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## CHARGING INTO THE MIXED TEAMS FINAL

Observers who believe in momentum as a factor in sporting events have an interesting question regarding the final of the Red Bull Mixed Teams. Does either team have more of that magic element than the other?
One of the finalists - Geely Automobile - could claim it by virtue of their strong performance against SAIC, another Chinese team. Geely started strong and finished with an 89-51 win. Team Salvo trailed by 21 IMPs at the halfway point of their match with Rossard but rallied in the second set to win 81-62. Geely and Salvo will play 56 boards for the championship today.
Also today, the Mixed Pairs will play semifinal sessions.
Sixty pairs from the original 130 have qualified to play today, but that number could increase if pairs eligible to drop into the event decline to do so.


Zia Mahmood and Hongli Wang, opponents in today's Mixed Teams final, near the kings display at the Sheraton.

## OurGame for tablets

It is easy to watch OurGame on tablets.
To view on an iPad, visit the Apple store and search for Ourbridge and simply install the application.
For viewing on an Android device, you need
Adobe Flash Player.


OURGAME

Find the finals of the Mixed Teams on Ourgame.

## Today's Schedule

Mixed Teams
Final
10:00-12:00
12:20-14:20
15:30-17:30
17:50-19:50

Mixed Pairs
Semifinal A\&B
10:00-11:30
II:50-13:20
14:30-16:00
16:20-17:50
18:10-19:40


## MLXED TEAMS

# Today's Final 

| MOSS | 58 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 62 | ROSSARD | 62 |


| SALVO | 69 | SALVO | 81 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 63 |  |  |


| GEELY AUTOMOBILE | 81 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HUOCHETOU BLUE | 34 | GEELY AUTOMOBILE | 89 |
|  |  |  |  |
| SAIC | 67 | SAIC | 51 |
| ATABEY | 42 |  |  |

SALVO
V.

GEELY AUTOMOBILE

## WBF CONGRESS MEETING

The WBF Congress Meeting will be held on Thursday, 16th October 2014 at 09:00 at the Hotel Sheraton.
Coffee, tea and pastries will be served prior to the meeting.
NBOs are kindly requested to ensure that the President or a designated delegate attends this important meeting.


## Video Corner

now online:

Interview with John Kranyak - USA
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wfh9QE3KTic
A Defense Tale by Zia
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vy2uh_MEqe0
Let's Go with the Mixed Teams
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPUVUGvGu00

Auction and Defence by Gabriel Chagas
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7dMppP50Q4Q
Interview with Lindsey Weinger
https://www.youtube.com/watch? $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{Zvx}$ SwBHsscM

Find all the links on www.worldbridge.org

## Mixed Teams final broadcast

The final of the Red Bull Mixed Teams will be broadcast only on OurGame.
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14TH Red Bull WORLD BRIDGE SERIES

### 7.2 Mobile Phones and Electronic Devices

## Mobile phones and electronic devices may not be taken into the playing area and toilets.

## WBF General Conditions of Contest © 2014 Page 13

Any player, captain or coach bringing a mobile phone and or electronic device into the playing area and toilets will cause his team to be fined 2 VPs , (or 6 IMPs in a knockout match) or, in the case of pairs events, will result in his partnership being fined $25 \%$ of the matchpoints available on a board during the session, plus in all cases, a monetary fine, the amount of which will be announced to the participants before the start of the event. This penalty is mandatory. Failure to pay the fine will result in the player being prohibited from playing.
The Head Tournament Director may, at his discretion, prohibit a player from bringing other equipment into the playing area.

Anyone entering the playing area may be required to comply with procedures put in place by the WBF for the detection of such electronic equipment.
See also Section 27.2 for restrictions pertaining to spectators.
The Head Tournament Director will arrange for random checks of players, captains and coaches to ensure that there is compliance with these prohibitions. Refusal to submit to these checks will bar the individual concerned from entry to the playing area and toilet area, and from remaining there.
Refusal to submit to these checks will result in the individual being barred from the playing area and toilet area for the duration of the match or until such time as the Head Tournament Director, in consultation with the Championship Committee, shall decide.

## WBF Systems Committee

The members of the WBF Systems Committee are
Fulvio Fantoni, Eric Kokish, Chip Martel, Krzysztof Martens,
P.O. Sundelin and Paul Janicki.

There will be a meeting of the committee in the WBF Meeting Room at II a.m. on Thursday, Oct. I6. John Wignall, chairman

## Perfect Numbers

By Mark Horton

In number theory, a perfect number is a positive integer that is equal to the sum of its proper positive divisors, that is, the sum of its positive divisors excluding the number itself (also known as its aliquot sum). Equivalently, a perfect number is a number that is half the sum of all of its positive divisors (including itself) i.e. $\sigma_{\rho}(n)=2 n$.
For 28, the divisors are $1,24,7$, and 14 .
Given that the matches of the round of 32 in the 14th Red Bull World Bridge Series Mixed Teams were of 28 boards all the players would be looking for some perfect numbers.
I elected to watch the match between Hauge (seeded 19) and McAllister (I4).

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - Q 9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PJ432 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 106 |  |
|  | - 10754 |  |
| 4 AKJ876 | N | -1032 |
| $\bigcirc$ K |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 10 |
| $\diamond$ Q 543 | W E | $\checkmark$ AK 2 |
| - AJ | S | \& Q 943 |
|  | - 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 98765$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 987$ |  |
|  | -K 82 |  |



Dessy Popova

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hauge | McAllister | Malinowski | Zur Campanile |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 2\%* | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 4\%* | Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 4®* | Pass | 49 | All Pass |
| 20 4 $4 \diamond$ $4 \bigcirc$ | orcing |  |  |

For my money both East and West should have done more - perhaps a good hand for You be the Jury?
With spades 2-2 declarer took all the tricks, +710 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bilde | Gunev | Lund Madsen | Popova |
| $1{ }_{1}$ | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT* | Pass | $4{ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 5 ${ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| $6{ }^{6}$ | All Pass |  |  |

3NT Serious, slam try
$4 \diamond$ Cue bid
4NT RKCB
5 22 key cards

That was +1460 and 12 IMPs to McAllister.
Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hauge | McAllister | Malinowski | Zur Campanile <br>  <br>  <br> Dble |
| Rdbl |  | 18 <br> Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $2 \varsigma$ |
|  |  | All Pass |  |

