

2026 RESEARCH SEASON EDITION

GAME CHANGER

Using Smash History to Build Better DraftKings Tournament Lineups

A SmashTracker Strategy Guide

BUILD WITH HISTORY, NOT HYPE.

SmashTracker • 2026

Copyright & Disclaimer

Copyright © 2026 SmashTracker. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission, except for brief quotations used in reviews or commentary.

This guide is provided for educational and informational purposes only. Nothing in this publication should be interpreted as legal, financial, gambling, or investment advice. Daily fantasy sports outcomes involve risk. Examples, frameworks, and strategy discussions are illustrative only and do not guarantee results.

References to third-party products or trademarks, including DraftKings, are used for identification and commentary purposes only and do not imply affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement.

Research Season Note: The 2026 SmashTracker season is a live Beta and research environment. The purpose of this guide is to explain the current methodology and how it is being applied. Findings may be refined as more live-season evidence is collected.

Contents

Introduction Build With History, Not Hype

- 1** Salary Creates the Assignment
- 2** Smash History: Evidence, Not Prediction
- 3** Why 4x Is the Primary Tournament Benchmark
- 4** Add Current-Week Context
- 5** Ownership and Leverage
- 6** Build a Contest-Specific Player Pool
- 7** Correlation and Lineup Construction
- 8** Single-Entry Strategy
- 9** 20-Max Strategy: Exposure and Portfolio Construction
- 10** Final Review: Make the Lineup Defensible

Weekly Process A Repeatable SmashTracker Workflow

Research Season Follow the Evidence Through 2026

INTRODUCTION

Build With History, Not Hype

Most NFL DFS players begin with the same weekly ingredients: projections, injury news, matchup analysis, ownership estimates, game totals, and a handful of popular value plays. Those inputs matter. The problem is that almost everyone sees them.

SmashTracker adds a different question to the process: How often has this player historically produced the DraftKings score required by his current salary?

That is the idea behind Smash History. It takes past DraftKings production and evaluates it against today's salary. Instead of asking only whether a player is good, cheap, popular, or projected well, it asks whether the player has shown the ability to deliver the return his price demands.

Core Principle: Smash History is evidence, not prediction. It should inform a tournament decision, not make the decision by itself.

The 2026 Research Season is built around that distinction. SmashTracker is being used live across real NFL DraftKings Main Slates, then reviewed after the fact. Wins and misses both matter because the goal is not to manufacture a perfect-looking record. The goal is to understand where salary-adjusted history adds useful information, where it does not, and how it should interact with current-week context.

The new operating model

This guide is a tournament decision framework that can be applied to single-entry contests, 20-max contests, and larger-field GPPs like the Millionaire Maker. The contest changes the way you use the evidence; the evidence itself does not change.

- Salary defines the scoring assignment.
- 4x is the primary tournament benchmark.
- 3x and 5x provide supporting context.
- Smash History shows what has happened, not what will happen.
- Projection, ownership, injuries, role, usage, game environment, and contest structure determine how the historical evidence should be used.
- Lineup construction must fit the specific contest you are entering.

What this guide will teach you

You will learn how to translate salary into tournament targets, read Smash History without overrating it, combine historical evidence with current-week information, build a focused player pool, and turn that pool into contest-specific lineups. The final sections separate single-entry strategy from 20-max portfolio construction because those formats require different decisions.

The goal: Do not build the same lineup everyone else can reach from the same weekly noise. Use history to add perspective, then make a decision that fits the contest.

CHAPTER 1

Salary Creates the Assignment

Fantasy points do not have the same value at every salary. A 20-point game can be excellent for one player and disappointing for another. The difference is price.

A \$4,000 player who scores 20 DraftKings points produces 5x value. A \$7,000 player who scores the same 20 points does not even reach 3x. The raw score is identical. The tournament return is not.

Salary is the cost of the bet

Every roster spot consumes part of a \$50,000 salary cap. The more salary you spend, the more production you need in return. Expensive players are not bad bets. They simply receive harder assignments.

This is why “Who will score more?” is incomplete. A better question is: “Who can score enough for this price to matter?”

Calculate the targets

The calculation is simple: divide the salary by 1,000, then multiply by the value threshold.

