

First things first, at the end of the day, the same four teams would have made the playoffs. The only difference would be that Oakland would be the #3 seed and Montréal would be the #4, but neither team would have moved on anyway, so we'd still have the exact same final four.

A couple of teams that didn't make the playoffs had large swings, with the largest in each direction being Milwaukee, who would have been 7-14 instead of 9-10-2, and Dallas, who would have been 11-10 instead of 7-11-3. Personally, I feel like those are a bit more accurate to how those teams actually played this season, but it's hard to really say for sure.

The other thing I want to talk about are the games that changed. Every single tie got changed to a win or a loss, but I think that's to be expected. In terms of non-ties, there were 26 games that flipped from a win for one team to a win for the other team, and one game, week 2 between Chicago and Houston, that the Bats originally won but would have actually been a tie on points. This is honestly more than I expected, but I think that speaks to how many close games we had. There are a lot of games that finished 5.5-4.5 or 6-4 that would've been decided by just a few points. There were also some games that weren't all that close under points that were under categories, or vice versa, and I think those deserve a closer look:

There were two 7-3 games that flipped. One was Toronto vs Milwaukee, week 12. This feels like a natural outlier as these teams finished 22nd and 23rd in points on the week. In particular, the Talons finished dead last in five entire categories: HR, RBI, R, K, and SVH, as well as being tied for last in SB. That said, their ERA and WHIP were both second in the league, while Milwaukee's was second from the bottom. Personally, I don't want to draw too much conclusion from this, because I feel like neither team really deserved to win this game, but it does feel like it should have been closer than it was.

The other 7-3 game was week 14 between Minnesota and Arizona. This time, we have two good teams, as these two were 4th and 5th in points, respectively. This game is more so what I expected from a game that might be affected by the switch, as the T-Birds won RBIs, SBs, and SVHs by one apiece, and won WHIP by less than a hundredth of a point, whereas the Gems won their three categories (HR, ERA, and W) by much larger margins. Obviously this is a matter of opinion, but it feels to me like Minnesota had a better week on the whole.

The largest point differential of any game was Boston-Philly back in week 8. The Keystones won 5.5-4.5 despite the Masons having a whopping 35.5 more points. It's pretty easy to see why: Boston hit for a ton of power, with 12 HR, 29 R, and 29 RBI, compared to Philly's 2, 11, and 14, respectively. That said, their pitching was bad, and they finished with the worst ERA and the second-worst WHIP, in addition to not picking up a save or a hold all week. Because of this, the Keystones won SVHs 1-0 and managed to win WHIP with the third-worst rate in the league, and they won their other categories by similarly low margins. Obviously I can see the argument that you shouldn't be able to just rely on your hitting (or your pitching, for that matter) to win games, but at the same time, I don't think be rewarding teams for doing poorly just because the other team happened to do even worse - or at the very least, we shouldn't be rewarding them the same amount as we reward their opponents for hitting six times as many dingers as they do.

That said, most of the games on that list are like Las Vegas-Tampa Bay from week 13. Under the categories system, the Atoms won by a single point, but under the points system, the Turtles would have won by ... a single point. You can look at the categories yourself, but I can't really make an argument that either team had a clearly better week than the other.