East led the two of hearts and when West put in the seven declarer won with the ten and played a diamond to the king and ace. West continued with the ace of hearts and a heart and declarer won and cleared the diamonds. That was eight tricks, +120 .
To defeat 2NT East must lead a spade - not exactly obvious.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bilde | Gunev | Lund Madsen | Popova |
|  |  |  | I $\diamond^{*}$ |
| Dble | $2 \triangleleft$ | 28 | 3 |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |
| $1\rangle \quad \mathrm{P}$ |  |  |  |

Hoping that the diamonds would provide enough tricks North took a shot at game. Knowing that diamonds were not behaving West applied the axe.
East led the five of clubs and declarer put up dummy's queen and played the king of diamonds. West took the ace and switched to the king of spades. Declarer won with dummy's ace and cleared the diamonds, East discarding the six and two of hearts. In with the jack of diamonds West returned a club and declarer won and cashed his diamond winners. If East had retained both her clubs the defenders would be in a position to collect two down, as dummy would come under pressure, but when she parted with the ten of clubs declarer could play a heart to the queen and ace. West exited with a club and East won and played a spade,West's queen being the setting trick, -200 and 8 IMPs to MaCallister.

Board 8 Dealer West. None Vul.


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hauge | McAllister | Malinowski | Zur Campanile |
| $1 \%$ | 24 | 38 | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4NT* | Pass |
| 54* | Pass | 6NT | All Pass |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4NT RK } \\ & 5 \$ \quad 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { ards }+\odot Q$ |  |  |

East's thoughtful final bid avoided the spade ruff that would have defeated Six Hearts. South led her spade, +990.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bilde | Gunev | Lund MadsenPopova |  |
| INT | $2 \diamond *$ | Dble | All Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | One major |  |  |

The defenders quickly got in three rounds of trumps and declarer could score only two trumps and a spade, five down, - I IOO adding 3 IMPs to McAllister's total.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 7
\& K 742
$\diamond$ AJIO
\& K 762


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hauge | McAllister | Malinowski | Zur Campanile |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Is | Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ | All Pass |

With an awkward lead North tried the seven of spades and declarer was not hard pressed to take ten tricks (eleven are possible and there is no lead to defeat Four Spades) +170 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bilde | Gunev | Lund Madsen | Popova |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | INT* | Pass |
| 2e* | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

To defeat 3NT South must lead a club honour, not at all easy given the auction. She went for the ten of hearts for the jack and king and North returned the two to declarer's ace. Three rounds of spades put South on lead and after a club to the king and a club declarer could win with the ace and claim nine tricks, +600 and 10 IMPs, 37-6 for McAllister.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- 92

ค J 108642
$\triangleleft K$ Q 5
2 A 10


East led the seven of clubs, and declarer won with the ace and ran the jack of hearts to West's king. A diamond to the king and ace saw East play a second club. Declarer won with dummy's ace, ruffed a club, crossed to dummy with a heart, drew the outstanding trump, played a diamond to the queen, cashed two trumps and played a spade to the ace. That was nine tricks, but the defenders took the last two, +50 .



Rosen Gunev

East led the four of spades and when declarer played low from dummy West won with the king and switched to the four of diamonds for the queen and ace. When East failed to continue with the jack of diamonds, preferring a second spade, declarer could win with dummy's jack, come to hand with a club and run the jack of hearts. In due course the ace of spades took care of the losing diamond, +420 and 10 IMPs back to Hauge, who trailed 37-I8 at half time.

Board I5. Dealer South. NS Vul.

- $\int 4$
$\bigcirc 5$
$\triangleleft$ A 10532
2 AKJ 92


Open Room

| West <br> Cichocki | North <br> McAllister | East <br> Hocheker | South <br> Zur Cam- |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | INT |
| $2 \triangleleft *$ | $2 N^{*} *$ | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 N T^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

2NT Lebensohl (or possibly Rubensohl?!)
4NT Both minors
East's double was a gallant effort - it might have been a real winner if West had started with a spade shortage.
However, reading nothing special into the double, West led the king of hearts, and declarer claimed all the tricks, + II 50 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bilde | Gunev | Lund Madsen | Popova |
|  |  |  | I $\diamond^{*}$ |
| 38 | Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ | 4NT |
| Pass | 5NT* | Pass | $6\rangle$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \diamond \\ & 5 N T \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

Here it was clear that East did not want a heart lead and West's spade lead meant +200 and 16 IMPs, almost doubling McAllister's lead.
When McAllister picked up game swings on the next two deals another 23 IMPs were in the locker and the result was not in doubt.

## Small swings add up

By Brent Manley

After playing 16 short matches in the qualifying stages of the Red Bull Mixed Teams, players in the round of 32 settled in on Monday for a couple of 14-board sets.
An all-USA squad of David and Lisa Berkowitz playing with Alan Sontag and Robin Taylor opposed Anna Gulevich (Russia), Apolinary Kowalski-Ewa Miszewska (Poland) and Vytautas Vainikonis (Lithuania), playing as Vitas.
Vitas went ahead on the first board of the match.
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

- QJ 92
- K 10
$\checkmark 6543$
- KJ 2


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kowalski | Sontag | Miszewska | Taylor |
|  | Pass | $2)^{*}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

2 Weak with 5-5 in hearts and a minor.


Vytautas Vainikonis

This contract should have been defeated. Sontag started with the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$, ducked all around. He pressed on with a low spade to Taylor's ace, and she continued the suit. Kowalski won the $\uparrow K$ and played the $\diamond K$ and the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, overtaking with the ace to fell the $\diamond$ J. On the third and fourth diamonds, Taylor discarded hearts. Instead of cashing dummy's fifth diamond, Kowalski played a low heart to the 8, jack and king. Sontag didn't want to set up Kowalski's long spade, so he exited with the P 10 . Kowalski ended with two hearts, five diamonds, the K K and for nine tricks and plus 400.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D. Berkowitz | Vainikonis | L. Berkowitz | Gulevich |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass |
| 2** | All Pass |  |  |
| $2 \triangleleft$ Five hearts or a good spade raise <br> 2 Willing to play hearts |  |  |  |

Berkowitz won the diamond opening lead in hand and played a low heart, ducking when North produced the 10. Berkowitz played low again when North continued with the SK. A low club then went to Berkowitz's queen. He cashed the $\diamond Q$, getting the good news in that suit, then cashed the c A and ruffed a club. Berkowitz lost only three trumps and the 4 for plus 140, but it was a 6-IMP loss.
The next board was interesting for what happened at other tables.