Salary	3x Target	4x Target	5x Target
\$4,000	12.0	16.0	20.0
\$5,000	15.0	20.0	25.0
\$6,500	19.5	26.0	32.5
\$7,000	21.0	28.0	35.0
\$8,000	24.0	32.0	40.0

The hierarchy matters

SmashTracker does not treat every threshold as equally important.

Threshold	Role in SmashTracker	How to use it
3x	Supporting context	Shows useful salary-adjusted production and helps frame the baseline case.
4x	Primary tournament benchmark	The main historical threshold for evaluating whether a player has produced tournament-relevant returns at the current salary.
5x	Supporting ceiling context	Shows whether the player has produced a truly salary-adjusted ceiling outcome.
2.5x	Optional context	Can be useful for research, but it is not one of the core tournament decision pillars.

Do not confuse cheap with valuable: A low salary only lowers the assignment. The player still has to complete it.

Raw points need salary context

Suppose Player A projects for 22 points at \$7,500 and Player B projects for 17 points at \$4,500. Player A has the higher raw projection, but Player B offers a much stronger salary-adjusted expected return. That does not automatically make Player B the better tournament play, but it tells you the two players are solving different roster problems.

Before you listen to the weekly story

1. Write down the player's current DraftKings salary.
 2. Calculate the 3x, 4x, and 5x targets.
 3. Identify what a strong tournament return actually requires.
 4. Then evaluate whether the player's history and current role support that assignment.
- Salary gives every player a job. Smash History helps show how often he has done that job before.

CHAPTER 2

Smash History: Evidence, Not Prediction

Once salary creates the assignment, Smash History asks how often the player has historically completed it.

SmashTracker compares past DraftKings scores with the targets created by the player's current salary. If a player is \$5,000 this week, his past games are tested against 15 points for 3x, 20 for 4x, and 25 for 5x. The historical salary from those old games is not the focus. The question is whether those old scores would meet the demands of today's price.

Hit count and hit rate

A hit count shows how many times the player cleared a threshold. A hit rate shows how often it happened within the available sample. You need both.

Four 4x hits in 40 games is different from three 4x hits in 15. The first player has more total hits. The second has produced the required score more often when given the chance.

Player	4x Hits	Games	4x Hit Rate
Player A	4	40	10%
Player B	3	15	20%

Sample size changes confidence

A strong hit rate from a small sample is interesting. It is not the same as a strong hit rate established over a larger sample. Smash History should always be read with sample size attached.

This matters especially for rookies, role changes, injuries, and players whose recent opportunity looks materially different from the games in the historical sample. A lack of history is not proof that the player cannot smash. It means the bet is less supported by historical evidence.

Role can make old history less relevant

Historical production becomes weaker evidence when the player's situation changes materially. Coaching, scheme, quarterback play, teammates, depth chart, snap share, route participation, target share, carries, and red-zone opportunity can all change the meaning of the old sample.

- Is the current role similar to the role behind the strongest historical games?
- Has opportunity increased or decreased?
- Did past smashes depend on efficiency or touchdowns that may be difficult to repeat?
- Has the team environment changed enough that the old sample deserves less weight?
- Is the current sample large enough to support a confident conclusion?

Do not turn history into prophecy

A player with strong 4x history can fail. A player with weak history can smash after a role change. The point is not to select the player with the highest historical rate. The point is to understand what evidence you have before adding the current-week information.

Correct interpretation: History shows what has happened under this salary assignment. Current context tells you whether the path still exists.

CHAPTER 3

Why 4x Is the Primary Tournament Benchmark

SmashTracker tracks multiple salary thresholds, but 4x sits at the center of the tournament process.

Why? Because 3x can be useful without being enough to separate a lineup, while 5x is powerful but naturally rarer. The 4x threshold sits in the middle: difficult enough to represent meaningful tournament return, but common enough to compare across a slate and across positions.

Use 3x to support the case

A strong 3x history can show that the player has often delivered useful production at the current salary. That can support the stability of a tournament case, but 3x alone does not establish a slate-winning ceiling.

Use 5x to understand the ceiling

A 5x history shows that the player has produced a score capable of creating substantial salary leverage. It is especially meaningful at lower salaries because the player delivers a large score while leaving more cap space for the rest of the lineup.

Start with 4x, then ask what supports it

When reviewing a position board, begin with the 4x history. Then check 3x, 5x, sample size, salary, and position. The 4x number is not a verdict. It is the first tournament question.

