

Owning the Transaction: The Discipline Experiment

An Original Application of Casino Kombat Wisdom to Sports Wagering

Submitted by Nakatomi Tony

Casino Kombat Doctoral Thesis — October 2026

Introduction: An Experiment in Discipline

When I first started what eventually became The Discipline Experiment, or DEOS, I wasn't trying to invent some magical system for picking winners in sports. I wasn't trying to become a professional sports bettor, either. What I wanted to do was take some of the principles I've learned from Casino Kombat and see whether they could be applied to sports wagering in a practical, repeatable way.

The original idea was pretty simple. I had been following a discussion about converting Caesars Rewards Credits into sportsbook wagers and taking advantage of monthly Caesars promotions. The question was whether I could use those opportunities to generate some additional value without putting a significant amount of money at risk.

But I wanted to do it differently. I didn't want to simply pick a baseball game, put some money on it, and hope for the best. I wanted a process.

Two Casino Kombat wisdoms became the foundation of what we were trying to accomplish:

"The House Owns the Math. We Own the Transaction."

And:

"Want the Win More Than the Action."

What began as a relatively simple experiment eventually became something considerably more involved. With the assistance of my AI partner, Atlas, I developed a structured operating system for evaluating sports wagering opportunities, managing a small bankroll, and, perhaps most importantly, deciding when not to wager.

I called it the Discipline Experiment Operating System, or DEOS.

What follows isn't an attempt to prove that we've beaten sports betting. We haven't proven that. It's an examination of how these Casino Kombat principles were adapted into a working system, what happened when that system failed, and what we've learned by rebuilding it.

The House Owns the Math. We Own the Transaction.

Casino Wisdom #100 is probably the most important principle behind DEOS.

In traditional casino gambling, we accept that the house has a mathematical advantage. We cannot change the cards that are dealt or the numbers that appear on the dice. But we can control how much we wager, how we manage our bankroll, which games we play, and when we walk away.

Sports wagering is a little different, but I believe the same principle applies.

I cannot control whether a baseball team wins, whether a goalie makes a save, or whether a player has an unusually good or bad night. What I can control is whether the opportunity is worth considering in the first place.

I can investigate the teams, examine the available information, compare prices, decide how much money I'm willing to risk, and ultimately decide whether to make the wager at all.

That's the transaction.

And that's what DEOS was designed to help me control.

An important part of this process came from **MLB Scout, the baseball screening tool you and Kismet developed**. Scout provided the inspiration for an approach that made a lot of sense to me: examine the day's games, apply consistent criteria, and narrow the field before spending time on deeper investigation.

Building on that idea, Atlas and I developed additional sport-specific screening tools, including FaceOff for hockey, FastBreak for basketball, and Striker for soccer. These tools were directly inspired by Scout's basic approach, adapted to the different characteristics and statistics of each sport.

Like Scout, their job isn't to predict winners or select wagers. Their purpose is to identify which games, if any, deserve further investigation.

Once a game survives that initial screening, Atlas and I investigate it more thoroughly. We examine the available information, consider the betting market, and determine whether Caesars is offering a price we're willing to accept.

The final decision always belongs to me.

And here's the important part: **just because a game survives the investigation doesn't mean we have to wager on it.**

If the price isn't acceptable, we pass. If the information isn't sufficient, we pass. If nothing looks good enough, we don't wager.

We didn't eliminate the uncertainty of sports wagering. We built a system intended to keep that uncertainty from controlling our decisions.

Want the Win More Than the Action

This is where I believe DEOS developed its most meaningful application of Casino Kombat wisdom.

One of the fundamental ideas you teach is to want the win more than the action. It's easy to understand that principle when you're standing at a blackjack table or watching the dice roll. Sometimes the smartest thing you can do is pick up your chips and walk away.

But I discovered that sports wagering introduces another temptation, particularly when casino promotions are involved.

Sometimes you aren't chasing the excitement of the wager. You're chasing the promotion.

Our Caesars offer was straightforward: complete \$100 in qualifying wagers during the month and earn a Bonus Bet.

On the surface, that sounds like a pretty good opportunity. But the promotion also creates pressure. Every day that passes without a wager is another day you haven't made progress toward that \$100 requirement.

And that's where things can go wrong.

You begin looking at a wager that almost qualifies and asking yourself whether it's good enough. You tell yourself there's only a little time left in the month. Maybe you relax the standards just this once because you want to earn that bonus.

Suddenly, the promotion is controlling the transaction instead of you.

That realization led us to develop a variation of your original wisdom:

"Want the Process More Than the Promotion."

I don't consider that a separate wisdom. It's an evolution of "Want the Win More Than the Action," applied to the particular circumstances of promotional sports wagering.

If a wager independently meets our standards, then great. If it also helps us qualify for a promotion, that's an additional benefit.

But the promotion cannot be the reason we make a wager that otherwise wouldn't qualify.

We also established a phrase that became central to the entire experiment:

NO BET TODAY.

In DEOS, those three words do not represent failure. They represent a successful application of the process when nothing meets our requirements.

That may sound simple, but learning to accept it was one of the hardest and most valuable parts of the experiment.

August: When the Experiment Failed

I would love to say that everything worked perfectly from the beginning.

It didn't.

We had some encouraging early results in July, but August was a different story. The original version of DEOS relied on a funding approach that simply wasn't sustainable.