Board 2 .Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- 9876
-87
$\diamond$ QJ 96
- 198
$\& K 53$
$\& 1043$
$\diamond$ A 87
$\&$ AK 107

| N | - AQJ2 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 2$ |
| W | $\diamond$ K 1053 |
| S | -6532 |
| -104 |  |
| PAKQJ965 |  |
| $\checkmark 42$ |  |
| \& Q 4 |  |


| West | North <br> Kowalski | East <br> Sontag | Miszewska <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Saylor |
| :--- |
| Tay |
| 3 NT $^{*}$ |

There were never more than seven tricks in hearts on this deal, and East-West soon were recording plus 300.

| West | North | East | South <br> D. Berkowitz <br> Vainikonis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | L. Berkowitz | Gulevich |

Gulevich started with a top heart, continuing with the suit at trick two. On that trick, Lisa Berkowitz discarded a low club. She did the same on the next trick - another high heart. On the fourth round of hearts, Berkowitz ruffed in dummy with the trump king, discarding a diamond, then played three rounds of trumps before starting on the minors. She finished with nine tricks for plus 140.
It is worth noting that at least six East-West pairs doubled $3 \bigcirc$ for plus 500 but where North-South reached $4 \bigcirc$, none of those contracts was doubled.
At any rate, the 4-IMP swing to Vitas gave the team a 10 0 lead. Another small swing on this board added to the Vitas team's total.

Board 5 .Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & 10643 \\ & \text { AJ8432 } \\ & \diamond 104 \\ & \& Q \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 7 \\ & \text { Q Q } 976 \\ & \diamond \text { A } 73 \\ & \text { K } 974 \end{aligned}$ |  | N |  | - KJ9 5 |
|  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc 5$ |
|  |  | W | E | $\checkmark$ J 82 |
|  |  | S |  | -AJ652 |
|  |  | - Q 82 |  |  |
|  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\triangleleft \mathrm{KQ} 9$ | 95 |  |
|  |  | -1083 |  |  |
| West <br> Kowalski | North |  | East | South |
|  | Sontag |  | Miszewsk | wska Taylor |
|  | $2 \bigcirc$ |  | All Pa |  |

Miszewska started with a diamond. Kowalski won the $\triangleleft \mathrm{A}$ and switched to the A , continuing the suit to East's king and taking a ruff at trick four. A club put East back on lead and she continued with the ${ }^{\text {d }}$. Sontag ruffed with the 9 K and ran the 810 , but he could not avoid losing another trick in trumps for minus 100.
Considering that East-West have the majority of the highcard points and a good club fit, minus 100 did not seem like a bad result. If David Berkowitz could have seen all the cards, it would have been a gain.

| West | North | East | South <br> D. Berkowitz <br> Vainikonis |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L. Berkowitz |  |  |  | Gulevich

Vainikonis hit on the lead of the $\triangleleft I O$, ducked all around. Another diamond went to South's 9 , and Berkowitz ducked again. Gulevich could have sunk the contract then with a switch to the 9 K , but she played a third diamond.

Berkowitz took the $\triangleleft \mathrm{A}$ and played a low club from hand, winning with the ace when North's queen appeared.
On a double-dummy basis, Berkowitz could have made the contract with a backwards finesse in spades - playing the jack from dummy and letting it ride if South didn't cover. If South did cover, Berkowitz could finesse against North's 10 for the ninth trick.
There was no particular reason for Berkowitz to make that play, however, and he eventually made the normal play of cashing the A and finessing the jack. When the finesse lost, he was two down for minus 100.Another 5 IMPs went to Vitas, now leading 15-0.
Taylor got back in the match on the following board.
Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- K 1075
© 1074
$\diamond A J 3$
- Q 75

| - J842 | N | - Q |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 3 |  | Q18652 |
| $\checkmark$ Q 9865 |  | $\checkmark$ K 742 |
| - K 10 | S | - 832 |
|  | - A963 |  |
|  | $\triangle$ AK 9 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10$ |  |
|  | * AJ964 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D. Berkowitz | Vainikonis | L. Berkowitz |  |
|  |  | Pass | Gulevich |

Vainikonis won the diamond opening lead in hand and played the K , finishing with just 10 tricks for plus 420. Sontag and Taylor did much better at the other table.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kowalski | Sontag | Miszewska | Taylor |
|  |  | Pass | 180 |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 48 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 64 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The $4 \curlyvee$ bid by Sontag indicated slam interest, and Taylor used Blackwood to drive to the slam. East started with a low heart. Sontag won with dummy's 8 A , entered his hand with a diamond to the ace and played a club to dummy's jack. Kowalski won the K and exited with the IO. Sontag took the Q and played a low spade, winning with the ace when East contributed the queen. Sontag played a spade to the 7 , ruffed a diamond and picked up the trumps with a spade to the $I 0$. He took four clubs, the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, a diamond ruff, four spades in hand and two hearts. Plus 980 was good for II IMPs to Taylor. The score was $15-1$ I. Vitas was leading 22-12 when this deal came along.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


Taylor had no difficulty coming to II tricks, losing only a heart and a club. That was plus 150 .
Vainikonis and Gulevich found a better contract.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D. Berkowitz | Vainikonis | L. Berkowitz | Gulevich |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | Is |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \$$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Lisa Berkowitz led a heart to her partner's ace. The $\ulcorner 3$ was returned to the 9 and king and a third heart set up North's jack. Declarer pitched spades from dummy on the second and third rounds of hearts. After winning the $\oslash \mathbf{Q}$, David Berkowitz exited with a low diamond. Declarer took the $\diamond A$ and ran the 9 to West's queen. That gave declarer four clubs, two diamonds, two spades and the 8 J for plus 600 and a 10-IMP gain.
At the halfway point of the match,Vitas was ahead 32-I2.


Robin Taylor


## By Francesca Canali

To be able to play bridge while watching a football match is definitely the dream of most of the men (actually not only a dream, as important football matches are the only condition that can convince them to try to be dummy in a mixed competition).
Well, this would have been very possible this weekend in Rome. The venue of the International Teams Tournament "Città di Roma - Angelini" was the Olympic Stadium: the competition was played in the rooms of the prestigious Monte Mario gallery, where players were able to enjoy a fascinating view of the soccer field.
The event met good international success, with participants coming from many parts of Europe and also from Israel, Lebanon and the United States, including the newest European Champions Lotan Fisher and Ron Schwartz.
After three days of play, the cup went to the Italian team Spassofood of Andrea Boldrini, Giuseppe Delle Cave, Francesco Ferrari, Federico lavicoli, Fabio Lo Presti and Francesco Mazzadi. The six of them are all under 40 and grew up in the junior division of the Italian Bridge Federation, which is now happy to have been responsible for their first encounter.
Even if their junior years are over, these players kept in touch and despite the geographical distance of some of them and their professional and family commitments, they decided to spend a weekend together in the "Eternal-like-true-friendships-City."

