseball is large and multifaceted. I am sure there are relevant events I have missed that could be analysed in similar ways to better explore how exactly team size and the cultural event of Blaseball interact.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, a huge thanks to the people running the events analyzed in this paper, including but not limited to: The Game Band, SIBR, the Hall of Fame admin team, and the creators of Blaseball: The Card Game. This paper (and many others) cannot exist without the passion you put in.

Special thanks to BaronBliss (@baronbliss#7135) (any) for their work in assembling the SIBR template used in this paper, to Gizmo aka Ifhbiff (he/him)#9315, the slinch, or the slug inch#7184, and crystallized#2721 for helping identify the Coffee Cup team creation, to Gizmo aka Ifhbiff (he/him)#9315 specifically for creating the Coffee Cup team predictions, to the TheWikiTeam (2022) for compiling much of the information used for this paper, to DeeJay#2609 for greatly assisting with the paper's formatting, and to the many, many SIBR members who peer reviewed this paper, helped my R graphs look not bad, and fixed all the spelling errors.

Any questions, comments or feedback can be directed to the author via #blaseball-general in the SIBR server. Please ping the author if you want to ask more specific questions¹².

REFERENCES

- AKAFishy#6676, G., crystallized#2721 and theslinchorthesluginch#7184, 2020 Blaseball coffee cup team generation method. web. https://discord.com/channels/738107179294523402/ 738539113669459998/780873677549862933.
- BlaseballHallofFame, 2022 Blaseball hall of fame first cycle retrospective and rule changes. web. https://medium.com/@BlaseballHallOfFame/
- blaseball-hall-of-fame-first-cycle-retrospective-and-rule-changes-8756ed4e3e98. Clarke, E. and S. Sherrill-Mix, 2017 ggbeeswarm: Categorical scatter (violin point) plots. R package version 0.6.0.
- Firke, S., 2021 janitor: Simple tools for examining and cleaning dirty data. R package version 2.1.0.
- GizmoakaIfhbiff(he/him)#9315, 2020 Blaseball coffee cup predictions. web. https://discord.com/channels/738107179294523402/ 738107920272588851/776854804881211403.
- R Core Team, 2021 R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- Slowikowski, K., 2021 ggrepel: Automatically position nonoverlapping text labels with 'ggplot2'. R package version 0.9.1.

- TheWikiTeam, 2022 The blaseball wiki. web. https://www.blaseball. wiki/w/Main_Page.
- Wickham, H., 2016 ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York.
- Wickham, H. and J. Bryan, 2022 readxl: Read excel files. R package version 1.4.0.
- Wickham, H. and D. Seidel, 2022 scales: Scale functions for visualization. R package version 1.2.0.



¹¹ The two players revealed currently (Kelvin Drumsolo of the Core Mechanics and Boyfriend Monreal of the Kansas City Breath Mints) represent teams that have less than 1 effective player in the base game.

¹² I often will read messages while at work (which is outside) and thus will not be able to grab information easily.

APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL FIGURES AND TABLES



Figure A-1 Predicted Appearances in the Coffee Cup by Team Size, with Anything as Predicted

Table A-1 Coffee Cup Team Representation Counts

Team	Predicted Player Count	Actual Player Count	
Boston Flowers	9	9	
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	8	8	
Canada Moist Talkers	9	11	
Charleston Shoe Thieves	5	10	
Chicago Firefighters	9	10	
Dallas Steaks	10	6	
Hades Tigers	8	9	
Hawai'i Fridays	10	9	
Hellmouth Sunbeams	10	12	
Houston Spies	9	6	
Kansas City Breath Mints	8	4	
Mexico City Wild Wings	7	5	
Miami Dale	10	5	
New York Millenials	12	8	
Philly Pies	8	7	
San Fransisco Lovers	7	8	
Seattle Garages	9	15	
Tokyo Lift	5	6	
LA Unlimited Tacos	8	8	
Yellowstone Magic	5	8	



Table A-2 Coffee Cup Anything Extra Representation

Team	Extra Players
Charleston Shoe Thieves	4
Tokyo Lift	1
Yellowstone Magic	2
Mexico City Wild Wings	2
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	1
Kansas City Breath Mints	1
Philly Pies	1
Boston Flowers	2