Primary question: How often has this player historically produced 4x at his current salary, and does the current-week environment support another path to that score?

Position matters

The same hit rate can mean different things at different positions. Quarterback scoring distributions are different from tight end scoring distributions. Cheap wide receivers may have more volatile 5x paths than expensive running backs. During the 2026 Research Season, positional differences should be studied rather than assumed away.

Do not invent rules from one slate

A week in which low-owned players with high 5x history dominate does not prove 5x should become the primary metric. A week in which chalk crushes does not prove ownership no longer matters. One slate can produce a useful finding. It cannot establish a new methodology rule by itself.

The purpose of the Beta is to collect enough live evidence to separate a pattern from noise.

CHAPTER 4

Add Current-Week Context

Smash History gives you a historical base. Tournament decisions happen in the present.

The strongest cases often appear when the historical evidence and the current-week information agree. The weakest decisions often happen when one input is allowed to overrule everything else.

Projection

A projection estimates expected scoring for the current week. It is useful for testing whether the salary looks efficient, but it does not prove tournament ceiling. Compare the projection with the 3x and 4x requirements, then use Smash History to see how often the player has exceeded the expected range.

Role and usage

Role is often more important than the historical number itself. A player can gain routes, targets, carries, snaps, or red-zone work. Another can lose those opportunities. New information can strengthen or weaken the relevance of history.

Injuries

Injuries create some of the most important DFS changes of the week. A backup may receive a starting role the historical sample barely represents. In that case, weak Smash History should not automatically eliminate the play. It should correctly label the uncertainty.

Game environment and Vegas

Totals, spreads, team totals, pace, and likely game script can help explain whether a player has a realistic path to the required score. A strong historical profile in a poor environment may deserve less confidence. A modest history in an unusually strong environment may deserve further investigation.

External DFS data

Ownership models, simulation results, projection systems, and other DFS tools can add information that SmashTracker is not designed to provide. They should be treated as supporting evidence. When strong Smash History, a strong projection, and supporting external data all agree, the convergence deserves additional attention.

Convergence matters: Strong Smash History + strong projection + supporting external DFS data is one of the most important relationships to document during the 2026 Research Season.

The decision order

1. Start with salary and the 4x assignment.
2. Review 3x, 4x, and 5x Smash History with sample size.
3. Check role, opportunity, and injuries.
4. Compare projection with the salary target.
5. Review ownership and game environment.
6. Use external tools when they add useful information.
7. Make the decision for the specific contest you are entering.

CHAPTER 5

Ownership and Leverage

Ownership does not tell you whether a player is good. It tells you how much of the field is expected to make the same bet.

A popular player with strong evidence can still be an excellent tournament play. A low-owned player with no meaningful path to 4x can still be a bad play. Ownership changes the value of being right; it does not create upside by itself.

Good chalk

Popular players can be worth using when salary, role, projection, and Smash History all support the case. Fading strong chalk only to be different can add unnecessary risk.

Fragile chalk

Popularity becomes more interesting when the field is paying for a projection, injury story, or salary discount that lacks historical support. That does not mean the player must fail. It means the bet may be more fragile than the ownership suggests.

Real leverage

Leverage exists when a lower-owned player has a legitimate path to a tournament-level score and succeeds in a way that harms more popular alternatives. The key is that the lower-owned play still needs actual upside.

Ownership + Evidence	Interpretation
High ownership + strong 4x support	Potentially justified chalk.
High ownership + weak 4x support	Requires more scrutiny; the field may be paying for current-week narrative.
Low ownership + strong 4x/5x support	Potential leverage if role and current context remain viable.
Low ownership + weak history	Different does not automatically mean useful.

Ownership works at the lineup level

A single popular player does not make a lineup chalky. A single low-owned player does not make it unique. Evaluate how the full lineup distributes popularity, correlation, and ceiling. Contest size changes how much separation you need.

Do not chase fake precision

Ownership projections are estimates. Treat 18.6 percent and 19.2 percent as functionally similar. Focus on broad ownership levels and on whether the strategic decision changes if the number moves.

CHAPTER 6

Build a Contest-Specific Player Pool

The player pool should be built before the final lineup. That principle is built on a basic poker analogy: you do not need to play every hand.