F. Ferrari, A. Boldrini, F. Lo Presti, F. Iavicoli, G. Delle Cave

## Round and About! <br> A review of the round of 32 from various sources

By Barry Rigal

Easiest winners in the round of 32 were Moss, who ended up winning by 100 or so (despite 'spotting' their opponents an Il00 on the very first deal - just to make it more interesting)... this was deal two.

Board 2. Dealer East. N-S Vul.

- 9876

ค 87
$\diamond$ Q 196
4 J 98


Where Moss-Seamon were $N / S$, a quiet $I \oslash$ opening saw Gothard collect + 150 in $3 \%$. Kerri Sanborn found herself in 44 after her opponents went for a more aggressive choice with the South cards.
Curiously nobody defended $3 \bigcirc x$ here but quite a few pairs were caught in $3 \checkmark$ when East could pass and balance with a take-out double or even light and re-open with a double.

How would you play 4¢ on repeated heart leads? Best must be to ruff, cross to a top club in dummy and ruff another heart. North can do no better than pitch a diamond on this trick, and now you unblock your trump honors from hand, cross to a second club in dummy and draw a third round of trumps, leaving North with the master trump and club, and play a third club. North is in, and can cash his trump if he wants, but you end up scoring two ruffs and three trumps, and five tricks in the minors. Kerri successfully brought home her game in approximately this fashion. Only Jenny Wolpert for the Diamond team also managed ten tricks in spades here.

## Board 6. Dealer East. E-W Vul.

- K 1075
- 1074
$\diamond$ A J 3
\& Q 75

```
& J842
Q Q 3
\triangleleftQ9865
& K 10
```


$\uparrow$ Q
คJ8652
$\checkmark$ K 742
\& 832
, A963
$\bigcirc$ AK 9
$\diamond 10$
\& AJ 964
As we have seen in Brent Manley's article, 64 can be brought home with accurate timing. Against Zhao-Sanborn the final contract was also 6s on a heart lead. Now declarer went after trumps immediately, guessing the suit by starting with the ace, then running the nine. Now declarer needs to come to hand to go after clubs. What you cannot do is run the queen, as North discovered, since Zhao could win and return the club ten, locking declarer in dummy. Two entries to hand were required, to ruff a diamond and then draw the last trump, and that was no longer possible.
Note that while it was necessary for declarer to lead a club to the jack, it might not have been sufficient...Zhao might have contributed the $\$ 10$ to this trick! Now declarer will need to drop the e K to make the slam. To misquote George Bush Senior "Not gonna happen; wouldn't be prudent". Two boards later the Gothard team was heavily punished for a slight inaccuracy. After West had opened and North had preempted in spades, E/W found their heart fit and bid to slam, but played it in $6 \bigcirc$, down on the spade ruff. They were not
alone in this: 15 of the 32 pairs went down in slam, only four finding their way to 6NT. One N/S pair elected to sit it out in $2 \diamond \mathbf{x}$ for -IIOO, (as detailed in Mark Horton's report) the matchpoint top for E/W, but Sanborn-Zhao were happy enough to take 800 after l nice view by Zhao, but what else could he sensibly do?
Ricco van Prooijen found a very satisfying way to go against the percentages here.

Board IO. Dealer East. Both Vul.
© 17

- K 742
$\Delta \mathrm{AJIO}$
\& K 752
AK 1052
$\bigcirc$ AJ 3
$\diamond$ K 53
\& 4

¢ 843
$\vee$ Q 865
$\diamond$ Q 64
\& Q 98
- Q 96
$\checkmark 109$
$\diamond 9872$
\& J 1053

| West <br> van Prooijen | North | East <br> Wilson | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  | Pass |

Ricco won the heart lead in hand and played $\Phi A$ and a second spade. North won to shift to a low club to the eight and ten. Declarer won and played $\vee A$ and another heart, letting North in for a second low club play. Restricted choice tells you clearly to play South for KHxx not for Jl0xx, but Rocco rose with the queen and when it held he had nine tricks. Why did he make the play? He judged that North's shift to a club was far more likely to be from kingfourth than jack fourth. But as an aside, don't you think that an on-form N/S pair would have seen South put in the ${ }^{0}$ on the first round?

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.
$\pm 92$
P J 108642
$\diamond K$ Q 5
\& A 10

- K 3

๑K 73
$\diamond 109764$
\& Q J 5


- Q 108764
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond$ A J
29876
- AJ5
$\bigcirc$ A Q 5
$\triangleleft 832$
\& K 432

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Li |  | Jing |
|  |  |  | INT (13-15) |
| Pass | 2\%* | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 28 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |
| 20 N | cing Staym |  |  |

At the table I was watching this deal determined the fate of one team. Defending to $4 \checkmark$, East led the $\varphi 8$, third and lowest, declarer playing low from dummy. Since from East's point declarer could have been 5-4 in the majors, he won the QK and returned a spade, East helpfully signaling suit preference with the ten. Now declarer should have played ace and another heart to guard against king-doubleton offside (if the 8 K was onside the contract was safe). However he actually crossed to hand with A and took the heart finesse. When West ducked his king declarer was not tested to rise with $\vee A$ on the next round of trumps and claim his contract by discarding the diamond loser on the spade winner.
Readers can determine whether my reluctance to name one of my ex-partners as the guilty defender is based on my angelic personality or the large amount of hush-money I am confidently expecting to receive.


Ricco van Prooijen and Alison Wilson

## Perfect timing needed

By Micke Melander

Team BINKIE who was seeded 22 took on WILLENKEN, seeded II, in the round of 32. Lots of IMPs were shared between the two teams and when the smoke had cleared after the first half of the match the standing was 3I-24 to the Binkie's.

Board 16. Dealer North. All Vul.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gill | Willenken | Dawson | Berkowitz |
| $1 \diamond$ | $3 ¢$ | Dble | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Van Prooijen | Callaghan | Wilson | Duckworth |
| $1 \diamond$ | 30 | Dble | Pass |
| $3 \Delta$ | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

In the Closed Room Callaghan led the ten of clubs. After some thinking Van Prooijen called low from dummy which ran to his jack. Next came the jack of spades. South probably should have ducked rather than winning as she did with the queen, to cash the ace of trumps and return a low heart, which went to North's king. Callaghan continued with the seven of hearts into declarer's tenace and West won South's ten with the jack. Van Prooijen cashed the ace of hearts and played a trump to dummy's ten. The king of spades then pulled the remaining trumps and ace-king of clubs and a diamond finesse made sure of his ten tricks.

