Q1: How should bet sizing on the flop be determined when opponents are likely to "fast play"?

When opponents are likely to "fast play" their strong hands, meaning they will raise with their powerful holdings and call with their weaker ones, the goal is to choose the **biggest size that will induce them to raise with their strong hands and call with their weak hands**. This applies to both value bets and bluffs. The aim is to extract the maximum amount of money from their strong holdings while also keeping weaker hands in the pot that you can potentially bluff later or that are drawing very thin. For instance, on a wet and dynamic board where the nuts are vulnerable, opponents are more inclined to fast play. However, in multi-way pots or three-bet pots, the absolute size of the pot might influence players more than relative sizing, requiring smaller bets (e.g., one-third pot) to incentivize action.

Q2: What's the approach to flop sizing when opponents are *not* likely to fast play?

When opponents are *not* likely to fast play (e.g., on dry, static boards where the nuts are stable and they fear stronger hands from the pre-flop raiser), the strategy for value bets and bluffs diverges.

* **Value Bets:** With strong value hands, the player should choose a **very big size**, often an overbet (e.g., 60-70% pot or more). The rationale is that if an opponent has a strong hand they won't fold regardless of the bet size, going big maximizes value. The rule of thumb for "big" is the "biggest size that the bottom 10% of the top of their range will call." This means targeting the weaker end of their strong holdings (e.g., weak top pair).
* **Bluffs:** With bluffs, it's generally **better to check back** on the flop. On these boards, opponents aren't likely to fast play or call with weak hands, so betting small doesn't achieve much, and betting big can lead to difficult situations on later streets against uncapped ranges. Checking allows the player to gain more information on later streets and potentially bluff more effectively once the opponent's range becomes more defined (capped).

Q3: How do turn bet sizing strategies compare to flop strategies, particularly concerning "fast play"?

On the turn, the decision-making process for bet sizing largely mirrors the flop, especially when opponents are still willing to "fast play."

* **Opponents will fast play:** Similar to the flop, if the board is still wet and dynamic (or becomes so on the turn), and opponents are likely to raise strong hands and call with weak ones, the strategy is to choose the **biggest size that will induce them to raise strong and call weak**. This applies to both value bets and bluffs. The absolute size of the pot will influence the relative bet size, with larger pots often necessitating smaller relative bets (e.g., 30-40% pot in a single-raise pot, or even quarter pot in a 3-bet pot). The goal with bluffs in this scenario is that if the opponent has a very strong hand (like a flush), they will raise, allowing you to fold. If they call, they often have a weaker, somewhat capped range, making future bluffs profitable.
* **Opponents won't fast play, but are capped:** If opponents are not going to fast play, but their range is relatively capped (e.g., they've called a flop bet and now lack many strong hands), then both bluffs and value bets want to choose a **big size**. The "big size" guideline of targeting the bottom 10% of the top of their range applies here as well, aiming to get maximum value from their continued, albeit capped, holdings.
* **Opponents won't fast play and are uncapped:** This is where value and bluffs diverge significantly.
* **Value Bets:** Value hands want to go **big** (targeting the bottom 10% of the top of their range), as opponents won't put in more money themselves, and strong hands are unlikely to fold.
* **Bluffs:** Bluffs should **mostly check**. Since opponents are uncapped and won't fast play, there's no easy way to get them to cap their range. Checking gains more information before committing more chips.

Q4: What are the four main scenarios for river sizing, and which two are most common?

The four main scenarios for river sizing categorize how value bets and bluffs should be sized relative to each other:

1. **Bluff wants to go big, value wants to go small.** (Most common, ~90% of hands fall into this or the next category)
2. **Bluff wants to go small, value wants to go big.** (Most common, ~90% of hands fall into this or the previous category)
3. **Value wants to go medium, bluff wants to go small or big.** (Less common, an exception)
4. **Bluff wants to go medium, value wants to go small or big.** (Less common, an exception)

The first two categories cover the vast majority of river situations, indicating a general inverse relationship between optimal bluff and value sizing.

Q5: Explain the "Bluff wants to go big, value wants to go small" river scenario.

