



This was touched upon in the segment on load work-ups. Mathematically-oriented people may tell you (and I understand this) that testing with 3-round groups provides accurate feedback of a round's performance. It has to do with probabilities and such. However! I believe too much in luck, or as Buddy Dave calls it, "The Bullet Fairy." Math-folk will further tell you that the more rounds fired the bigger the shot groupings will become. I've seen many instances where that wasn't true, where the first two or

You are always shooting a group! You might be aiming at one point but you're shooting a group. The aiming point is really the center of the group. That's a "zero," by the way, or that's how to zero, but this is straying beyond the levee here. This drawing here is a clear representation of the importance of smaller group sizes. One of the biggest helps that great accuracy provides a competitive shooter is that it's clear when there's a need for sight correction. The smaller circle the ammo covers on a target face, the more defining sight corrections can be. If that's not clear: A perfect shot break on a correct sight setting at 600 yards from a 1 MOA combination means that a shot 3 inches left, right, up, or down away from target center is still a "perfect" shot, even though the perforation point was imperfect, to be sure. With a 1/4 MOA combination, we're defining "perfect" with more certainty, because "imperfect" is anything outside 1 inch of target center. *Follow?* **This hain't just theory.**

three rounds defined the outer edge of what ultimately became a 10-shot group. I can't argue with math, but I can argue with myself to the point that I want to see more rounds, and more groups, before I cook up a big batch of a component combination and call it good, or call it "match ammo."

If you are a competitive shooter, better accuracy helps you get all the points