In the Open Room Dawson who was declaring from the other hand after Gill didn't want to pick which major to play in also received a club as her opening lead. Dawson won with the ace in hand and finessed in diamonds with the queen. When that held, she cashed the ace of diamonds, ruffed a diamond and cashed king of clubs (discarding a heart from dummy). Declarer then ruffed a club, noticing that South discarded a heart, another
diamond was ruffed in hand before she played her fourth club ruffing in dummy when South again discarded a heart. This left


If declarer had now cashed the ace of hearts and just exited with a heart South would have been endplayed. For reasons unknown (declarer probably didn't believe trumps were $4-1$ ) he instead called for a low heart from dummy. Willenken jumped up with his king making a crocodile coup of his partner's queen. When he shifted to a spade through declarer, it was all over, down two. I3 IMPs to the Willenken team.

For the record, South had missed her chance by not ruffing low on the previous club. Had she kept two hearts and three trumps in the ending, declarer is helpless. Sabine Auken made 4 in this way when her opponent missed the chance to be brilliant.

More tests arrived on the very next board, since if you arrived in 3NT, as Duckworth did, you had to time your play perfectly, for sure it wasn't easy to see where the nine tricks should arrive from.

Board I7. Dealer North. All Vul.

- KJ4

ค873
$\diamond 875$
\& A 1042

| ¢ 9873 | N | ¢ Q 102 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 10$ |  | $\bigcirc$ KQ 9642 |
| $\diamond$ KJ 109 | W E | $\diamond 63$ |
| ¢ Q 975 | S | 963 |
|  | , A65 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 5 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 42 |  |
|  | 2 KJ 8 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gill | Willenken | Dawson | Berkowitz |
|  | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Dble |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 30 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Van Prooijen | Callaghan | Wilson | Duckworth |
|  | Pass | 2 \% | Dble |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Playing at double dummy it's an interesting hand, Duckworth almost did that when she wrapped up her nine tricks after Van Prooijen led the ten of hearts which went to the queen and ace. Declarer won the king of clubs then played the eight of clubs to the nine, ten and three. Then the key play arrived when Duckworth ducked a diamond to West to set up the timing for a potential squeeze. Van Prooijen exited with the queen of clubs setting up another trick for the defense. But when Duckworth won in dummy and played a heart towards her hand Wilson won with the king to play another round. That put pressure on West who now discarded a diamond. One might think that it matters if East doesn't win with the king of hearts or plays a third round of the suit, but in fact it doesn't matter so long Duckworth reads the situation right. Nor does it matter if West discards a spade instead...


At this point South played a spade to the king and took a losing finesse in diamonds, but with six tricks in the bag the ace of spades to come and two established diamonds that was the nine tricks she needed.
At the other table Berkowitz managed to make her contract in three clubs when Gill and Dawson both made some errors in the defense.

Board 21. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | - 84 <br> - K 9762 <br> $\diamond 73$ <br> - 10954 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AKQJ92 |  | - 103 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 53 |  | $\bigcirc 8$ |
| $\diamond$ Q | W E | $\diamond$ AK9865 |
| +873 | S | - KQJ 2 |
|  | - 765 |  |
|  | Q QJ 104 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1042 |  |
|  | - ${ }^{\text {a } 6}$ |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gill | Willenken | Dawson | Berkowitz |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Is | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \Phi$ | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Van Prooijen | Callaghan | Wilson | Duckworth |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| 69 | All Pass |  |  |

Here both Wests probably wished that they could bid two spades like in the old days to set the trump suit and force to game. For Van Prooijen it was easier when partner showed her second suit than for Gill who was staring into three potential club losers without knowing that partner also had a fit there. Still, Van Prooijen had to go through "fourth suit" before rebidding his spades. When partner raised to four he had no problems asking for aces then bidding the slam.
Gill just gave up at the other table and jumped to game when partner rebid her diamonds. That action cost the Binkie team II IMPs, in the end they lost the match by 6550.


## A four-pipe problem

By Barry Rigal

Sherlock Holmes described a particularly knotty case as being a three-pipe problem. Be prepared to step outside the playing area and consume four pipes worth of tobacco as you address the following defensive conundrum. It came in the Mixed Teams round of 16 .

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { \& - } \\
& \text { J653 } \\
& \text { A 10542 } \\
& \text { AQ } 74
\end{aligned}
$$

$-\mathrm{KQJ} 2$

$\diamond$ -
\& KJ8653


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2\%* | Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6\rangle$ | All Pass |  |

As West you lead the spade king, declarer ruffing in dummy (partner follows with an upside-down 48) and following with the nine from hand.
Five rounds of trumps follow and your partner (who obviously began with seven spades to the ten else declarer would have ruffed another spade in dummy) must, you can be sure, have a heart honor if you want to beat the slam.
East's discards (after following with suit preference $\diamond$, $\diamond 3$ ) are $\$ 6, \$ \mathbf{~} \$$. On the fifth trump, dummy pitches a heart. What seven cards do you come down to, and what do you discard on declarer's last trump?
When you've decided, take a look at the full deal.
Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | $1-$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\text { QJ } 653$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 10542 |  |
|  | \& A Q 74 |  |
| ¢ K Q J 2 | N | ¢ 10876543 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 108 |  | $\bigcirc$ K 97 |
| $\diamond$ - |  | $\diamond 86$ |
| \& K J 8653 | S | 29 |
|  | - A 9 |  |
|  | - A 42 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 973 |  |
|  | \& 102 |  |

In the six-card ending you have just one chance if you want to beat the slam. This is what you need to come down to:


If your two non-club cards are either two hearts or one heart and one spade, declarer cashes the spade ace to force a heart out of you, runs the club ten, covered all round, then comes back to had with a heart. When he leads the club two from hand, intending to insert the seven if you play low, you must split your honors. Declarer ducks and you are endplayed. As you can see, this does not work in the ending above because whenever declarer cashes the spade ace he sets up a side-winner for you. And if he does anything else you have an exit card when you need it.