The only thing you need to do is answer a practical question about a player: Does he belong in this contest-specific build, and if so, how should he be used?

Start with games, then players

Begin with the Main Slate. Identify the games, environments, injuries, and roles that deserve attention. Then move into the players inside those games. This prevents isolated player takes from replacing slate context.

Use the First Look correctly

Wednesday is for discovery. The First Look should identify players and games worth investigating through the lens of Smash History. It should not force final decisions before ownership, injuries, and the rest of the week develop.

Build the Saturday pool from evidence

By Saturday, the pool should reflect the full week of information. A player can survive because of a strong smash history, a current role change, a strong projection, useful ownership, a game environment, or a combination of those factors. The important point is that the reason is explicit.

A player needs a reason to stay

- What does the current salary require for 4x?
- What does the 3x/4x/5x history show?
- How large and relevant is the sample?
- Does the current role support the required score?
- How does the projection compare with the assignment?
- What ownership is the field likely to assign?
- Does the player fit the game environment and lineup construction?
- Does this specific contest reward or punish the risk you are taking?

The pool can differ by contest

A player who is too volatile for your single-entry lineup may still deserve exposure in a 20-max set or in the Milly Maker. A popular player who is acceptable in single-entry may need to be underweight in a multi-entry portfolio. There is no reason the final pool must be identical across contest types.

Key change: SmashTracker does not assign the final player type. The contest and the full evidence determine how the player is used.

CHAPTER 7

Correlation and Lineup Construction

A tournament lineup is not nine independent player picks. It is a set of outcomes that must be able to happen together.

Start with the game story

A quarterback and pass catcher can benefit from the same touchdowns. An opposing receiver can benefit if the game stays competitive and forces continued passing volume. A running back and defense can benefit from a lead and a game script that creates rushing volume and pass-rush opportunities.

The goal is not to force correlation everywhere. The goal is to avoid building a lineup whose players require contradictory versions of the slate.

Smash History still applies inside a stack

Correlation does not rescue a weak individual play. A receiver should not enter the lineup only because he catches passes from your quarterback. He still needs a plausible path to the salary-adjusted score the roster spot requires.

Bring-backs are tools, not rules

An opposing player can strengthen a game stack when the game story supports continued scoring. But not every quarterback lineup requires a bring-back. Contest type, team concentration, ownership, and the quality of the opposing options all matter.

Secondary correlation

Secondary stacks can connect two additional players from the same game, but only when both players already deserve consideration. Correlation should improve strong bets, not justify weak ones.

Salary and duplication

Using the full \$50,000 salary cap is not mandatory. Leaving salary unused can create less common combinations, but unused salary is not an edge by itself. Never downgrade a lineup simply to leave money on the table.

Construction rule: Every player should have an individual reason to be rostered and a lineup-level reason to fit the build.

CHAPTER 8

Single-Entry Strategy

Single-entry is a commitment format. You do not get 20 different paths. You get one lineup. That changes the way SmashTracker evidence should be used.

Build the strongest complete lineup, not the safest lineup

Single-entry does not mean cash-game strategy. The lineup still needs tournament ceiling, correlation, and enough differentiation to win. But because you only get one build, every speculative decision carries more weight.

Use your highest-conviction evidence

The best single-entry candidates are often the players where the evidence converges: strong or useful 4x history, a current role that supports the score, a competitive projection, and ownership that does not create an obvious strategic problem.

That does not mean every player must have perfect Smash History. A new role, an injury, or an emerging player can create a strong current-week case with limited historical support. The key is that you understand exactly what evidence is missing.

Limit unnecessary speculation

A single-entry lineup can contain a lower-owned leverage play. It should not need four fragile bets simply to look different. One or two carefully selected points of separation are usually more defensible than a lineup built from low-owned players for their own sake.

Evaluate duplication

A strong single-entry lineup can still be a poor tournament entry if it is likely to be duplicated heavily. Look at the stack, popular value plays, salary used, and common roster constructions. Small structural changes can reduce duplication without weakening the lineup.

Single-entry checklist

- Does the lineup have a clear path to a tournament-winning score?
- Does the main stack tell a believable game story?
- Are the most important roster spots supported by 4x evidence and current role?
- If a player lacks history, is there a specific current-week reason for the bet?
- Is the lineup differentiated enough for the contest size?
- Are there too many fragile or touchdown-dependent plays?
- Can you defend every roster spot without referring to “the optimizer liked it” or “everyone is playing him”?

