Results

Champions: Villanova

Runner-up: North Carolina

Semifinalists: Oregon

Michigan State

Prediction Accuracy

24 of the 32 picks in the first round were accurate – 75%

12 of the 16 picks in the second round were accurate – 75%

6 of the 8 picks in the third round were accurate – 75%

2 of the 4 picks in the fourth round were accurate – 50%

2 of the 2 picks in the fifth round were accurate – 100%

The 1 pick in the sixth (final) round was accurate – 100%

47 of the 63 total picks were accurate – 74.6%

14 of the 15 picks in the South region were accurate – 93%

12 of the 15 picks in the West region were accurate – 80%

10 of the 15 picks in the East region were accurate – 66%

8 of the 15 picks in Midwest region were accurate – 53%

3 of the 3 upsets that were predicted in the South region were accurate – 100%

The 1 upset that was predicted in the West region was accurate – 100%

1 of the 3 upsets that were predicted in the East region was accurate – 33%

2 of the 3 upsets that were predicted in the Midwest Region were accurate – 66%

7 of the 10 upsets that were predicted were accurate – 70%

11 of the 12 picks for the higher seeded team winning in the South region were accurate – 91.6%

11 of the 14 picks for the higher seeded team winning in the West region were accurate – 78.5%

9 of the 12 picks for the higher seeded team winning in the East region were accurate – 75%

6 of the 12 picks for the higher seeded team winning in Midwest Region were accurate – 50%

37 of the 50 picks for the higher seeded team winning were accurate – 74%

Interpretation of Results

I was only able to predict 75% of the first round correctly. This made it nearly impossible to predict the second round perfectly. This is because if two teams – which were supposed to lose in the first round – advance to the second round and are playing each other, then the winner of that matchup will not be an accurate prediction. The other scenario is that if a team – which was supposed to lose in an earlier round – keeps advancing through the tournament, then every game that team wins is not an accurate prediction. If I want to obtain more accurate results, then I need to predict the earlier rounds more accurately.

I found the discrepancies in prediction accuracies for different regions to be surprising. The South region had a very high prediction accuracy, while the Midwest region had a very low prediction accuracy. It would be interesting to look at how the teams from the Midwest region differ from the teams in the South region. I had many false positives in the first round for the Midwest region.

Of the upsets that I predicted, 70% of them were correct. However, many of the games that I wrongly predicted were upsets. False positives were the most significant problem in my model, which wrongly predicted that the higher seeded team would win in numerous matchups. For instance, my model predicted that Michigan State advanced to the Final Four. This did not actually happen, since Michigan State lost against Middle Tennessee in the first round. This was an essential upset that if my model was able to predict, then I probably would have been able to better predict later rounds.