## Looking for action

By David Stern

It's hard to decide who to watch in the first round of a tournament. There are the marquee "big name" players or the ones around whom there is likely to be "action." For the Mixed Pairs qualifying, I elected to watch Jacek Pszczola (Pepsi) and his partner Meike Wortel.
Pepsi, holding the WBF Ranking of 33rd in the world, is a Polish expert who lives in North Carolina in the U.S. and is a regular at ACBL tournaments, especially the three North American Bridge Championships, where he was won four titles. Pepsi is well known in the bridge world as a very solid player who takes advantage of the slightest slipup by the opponents.
Wortel is a three-time North American champion and holds the WBF Ranking of 65th in the world, holds European Women's, Girl's and Juniors titles and is at the forefront of women's bridge in the most competitive environment of the Netherlands.


Pepsi and Meike Wortel
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

- 97652
$\bigcirc 97654$
$\diamond 3$
\& K 9

| \& AKJ843 <br> $\bigcirc$ A <br> $\checkmark 75$ <br> \& Q 1084 |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



After North passed, Wortel opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ and rebid INT
when Pepsi bid 14. His 4s became the final contract.
North elected to lead the $\vee 4$ in an effort to force declarer rather than playing for a diamond ruff. The casual player might put up the $\cap \mathrm{Q}$ from dummy, hoping for a cover with the king. Pepsi, realising the importance of the $\curvearrowright 4$ lead, suggesting North held the $\oslash K$, wanted to preserve the
QQ J IO for future use. South, suspecting that her partner had underled the ace, put up the king. Pepsi showed no mercy, crossing to the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and discarding three clubs on the good hearts, making five for 97.6\%
On this board, the spotlight fell on Wortel and her matchpoint strategy.

Board 2 . Dealer East. N/S Vul.
© K 6
คA987
$\diamond 107$
297652


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pepsi |  | Wortel |  |
|  |  | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

South led the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ to North's ace. Wortel won the heart return with the king. Clearly, 12 tricks are available with either a diamond break or spade finesse and reasonable spade layout - LK $9 \times \times$ with North if they break badly.
At trick three,Wortel tried three rounds of diamonds and was at the crossroads. She could guarantee making II tricks by conceding a diamond or go for 10 or 12 tricks by taking the spade finesse. Clearly a gambler, and appreciating matchpoints, she finessed the spades - making 12 tricks but only $35.7 \%$ against those who made 13 tricks in spades and II pairs who bid and made slam.
On the following board, a mispick by Pepsi proved costly.


North led the $\diamond A$, allowing declarer to discard dummy's losing club on the $\diamond$ K. Double dummy, it's easy to see that a heart finesse will see smooth sailing for declarer. However, with so many ruffs available, Pepsi elected to play a heart to the ace, ruff a heart and play a spade to the ace and a spade to the king. A club ruff, heart ruff and club ruff saw the end of tricks for Pepsi, two down and $27.3 \%$.

Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.


Wortel, sitting East, did well to steal the hand in $4 \checkmark$ with N/S making 44. It seemed likely that South would lead a club, win the $\triangleleft \mathrm{K}$ and put partner in with a diamond to get a club ruff to go with the $\diamond A$ for one down and a good score. In practice, South cashed the $\mathbf{\Delta A}$ and continued the suit. Wortel ruffed and now committed the only error on the set by playing a club to dummy to finesse the heart. Yes, it's pairs, but setting up a likely club ruff seems an unacceptable risk. Anyway, all finished well when the heart finesse lost and South continued spades, allowing declarer
to make 10 tricks after losing the $\forall \mathrm{A}$.
Another handy overtrick came their way in 3NT when Pepsi, holding $\vee 75$ opposite $\vee$ A K 104 3, played a heart to the ten with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ J onside. That was good for $89.8 \%$ on the board and $59.35 \%$ after 10 boards. A good start for sure.
A solid opportunity slipped by on the first board of the next stanza.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.
\& K Q 1097
$\bigcirc 103$
$\diamond 73$
KJ 104
$\wedge 85$
$\diamond A K 9$
$\diamond K$ QJ 9654
$\& A$


- A 6
$\bigcirc 54$
$\diamond$ A 102
-986532
Q Q J 8762
$\diamond 8$
Q Q 7

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pepsi |  | Wortel |  |
|  |  |  | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble | 28 | 30 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

There are an easy 12 tricks in $6 \diamond$. Still, stopping in game was worth $69.8 \%$ all the same as 29 tables played in $5 \diamond$ for plus 420 against the 460 in top tricks in no-trumps.
A few boards later, Pepsi could count himself very lucky when North, declarer in 3 doubled, lost his way on this layout.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
$\triangle A 2$
$\vee$ Q J 843
$\diamond 93$
\& 8752


I won't make you suffer declarer's agony other than to say he finessed spades and Pepsi won a trick with the $\vee 8$. That one down was worth $96.8 \%$, whereas the more expected 530 would have been just $2.3 \%$. But hey, that's what champions do - turn a sow's ear into a silk purse.
The next board was probably the most interesting of the
set. The defence certainly deserved a better result for Pepsi-Wortel than it actually got.

Board I9. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- AK 104
$\bigcirc 1042$
$\diamond 1042$
\& 653


| West <br> Pepsi | North | East <br> Wortel | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Wortel led the Q , won by declarer's ace. Seeing all hands, it's easy to see that declarer can cash the $\diamond A K$ and cross back to the $\diamond I O$ after the queen drops to cash the QK and then finesse hearts for at least 10 tricks. Declarer wasn't blessed with a hand record, however, and tried the $\diamond$ IO, which Wortel correctly covered with the queen. Declarer, now desperate to get back to his hand to enjoy the $\varphi K$, tried the $\triangle Q$, ducked by Wortel, and continued with the $\vee, J$ again beautifully ducked by Wortel. Declarer then played a low heart to the 10, which Wortel won and put declarer back into dummy with the last heart.
Declarer cashed the diamonds to come down to this ending:


Note how beautifully Pepsi unblocked the 9 to allow a low club to go round to East to play a low club and force declarer to the club guess. Declarer guessed right, playing the 2 K , but holding declarer to 10 tricks earned PepsiWortel a fine 65.7\%.
At the end of second qualifying session, the two were running 20th of 130 pairs on $57.95 \%$.

## Answer from Germany

By jean-Paul Meyer

Ulrich Wenning is the President of the German Bridge Federation (GBF) and he was a member of the national team that won the D' Orsi Trophy (Senior Teams) in Bali.
We met him as he wanted to express his opinion as a partial answer to Jeff Polisner's interview (Bulletin 3) and as answer on other questions about the cooperation between the WBF and the GBF.