Table A-3 Blessing Majority and Win Rates Overall

Team	Participat Sea- sons	Blessing Majorities per Season	Blessings Won per Season
Dallas Steaks	21	0.14	0.52
Miami Dale	21	0.24	0.38
Mexico City Wild Wings	21	0.48	0.38
Atlantis Georgias	12	0.08	0.58
San Francisco Lovers	21	0.38	0.57
Tokyo Lift	12	0.08	0.5
Houston Spies	21	0.38	0.86
Core Mechanics	12	0.58	0.5
Philly Pies	21	0.62	0.71
Kansas City Breath Mints	20	0.9	1.15
New York Millennials	21	0.86	0.76
Boston Flowers	21	0.57	0.71
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	20	0.45	0.65
Hawai'i Fridays	21	1.14	1.43
Chicago Firefighters	21	0.67	0.9
Ohio Worms	12	0.92	1
Charleston Shoe Thieves	20	1	1.3
Baltimore Crabs	19	2.95	1.32
Canada Moist Talkers	21	1.05	1.19
LA Unlimited Tacos	21	1.1	0.76
Yellowstone Magic	21	1.62	1.19
Hades Tigers	21	1.95	1.33
Seattle Garages	21	1.43	1.43
Hellmouth Sunbeams	21	1.52	1.24

Note: You cannot make me type up a chart of all 21 included seasons you cannot. Go look at TheWikiTeam (2022) yourself.



Table A-4 Blessing Pearson Correlation Team Rank vs Count Differences

Season	Category	Team Rank Correlation	Team Count Correlation	
3	Majorities	0.374	0.471	
6 Majorities		0.638	0.470	
8	Majorities	0.588	0.538	
17	Wins	0.371	0.459	
22	Wins	0.405	0.240	
p < 0.0	5 bolded , p <	0.01 bolded and	ł italicized	



Table A-5 Team Size Prediction Lines

Team	Equation	R ²
Dallas Steaks	$-0.000000349314122x^{4} + 0.006208061211x^{3} + -413.7374627x^{2} + 12254875.96x + -136120014473$	0.970
Miami Dale	$-0.0000002247628282x^{4} + 0.003996802827x^{3} + -266.5202685x^{2} + 7898838.737x + -87786051093$	0.981
Mexico City Wild Wings	$-0.0000003178625792x^4 + 0.005651263769x^3 + -376.7741497x^2 + 11164317.18x + -1240545088888$	0.973
Atlantis Georgias	$-0.0000009110622275x^4 + 0.0162209988x^3 + -1083.022316x^2 + 32137618.75x + -357618719861x^2 + -35761871980x^2 + -35761871980x^2 + -35761871980x^2 + -35761871980x^2 + -35761871980x^2 + -357618871880x^2 + -3576188718880x^2 + -35761887188888888888888888888888888888888$	0.974
San Francisco Lovers	$-0.0000005404999232x^{4} + 0.009608076579x^{3} + -640.4810312x^{2} + 18975415.28x + -210816831825$	0.978
Tokyo Lift	$-0.0000006122569418x^4 + 0.01090154516x^3 + -727.9006216x^2 + 21600908.46x + -240381814876$	0.983
Houston Spies	$-0.0000004644022312x^4 + 0.008254059481x^3 + -550.1365707x^2 + 16296309.87x + -181024622248$	0.974
Core Mechanics	$-0.0000005073466642x^4 + 0.009038534331x^3 + -603.8413234x^2 + 17929388.46x + -199636401927$	0.984
Philly Pies	$-0.00000005717795061x^4 + 0.01015937739x^3 + -676.9161106x^2 + 20045554.28x + -222602754453$	0.977
Kansas City Breath Mints	$-0.0000004320598404x^{4} + 0.007681952196x^{3} + -512.1872552x^{2} + 15177547.89x + -168656821440$	0.981
New York Millennials	$-0.00000007715239562x^4 + 0.01370775329x^3 + -913.2969373x^2 + 27044115.99x + -300304904003$	0.966
Boston Flowers	$-0.00000005542234149x^4 + 0.009851082062x^3 + -656.6175063x^2 + 19451658.64x + -216087806375$	0.981
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	$-0.0000006760508102x^{4} + 0.01201663955x^{3} + -800.9694051x^{2} + 23728168.84x + -263597750863$	0.981
Hawai'i Fridays	$-0.000000908190938x^4 + 0.01613884729x^3 + -1075.465869x^2 + 31851928.62x + -353755821904$	0.978
Chicago Firefighters	$-0.0000005813560645x^4 + 0.01033006666x^3 + -688.3253361x^2 + 20384511.87x + -226379236592x^2 + -2263792x^2 + -226379x^2 + -2263792x^2 + -226379x^2 + -22678778x^2 + -2267877878x^2 + -22678778x^2 + -2267878878x^2 + -226787878878x^2 + -2267$	0.979
Ohio Worms	$-0.000000548222784x^4 + 0.009768900869x^3 + -652.7790272x^2 + 19386738.82x + -215911204844$	0.969
Charleston Shoe Thieves	$-0.0000001194275904x^4 + 0.02122922306x^3 + -1415.116494x^2 + 41924235.49x + -465764894256$	0.975
Baltimore Crabs (Disc)	$-0.00003488240264x^4 + 6.154205058x^3 + -407163.4765x^2 + 11972453490x + -132016672833893$	0.999
Baltimore Crabs (Exp)	$-0.0000008252364397x^4 + 0.01468884661x^3 + -980.4550805x^2 + 29086041.73x + -323572973671x^2 + -3235729737287287287287287777877877788777877777777$	0.918
Canada Moist Talkers	$-0.0000009536473739x^4 + 0.0169539574x^3 + -1130.274064x^2 + 33489760.75x + -372108601265x^2 + -37210860126x^2 + -37210860126x^2 + -37210860126x^2 + -37210860126x^2 + -372108601265x^2 + -372108600000000000000000000000000000000000$	0.968
LA Unlimited Tacos	$-0.0000001067824872x^4 + 0.01898876018x^3 + -1266.258731x^2 + 37528720.99x + -417094355983$	0.972
Yellowstone Magic	$-0.0000009117399866x^4 + 0.01620951933x^3 + -1080.684073x^2 + 32021601.88x + -355808912617$	0.978
Hades Tigers	$-0.000001002397974x^4 + 0.01781901076x^3 + -1187.836495x^2 + 35192134.54x + -390988695280$	0.976
Seattle Garages	$-0.0000001186884134x^4 + 0.02110020435x^3 + -1406.676056x^2 + 41678956.09x + -463093463917$	0.981
Hellmouth Sunbeams	$-0.0000001436201327x^4 + 0.0255266784x^3 + -1701.384214x^2 + 50399451.26x + -559858546177$	0.981



