

What is the difference between a bankroll and money management?

You would probably have heard comments such as "If you don't have financial management skills, you will not succeed"; or, how do you feel "money management is more important than the strategy used"; or even "You will not win if your financial management skills aren't up to scratch."

One punter group will never cease to boast about the advantages and virtues of managing their money. They think that 'money management' will magically transform their otherwise unsuccessful approach to one that's profitable. All they need to do is modify how they place bets. I can assure you that there is more chance of this happening like it is to Jess going out on a night out with Nicole Kidman.

Now I realise, that I could be off-guard somewhat here, especially in case you've been deceived by the people who believe in these two phrases. This is only an opinion, and you can ignore everything I say.

I admit that I probably shouldn't feel the way I do, but I'm telling you that I have terrible thoughts rushing through my mind whenever these two words are mentioned.

What's the fuss about? What's the difference between money management and bankroll management?

Money management, in my opinion is the practice of earning money by gambling. This is done purely using a staking strategy. We all know that no matter what game we pick (horse racing as well as sports betting, craps roulette etc) when we bet blindly, don't make a mistake about it you will lose. That is to say, that if we put our money on number 7 on the roulette wheel for a long enough period then eventually the casino will be left losing our cash. It is possible to be lucky in the short-term, however the reality will be set within a half-reasonable time.

If you believe you can beat any of these games by simply changing the amount that you wager per race, bet, spin, hand, etc but you're playing in a losing position. This means that you're trying to employ money management to win the game. You are trying to win a game by just putting your money into.

It is obvious that we can make the vast majority of gambling lucrative if we apply our skills and knowledge. (Some games are more difficult to beat over others).



Bankroll management, on the other on the other hand, is deciding about how to bet on your choices once you've found a profitable approach.

It is when you are winning that you have to consider ways to stake your money, NOT before you have shown that you are able to turn a profit, using a specific approach by betting level stakes which is basically betting the same amount each bet.

That is, in essence, the difference. Punters who try to win a game by staking use money management. This may be great for fun however it's not a good idea for your finances.

It would be foolish and arrogant of me not to acknowledge that this whole idea of staking is a bit tense. There a millions upon million of gamblers who swear (maybe perhaps even the vast majority of punters) that it is possible to make a loser's strategy an income-producing one by using 'clever financial management'. If that's the case, then please, don't allow me to hinder you. The best thing that any gambler can do is keep going with whatever is successful for them. Very simply, if your strategy for staking works for you If it does, you should definitely go ahead and continue.

On the other hand, I prefer to use proven approaches to bankroll management. Management of bankrolls is about how to maximize an effective strategy. It is not about how you stake the way to success. You can't find a profitable way to stake your selections in the absence of an efficient strategy. This is not an thought or an idea based on a hunch. this is a decade old mathematically proved fact!

If punters are willing to listen and learn what has been proven to work, or if they want to throw their heads in the sand and say that this is just 'academic wank' and that it isn't working (as several punters have graciously informed me) It is obviously their decision.

This begs the question: If it was possible to beat an invincible game by simply staking that money, how were casinos even able to exist? play games on zoom , along with other casino games is a game with an edge on the house that is lower than betting on sports, horse racing

or Keno. (For instance, 2.7% house advantage on roulette, against 15% - 25% on horse racing or 5% to 10% on sports betting.) If it was feasible, it would be expected that the casinos are the first to be cleaned. Wouldn't you?

But, I'm telling you that when a person's livelihood depends on these types of decisions, I am much more confident in using strategies that can be proven mathematically to be efficient, even if it is all 'academic rubbish', rather than to rely on hot streaks and hunches. According to my experience, hot streaks and hunches will not bring food on the table.

If you are playing a tournament most of the above doesn't apply. Since an entrant is playing against a different opponent, this is the one exception of the general rule. In this case, it could make sense to use an approach to staking that will differ, based on the opponent's position. play online can maintain or increase your bankroll by playing a conservative and steady game, whether you're playing blackjack or roulette at a casino. In order to win these tournaments you must be more aggressive in order to outdo other players.

Therefore, in closing If you're a money management fan and believe that all the evidence is academic wank, and believe that games such as roulette are beaten simply through staking, then you have one advantage over those who employ more mathematical methods and that is that you will always be welcome with open arms at any gambling establishment.