Ulrich Wenning

The GBF has cooperated with the WBF all during its history. An investigation and a decision in Bali would have prevented some bad publicity for the WBF and GBF.
The GBF had good reason for asking for a postponment of the meeting in Dallas, which was declined by the WBF.
The decision of Disciplinary Committee of WBF was without delay enforced by the GBF.
Mr. Elinescu and Mr. Wladow brought an action against the GBF and the WBF in a German court. The serious complaint of "German Doctors" will be defended by the GBF in cooperation with the WBF.
No public statement to this pending procedure is possible this time.
The cheating accusation against Mr. Elinescu and Mr. Wladow was shocking for the members of the German Seniors Team. Not one of the team members could have imagined that the swings of their scores were anything other than a result of their wild bidding. Certainly none of them had any suspicion that it could have been due to cheating.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Pair |  | Country | \% |
| 1 | LARA Maria Joao | OREY CAPUCHO Manuel d' | POR - POR | 59.69 |
| 2 | SUN Yanhui | HOU Xu | CHN - CHN | 57.86 |
| 3 | CHAGAS Gabriel | PAIN Leda | BRA - BRA | 57.59 |
| 4 | GONG Wangying | LONG Hao | CHN - CHN | 56.68 |
| 5 | FISCHER Doris | SAURER Bernd | AUT - AUT | 56.38 |
| 6 | DEWI Suci Amita | KARWUR Franky Steven | INA - INA | 55.87 |
| 7 | LI Hui | BI Shuguang | CHN - CHN | 55.83 |
| 8 | SHEN Lili | LI Jianwei | CHN - CHN | 55.73 |
| 9 | LEI Li | YAO Jiangtao | CHN - CHN | 55.35 |
| 10 | CHEN Wenmin | TANG Yi | CHN - CHN | 55.07 |
| 11 | NG Kelvin | TAN Gemma | SIN - PHI | 54.68 |
| 12 | DEY Bharati | HOODA Major Surendra Kumar | IND - IND | 54.54 |
| 13 | ROSSLEE Diana | STEPHENS Robert | RSA - RSA | 54.52 |
| 14 | SONG Yan | YANG Hua | USA - USA | 54.5 |
| 15 | BJERKAN Cheri | WEINSTEIN Howard | USA - USA | 54.17 |
| 16 | ZHENG Zuanpei | SHEN Jia Xiang | CHN - CHN | 54.11 |
| 17 | PAOLUZI Simonetta | DE FALCO Dano | ITA - ITA | 54.06 |
| 18 | JOEL Geeske | WEINSTEIN Steve | USA - USA | 54.06 |
| 19 | JIANG Haiyan | XU Fang | CHN - CHN | 54 |
| 20 | CHEEK Curtis | DEAS Lynn | USA - USA | 53.93 |
| 21 | WU Jian | ZHOU Tao | CHN - CHN | 53.9 |
| 22 | MIHAI Geta | MIHAI Radu | ROM - ROM | 53.84 |
| 23 | ENGEL Berthold | VECHIATTO Claudia | LUX - GER | 53.8 |
| 24 | HUWen | ZHANG Wei | CHN - CHN | 53.65 |
| 25 | ELLINGSEN Kristian | NILSEN Louise | NOR - NOR | 53.62 |
| 26 | CHEN Yanqing | ZHI Jun | CHN - CHN | 53.58 |
| 27 | KISSINGER John | KISSINGER Susan | USA - USA | 53.51 |
| 28 | LEWIS Linda | LEWIS Paul | USA - USA | 53.44 |
| 29 | BLAAGESTAD Lise | BREKKA Geir | NOR - NOR | 53.24 |
| 30 | LIAO Zhengjiang | XIE Zhaobing | CHN - CHN | 53.16 |
| 31 | CHINMANAS Virat | SVANGSOPAKUL Vallapa | THA - THA | 53.13 |
| 32 | FUGLESTAD Ann Karin | SAELENSMINDE Erik | NOR - NOR | 53.07 |
| 33 | MA Junshan | WU Zhonghua | CHN - CHN | 53.01 |
| 34 | GU Ling | WANG Yuanwei | CHN - CHN | 52.98 |
| 35 | BLOOM Valerie | EBER Neville | RSA - RSA | 52.88 |
| 36 | GEORGE Julius Anthonius | SUMAMPOUW Conny | INA - INA | 52.82 |
| 37 | GAN Lin | CHEN Yunlong | CHN - CHN | 52.8 |
| 38 | WENNING Karin | WENNING Ulrich | GER - GER | 52.46 |
| 39 | GLASSON Bob | GLASSON Joann | USA - USA | 52.46 |
| 40 | BROCK Sally | MYERS Barry | ENG - ENG | 52.37 |