One lineup means one thesis

Your single-entry build should express your best complete view of the slate. It does not need to cover every outcome. It needs one coherent path that you believe is strong enough to beat the contest.

CHAPTER 9

20-Max Strategy: Exposure and Portfolio Construction

Twenty lineups change the problem. You are no longer choosing only one path. You are building a portfolio of connected tournament bets.

The 2026 SmashTracker 20-max research uses the DraftKings NFL \$150K First Down as a consistent laboratory. Keeping the contest stable makes it easier to study exposure, construction, ownership, and lineup behavior across the season.

Exposure is bet sizing

If you use a player in 10 of 20 lineups, you have 50 percent exposure. The number should reflect the strength of your opinion, the player's risk, his ownership, his stack relationships, and the contest.

Do not spread exposure evenly just to feel diversified. If your strongest ideas appear only slightly more often than your weakest ideas, the portfolio does not reflect your research.

20 Lineups	Player Lineups	Exposure
20	2	10%
20	4	20%
20	8	40%
20	12	60%
20	16	80%

Overweight, underweight, and fade

Compare your exposure with projected ownership. If a player projects for 20 percent ownership and you use him in 40 percent of lineups, you are overweight. At 10 percent, you are underweight. At zero, you are fading.

Those positions should be intentional. You do not need to be overweight on every player you like.

Use caps to control weak paths

Players with narrow scoring paths can appear in the portfolio without taking over the build. Maximum exposure caps are one of the cleanest ways to limit a fragile idea. Minimum exposure should be used carefully because it can force the optimizer into weaker combinations.

Build several slate paths

A good 20-max set should not be 20 cosmetic variations of the same hidden bet. Vary the main stacks, secondary correlations, salary structures, and leverage points for reasons you can explain.

Optimizer: execution, not strategy

An optimizer can generate combinations quickly, but it does not know why a player belongs in your pool. Regardless of the optimizer you use, load only players you have qualified, set exposure limits and stacking rules, then inspect the results. If the output looks wrong, fix the rule that caused the problem and rerun.

- Confirm projections and ownership are current.
- Load only players who earned a place in the pool.
- Set exposure maximums and, when necessary, carefully chosen minimums.
- Require sensible quarterback correlation.
- Use bring-backs and secondary stacks when they fit the game story.
- Control conflicting player combinations.
- Allow enough lineup uniqueness to create distinct paths without forcing random players.
- Review player, stack, team, and game exposure after every run.

Do not let salary fit become confidence

Optimizers can overuse cheap players because they unlock construction. That is a salary property, not proof that the player deserves 60 percent exposure. Compare the actual output with the research plan.

Portfolio question

Ask: If my highest-exposure players fail, what happens to the full set? If my best leverage read hits, do I have enough exposure for it to matter?

CHAPTER 10

Final Review: Make the Lineup Defensible

The final decision still belongs to you. A lineup can be legal, optimized, correlated, and projected well while still being a poor tournament entry.

Explain the path

Before lock, every lineup should answer: What needs to happen for this lineup to compete for first place? The answer should be understandable. A stack shoots out. A lower-owned receiver beats a popular alternative. A running back controls the game while his defense benefits. The lineup should represent a believable version of the slate.

Review every one-off

Players outside the main stack need individual reasons to be there. Strong 4x evidence, role, projection, ownership, salary, or game environment can provide that reason. "He fit the cap" is not enough.

Count fragile bets

Tournament lineups need variance. They do not need uncontrolled variance. If several players need long touchdowns, unexpected workloads, or unusual efficiency, the lineup may require too many narrow outcomes at once.

Check late news

Inactive players, depth-chart changes, workload reports, weather, and ownership movement can change an entire game. Update connected players, not just the obvious replacement. Major news should trigger a fresh review and, for multi-entry builds, often a fresh optimizer run.

Protect late-swap flexibility

Place later players in flexible roster spots when possible. A late wide receiver, running back, or tight end may belong in FLEX so you preserve more replacement options after the early games begin.

Contest fit

A lineup should match the contest. A large-field 20-max lineup can tolerate a narrower path than your one single-entry lineup. A lineup that is strong in one contest can be poorly suited to another.