Table A-6 Blessings Majority vs Won Pearson's Correlation Test Results

Era	Pearson's Correlation	
Discipline	0.663	
Expansion	0.792	
Both	0.778	
p < 0.01 <i>bolded and italicized</i>		

Table A-7 Blaseball Hall of Fame Team Representation Counts

Team	Player Count	Effective Player Count
Dallas Steaks	7	1.94
Miami Dale	2	1.12
Mexico City Wild Wings	3	2.04
Atlantis Georgias	3	0.34
San Francisco Lovers	7	2.05
Tokyo Lift	4	1.52
Houston Spies	6	2.49
Core Mechanics	4	2.33
Philly Pies	5	1.73
Kansas City Breath Mints	7	3.32
New York Millennials	7	3.96
Boston Flowers	9	3.23
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	6	2.51
Hawai'i Fridays	6	0.96
Chicago Firefighters	3	1.46
Ohio Worms	2	1.4
Charleston Shoe Thieves	7	1.15
Baltimore Crabs	11	3.07
Canada Moist Talkers	6	3.54
LA Unlimited Tacos	7	3.43
Yellowstone Magic	4	2.1
Hades Tigers	7	1.32
Seattle Garages	7	1.92
Hellmouth Sunbeams	4	2.46



Table A-8	Blaseball:	The Ca	d Game	Team	Represent	ation	Counts

Team	Player Count	Effective Player Count
Dallas Steaks	3	0.34
Miami Dale	3	0.82
Mexico City Wild Wings	4	0.2
Atlantis Georgias	2	0.25
San Francisco Lovers	5	0.94
Tokyo Lift	5	1.31
Houston Spies	2	0.31
Core Mechanics	3	0.72
Philly Pies	2	0.41
Kansas City Breath Mints	2	0.18
New York Millennials	6	2.43
Boston Flowers	5	0.85
Breckenridge Jazz Hands	4	0.9
Hawai'i Fridays	6	1.1
Chicago Firefighters	1	0.09
Ohio Worms	3	1.46
Charleston Shoe Thieves	7	1.84
Baltimore Crabs	8	2.25
Canada Moist Talkers	7	2.45
LA Unlimited Tacos	7	3.32
Yellowstone Magic	4	1.42
Hades Tigers	9	3.05
Seattle Garages	8	2.36
Hellmouth Sunbeams	2	0.42



Table A-9 Graphed Linear Trend Lines

Graph	Equation	R ²	Standard Error
Figure 1 Majorities	0.0843x + -0.0604	0.632	0.414
Figure 1 Wins	0.0448x + 0.39	0.647	0.213
Figure 2 Disc Majorities	0.102x + -0.129	0.527	0.589
Figure 2 Disc Wins	0.0448x + 0.457	0.317	0.354
Figure 2 Exp Majorities	0.0755x + -0.0407	0.580	0.463
Figure 2 Exp Wins	0.0449x + 0.341	0.613	0.258
Figure 3	0.356x + 4.46	0.644	1.659
Figure 4	-0.0105x + 8.41	0.001	1.885
Figure A-1	$-9.02 * 10^{-03}x + 9.09$	0.002	1.411
Figure 5	0.083x + 4.55	0.069	2.195
Figure 6	0.029x + 1.78	0.048	0.925
Figure 7	0.161x + 2.49	0.244	2.048
Figure 8	0.084x + 0.176	0.376	0.782