| 41 | JACOBUS Brenda | JACOBUS Marc | USA - USA | 52.33 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 | LOO Choon Chou | WU Hongjun | SIN - SIN | 52.13 |
| 43 | LIOSSIS Georgios | SIRAKOPOULOU Christina | GRE - GRE | 52.09 |
| 44 | YANG Qing | LIN Le | CHN - CHN | 52.07 |
| 45 | HE Xinmei | GAN Xinli | CHN - CHN | 52.05 |
| 46 | YING Hong | LEI Liangshui | CHN - CHN | 52 |
| 47 | KORBEL Daniel | SHI Sylvia | CAN - USA | 51.89 |
| 48 | YANG Qing | TIAN Hai Qing | CHN - CHN | 51.87 |
| 49 | MILNER Reese | SEAMON-MOLSON Janice | USA - USA | 51.58 |
| 50 | ASBI Taufik Gautama | BOJOH Lusje Olha | INA - INA | 51.57 |
| 51 | TIAN Wei | SHI Bin | CHN - CHN | 51.54 |
| 52 | KOVACHEV Valentin | MARQUARDT Diana | BUL - USA | 51.49 |
| 53 | HAN Bing | DING Jingheng | CHN - CHN | 51.38 |
| 54 | TOBING Robert Parasian | TUEJE Julita Grace | INA - INA | 51.32 |
| 55 | MCGARRY Dennis | MCGARRY Linda | USA - USA | 51.25 |
| 56 | GU Song | YANG Zhaokun | CHN - CHN | 51.09 |
| 57 | ARNOLDS Carla | BAKKEREN Ton | NED - NED | 50.98 |
| 58 | PSZCZOLA Jacek | WORTEL Meike | USA - NED | 50.86 |
| 59 | HAMMAN Petra | LALL Hemant | USA - USA | 50.59 |
| 60 | ROMANOVSKA Maija | RUBINS Karlis | LAT - LAT | 50.54 |
| 61 | YANG Jinghui | LIU Xiangdong | CHN - CHN | 50.54 |
| 62 | NEHMERT Pony Beate | YUEN Michael | GER - CAN | 50.54 |
| 63 | ZHANG Yanmei | CHEN Jun | CHN - CHN | 50.47 |
| 64 | GAO Yanrong | HAN Ping | CHN - CHN | 50.33 |
| 65 | GRUDE Marian | GRUDE Tor Eivind | NOR - NOR | 50.32 |
| 66 | KUANGYe | ZHAO Haibo | CHN - CHN | 50.28 |
| 67 | FUJIMOTO Takako | HACKETT Paul D | JPN - ENG | 50.23 |
| 68 | WU Xia | SU Nan | CHN - CHN | 50.17 |
| 69 | INO Masayuki | NISHIDA Natsuko | JPN - JPN | 50.05 |
| 70 | GANZER Craig | PICUS Sue | USA - USA | 50.02 |
| 71 | CHUA Gang | SEET Choon Cheng | SIN - SIN | 49.87 |
| 72 | GILLIS Simon | HARDING Marianne | ENG - NOR | 49.87 |
| 73 | KARMARKAR Marianne | PURUSHOTTAM Andrey | IND - IND | 49.67 |
| 74 | WANG Shigang | LIU Yan | CHN - CHN | 49.66 |
| 75 | YAN Jin | PENG Jianfeng | CHN - CHN | 49.6 |
| 76 | YUE Wuyuan | LI Xiao Yang | CHN - CHN | 49.57 |
| 77 | CHEN Rong | ZHOU Haihong | CHN - CHN | 49.55 |
| 78 | SENENSKY Barry | SHNIER Barbara | CAN - CAN | 49.52 |
| 79 | KAZMUCHA Danuta | SEREK Cezary | POL - POL | 49.33 |
| 80 | YANG Jiahong | CHEN Liulin | CHN - CHN | 49.16 |
| 81 | WANG Huijun | GU Xuehai | CHN - CHN | 49.12 |
| 82 | BANASZKIEWICZ Ewa | STARKOWSKI Wlodzimierz | POL - POL | 49.01 |
| 83 | ZHANG Jian | YANG Hongmei | CHN - CHN | 48.92 |
| 84 | CHEN Qi | REN Yuandong | CHN - CHN | 48.9 |
| 85 | ISPORSKIVladislav Nikolov | TOKCAN Merih | BUL - TUR | 48.62 |


| 86 | IMAKURA Tadashi | ITO Midori | JPN - JPN | 48.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 87 | WANG Xuezhu | WANG Yanhua | CHN - CHN | 48.49 |
| 88 | WU Wenjun | ZU Zhiqiang | CHN - CHN | 48.38 |
| 89 | CHEN Linzhong | WANG Yuanluo | CHN - CHN | 48.29 |
| 90 | LIU Bin | ZHANG Yan Mei | CHN - CHN | 48.21 |
| 91 | CHILD Christine | HINGLE Gregory | RSA - RSA | 48.21 |
| 92 | LYNCH Carolyn | PASSELL Mike | USA - USA | 48.19 |
| 93 | LI Leqing | LOU Hongguang | CHN - CHN | 48.18 |
| 94 | XU Peifeng | ZHANG Haixiong | CHN - CHN | 47.39 |
| 95 | GU Jennifer | ROSENFELD Jason | USA - USA | 47.22 |
| 96 | GUYan | SHAO Ruibing | CHN - CHN | 47.03 |
| 97 | WANG Jian | ZHOU Yuedong | CHN - CHN | 46.99 |
| 98 | ZHANG Yulan | YIN Men Liang | CHN - CHN | 46.83 |
| 99 | BURGESS Stephen | DJUROVIC Nevena | AUS - AUS | 46.66 |
| 100 | FURUTA Kazuo | OH Hye Min | JPN - KOR | 46.65 |
| 101 | YANG Weiguo | QIN Huiyun | CHN - CHN | 46.59 |
| 102 | BAISAMUT Somchai | SOPHONPANICH Esther C. | THA - THA | 46.53 |
| 103 | SURIYA Auraya | SURIYA Chaitad | THA - THA | 46.51 |
| 104 | RETEK George | RETEK Mari | CAN - CAN | 46.47 |
| 105 | DU Bing | WANG Dade | CHN - CHN | 46.32 |
| 106 | MA Aiyue | WANG Cheng | CHN - CHN | 45.99 |
| 107 | SHAN Xingxing | WU Zhen | CHN - CHN | 45.97 |
| 108 | LING Pauline | LING Roger | HKG - HKG | 45.7 |
| 109 | LAMPORT Anne | LEWIS Marshall | AUS - CRO | 45.57 |
| 110 | BODELL Michael | GU Belinda | CAN - USA | 45.51 |
| 111 | LI Xiaoyan | ZHU Hongwei | CHN - CHN | 45.47 |
| 112 | BAO Linchun | ZHOU Qiang | CHN - CHN | 44.9 |
| 113 | CHAN Eugene | NOURS Eurydice | CAN - CAN | 44.7 |
| 114 | CHAN Chung Wai Terence | CHEUNG L. Fu | HKG - HKG | 44.6 |
| 115 | RAYNER John | THOMPSON Jill | CAN - CAN | 44.51 |
| 116 | XIYuheng | YU Huiwen | CHN - CHN | 44.04 |
| 117 | HUYihong | LI Xiaoyi | CHN - CHN | 43.82 |
| 118 | SUGINO Masakatsu | TANAKA Hiroko | JPN - JPN | 43.66 |
| 119 | BANERJI Nita | BANERJITAPAS KUMAR | IND - IND | 43.62 |
| 120 | TITOW Joanne | TITOW Kenneth | FRA - FRA | 43.15 |
| 121 | LI Jie | RIOLO Iolanda | CHN - ITA | 42.8 |
| 122 | CHAN Pek See Nancy Marie | GOH Leng Hock | SIN - SIN | 42.79 |
| 123 | HE Xi Mei | SHEN Longhua | CHN - CHN | 42.78 |
| 124 | LIU Guihua | CHEN Qiang | CHN - CHN | 41.96 |
| 125 | CHEN Xioajuan | LI Jian | CHN - CHN | 41.48 |
| 126 | FOK Wing Hung | HO Irene | HKG - HKG | 41.32 |
| 127 | KIM Hye Young | YOKOI Hiroki | KOR - JPN | 41.32 |
| 128 | YOU Suhua | GAO Peicheng | CHN - CHN | 40.54 |