Final lineup checklist

- What is the path to a first-place-level score?
- Does the main stack make sense?
- Does each player have a reason to be rostered?
- Does the 4x evidence support the most important bets?
- Are current roles, injuries, and projections updated?
- Is the ownership structure intentional?
- Are there conflicting game scripts?
- Is the lineup too fragile?
- Is duplication risk acceptable?
- Is salary being used for a reason?
- Does the lineup fit the contest?
- Can you defend every choice?

Final standard: Do not enter a lineup because a tool created it. Enter it because you understand why it belongs in that contest.

WEEKLY PROCESS

A Repeatable SmashTracker Workflow

The players and games change every week. The research discipline should not.

Wednesday: First Look

1. Review the Main Slate by game.
2. Calculate the salary assignments.
3. Start with 4x history and use 3x/5x as supporting context.
4. Identify players and games worth further research.
5. Do not force final decisions.

Thursday/Friday: Add context

1. Update projections and ownership.
2. Track injuries, role, snaps, routes, carries, targets, and news.
3. Review Vegas totals, spreads, and team totals.
4. Use external DFS tools where they provide useful additional evidence.
5. Note where Smash History and current-week data strongly agree or disagree.

Saturday: Contest-specific Strategy Sessions

The same research now branches into two different lineup decisions.

Single Entry	20-Max First Down
Build the strongest complete lineup.	Build a portfolio of 20 intentional paths.
Favor highest-conviction evidence.	Size exposure according to confidence and risk.

Single Entry	20-Max First Down
Limit unnecessary fragile bets.	Use caps, leverage, and stack diversity.
Evaluate duplication and contest size.	Review player, stack, game, and portfolio exposure.
One coherent thesis.	Several coherent theses.

Sunday/Monday: After Action

- 1. Record the actual DraftKings result.
- 2. Calculate the salary multiple achieved.
- 3. Note whether 3x, 4x, and 5x were reached.
- 4. Review whether the anticipated role and opportunity materialized.
- 5. Separate process quality from outcome quality.
- 6. Document useful findings without creating new methodology rules from one slate.

Tuesday recap and Wednesday research

The Main Slate Recap closes the loop on the decisions that were made. The Millionaire Maker Review studies what the winning lineup teaches about tournament construction, ownership, and the slate. Together, they turn each NFL week into research instead of isolated results.

2026 RESEARCH SEASON

Follow the Evidence

Game Changer is the starting point. The 2026 SmashTracker Research Season is where the method is tested.

Each week, Smash History is applied to a live DraftKings Main Slate. The decisions are documented before the results. Then the slate is reviewed afterward. That process matters because a winning lineup does not automatically prove the reasoning was good, and a losing lineup does not automatically prove the reasoning was bad.

The public research loop

Day	Content	Purpose
Tuesday	Main Slate Recap	Review the choices, reasoning, results, and lessons.
Tuesday	Millionaire Maker Review — Article	Study the winning lineup and tournament environment.
Wednesday	First Look — Video	Identify games and players worth investigating through Smash History.
Saturday	Strategy Session — Single Entry	Build one contest-specific lineup through the Smash History lens.
Saturday	Strategy Session — 20-Max First Down	Build and review a 20-lineup portfolio for the same weekly contest.

What SmashTracker does

Collecting this data manually is difficult. You would need historical DraftKings scoring, current salaries, threshold calculations, hit counts, hit rates, and position-by-position organization for every player on the Main Slate. SmashTracker is designed to make that salary-adjusted historical evidence available in a usable research workflow.

What SmashTracker does not do

- It does not predict the exact score a player will produce this week.
- It does not replace projections, ownership, injury news, role analysis, or game context.
- It does not automatically build the correct lineup.
- It does not guarantee tournament results.

Why the Research Season matters

The 2026 Beta is intended to create a documented season of live evidence. The objective is to learn which relationships matter, which product features are genuinely useful, how the process changes by contest type, and where the methodology needs refinement before 2027 commercialization.

Build with history, not hype: Use Smash History to add evidence to the weekly decision. Then let current context and contest strategy determine what you actually do with it.

Read the research. Watch the Strategy Sessions. Review the recaps. The point is not to pretend the process is finished. The point is to make it better every week.

GAME CHANGER

Smash History is evidence. The lineup is the decision.

2026 SmashTracker Research Season