Before August 10, the bankroll was exhausted, and we had completed only \$8 toward the \$100 monthly qualifying requirement.

The experiment had failed financially.

Rather than continuing to throw money at it, we stopped and conducted a thorough examination of what had happened.

We discovered several problems. The original funding model was too fragile. Our evaluation of sportsbook prices needed improvement. The timing of our investigations wasn't always appropriate, and the operating process had become unnecessarily complicated.

We also had to acknowledge that some of July's apparent success was simply good fortune.

That was an important lesson. A profitable result doesn't necessarily mean the process was good, any more than a losing wager automatically means the original decision was wrong.

We weren't going to solve those problems by increasing the bankroll or chasing the money we had lost.

We needed to rebuild the system.

DEOS 2.0 introduced a controlled \$50 cash bankroll, a standard \$10 wager, a limit of one open wager at a time, improved candidate evaluation, and a much clearer separation between identifying opportunities and deciding whether to wager.

We also maintained the most important rule: no wager would ever be forced simply because the calendar, the promotion, or our previous results suggested we needed one.

The lesson from August was not that we needed to become better at guessing winners.

We needed to become better at managing the entire transaction.

September: Putting the Wisdom Into Practice

September was our first opportunity to see whether the rebuilt system could accomplish what we intended.

We started with \$50 and used a standard \$10 wager.

Throughout the month, we followed the same basic process. MLB Scout identified potential games. We investigated the surviving candidates. We examined the available prices at Caesars. And we made a wager only when we were satisfied with the opportunity.

There were days when Scout found nothing worth investigating. Other days, a game survived the screening but failed the deeper examination. Sometimes we liked the game but didn't like the available price.

In each case, we passed.

By the end of September, **seven daily sessions had ended without a single wager.**

That number matters to me because the goal of DEOS was never to generate action. It was to control action.

And despite those seven sessions without wagering, we still completed the monthly Caesars promotion.

The final results were:

- Starting cash bankroll: \$50.00
- Total wagers placed: 14
- Record: 8 wins, 5 losses, 1 push
- Sessions without a wager: 7
- Ending cash bankroll: \$90.87
- Cash profit: \$40.87
- Caesars promotion completed: \$100 in qualifying wagers
- Promotional reward earned: \$30 Bonus Bet

The Bonus Bet provided one final test of our discipline.

We didn't use it immediately just because we had earned it. We investigated possible opportunities and passed when nothing looked attractive.

Eventually, we found a wager we were comfortable making.

It lost.

The \$30 Bonus Bet produced absolutely nothing.

But here's what I found interesting: that loss didn't change the success of the underlying experiment. We still finished September with \$90.87 in our controlled cash bankroll, and we had completed the promotion without manufacturing action.

The bonus was an opportunity, not a requirement to win.

We finished the month profitable, but I don't want to overstate what that means. Fourteen wagers are nowhere near enough to prove that we've discovered a long-term advantage in sports wagering.

What September demonstrated was something more immediate and measurable: **we were capable of following the process even when doing so meant passing up opportunities and delaying a promotional reward.**

For me, that was the real accomplishment.

The Bigger Game and the Continuing Experiment

Your core concepts encourage us to think beyond the results of an individual session and consider the larger picture.

DEOS applies that thinking to sports wagering.

We're not trying to win every wager. We're trying to make sound decisions over time, protect a bankroll we can afford to lose, and take advantage of appropriate casino rewards opportunities along the way.

We deliberately use a fixed standard wager rather than copying the progressive and regressive systems designed for table games. This isn't intended to reproduce your TRG4 wagering system or any other particular wagering system. It's an adaptation of the broader principles to a different kind of gambling.

And we recognize that promotions and rewards can add value to the overall experience, but they don't erase the financial risk of an individual wager.

At the end of September, we made another decision that I believe demonstrates the importance of owning the transaction.

We decided not to wager on Major League Baseball's postseason.

Our baseball screening methodology had been developed and tested around the regular season. We weren't willing to assume it would work equally well in the postseason simply because baseball was still being played.

So we stopped.

As October begins, we're turning our attention to the NHL and testing whether the same disciplined operating principles can be successfully applied to a completely different sport.

That's the next question we hope to answer.

Conclusion: The Discipline Is the Experiment

When I look back at everything we've built, the most valuable part of DEOS isn't the software, the statistics, or even September's profit.

It's the change in how I approach a wagering opportunity.

I no longer feel that a day without a wager is necessarily a missed opportunity. I don't consider a casino promotion something that must be completed at any cost. And I don't judge the quality of every decision solely by whether the wager wins or loses.

Instead, I try to judge whether we followed the process, respected the bankroll, evaluated the transaction, and made the best decision we could with the information available.

We haven't eliminated losing wagers. We haven't discovered a guaranteed path to profit. And we certainly haven't finished the experiment.

But we have taken several fundamental Casino Kombat principles and developed a practical system intended to enforce them in an environment where the temptation to wager is always present.

Perhaps the most important lesson is that **discipline isn't simply something you promise yourself you'll exercise. It's something you can build into the way you operate.**

You taught us to want the win more than the action.

DEOS taught me that sometimes, when a promotion is involved, I have to want the process more than the promotion.

And both lessons ultimately lead me back to Casino Wisdom #100.

The house owns the math.

We own the transaction.

And sometimes, the best transaction is the one we decide not to make.

The Discipline Experiment continues.

— Nakatomi Tony