This scenario typically occurs when the opponent's range is relatively **capped** (e.g., due to previous small bets that allowed them to continue with weaker hands, or if strong draws bricked).

* **Bluff (Big):** When the opponent's range is capped, bluffs can go **very big** to induce folds from a high frequency of hands that are now vulnerable (e.g., top pair that just got downgraded by a completed draw). The aim is to get marginal hands to fold.
* **Value (Small):** In the same capped range situation, value bets want to go **relatively small**. This is because the opponent lacks many strong hands, and the goal is to get called by the bottom of their continuing range (e.g., weak top pair or middle pair) to extract maximum value from hands that wouldn't call a larger bet.

Q6: Explain the "Bluff wants to go small, value wants to go big" river scenario.

This scenario typically occurs when the opponent's range contains a lot of **strong two-pair hands or better**, but also many **marginal hands that have been downgraded** (e.g., due to a scare card on the river).

* **Bluff (Small):** Bluffs want to go **small and efficient**. Many of the opponent's weaker, downgraded hands (like mid-pairs or lower top pairs) are already on the verge of folding to any pressure. A small bet is sufficient to get these hands to fold without risking too much.
* **Value (Big):** Value hands want to **"empty the clip"** and go **very big** (e.g., all-in or near pot-sized). This is because the opponent's strong hands (like two pair or better) are unlikely to fold regardless of the size, so maximizing the pot against them is the goal.

Q7: Describe the less common river scenarios where one bet type goes "medium."

These scenarios are more nuanced and depend on opponent tendencies.

* **Value medium, bluff small or big:** When you have a strong value hand (like top set), you might choose a **medium size** (not small, not all-in) to ensure you get called by top pair hands that wouldn't call a massive bet but are unlikely to fold to a small one. For bluffs in this situation, you have two options:
* **Small:** Bet very small to efficiently fold out weaker hands that are likely to fold to any bet.
* **Big (all-in):** If you are confident the opponent is capable of folding top pair to extreme pressure, an all-in bluff can be highly effective because your value hands were sized to get calls from top pair.
* **Bluff medium, value small or big:** When you have a bluff, you might choose a **medium size** (e.g., 250-300) to get downgraded top pair or strong draws to fold, without risking too much against hands that simply won't fold (like strong two-pair). For value hands in this situation, you have two options:
* **Small:** Bet very small to induce calls from hands like weakened top pair or strong draws that might call a small bet but fold to a medium/large one.
* **Big (all-in):** If the opponent can have a lot of strong two-pair hands that won't fold, going all-in with your nuts/strongest value can extract maximum value. The decision depends on how sticky you expect the opponent to be with their strong, but not unbeatable, hands.

Q8: What is the concept of "diminishing returns" in deep-stacked river play, and how does it relate to massive overbets?

In very deep-stacked poker (e.g., 500 big blinds effective), there can be a point of "diminishing returns" when it comes to massive river overbets (e.g., 5-6x pot).

* **The Idea:** While a 2.5x or 3x pot bet might get top pair to fold a certain percentage of the time (e.g., 80%), increasing the bet size to 5x or 6x pot might only marginally increase that fold equity (e.g., to 90%). However, the absolute amount of chips risked increases drastically.
* **Implication for Value:** For strong value hands (especially the nuts or second nuts), choosing an extremely massive overbet (like 5-6x pot) can sometimes be the most profitable play. This is because if the composition of what calls and what folds doesn't change significantly between a large overbet (2.5x pot) and an egregious one (6x pot), the player with the nuts wants to maximize the pot to capitalize on the few times their opponent does call, even if the frequency of calls is low. The massive size coolering them is more valuable than trying to induce folds.
* **Implication for Bluffs:** For bluffs in deep-stacked situations, risking an extremely large amount for a marginal increase in fold equity might not be optimal, as the downside is too severe. A smaller, more efficient bluff might be better.
* **Key takeaway:** When extremely deep, and especially with the nuts or near-nuts, sometimes the "ridiculously large" bet size can yield the highest expected value because the incremental fold equity gained by even larger sizes is minimal, but the potential payout when called is immense. This is a situation where absolute risk/reward outweighs traditional relative sizing considerations.