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## SCHEDULE

10:00-12:00:
Juniors, Girls, Youngsters, Kids
13:30-15:30:
Juniors, Girls, Youngsters, Kids

We are approximately one third of the way through the qualifying stage of these championships. In the Juniors, after 7 of 21 rounds, Norway enjoys a microscopically small lead - 0.26 victory points -- over USA1, with Poland close behind in third.
Five teams had perfect days: Norway, USA1, Poland, China and China Hong Kong. Italy had two wins and a tie.
After 6 of the 17 rounds in the Youngsters, Europe rules, with France, Denmark and the Netherlands at the top of the table. However, only one team won all three matches: Singapore.
Each girls team has to play 12 matches. Just under halfway through, China has a lead of half a match over the Netherlands, with USA third.
Two teams did not lose yesterday: the Netherlands and USA.
Last but very much not least, after 6 of the 13 rounds in the Kids event, China2 holds a 0.15 victory point lead over France, with China1 just behind.
Three teams cruised through the day: China2, France and Israel.

| $\overline{\mathrm{BBO}}+\mathrm{c}$ - cos | BBOA ONLY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USA1-ITA (J) | FRA-HKG (J) | SWE-SIN (J) | NED-TPE (Y) | AUS-POL (G) |
| EGY-USA2 (J) | ENG-GER (J) | CAN-JPN (J) | BER-SIN (Y) | CHN-IND (G) |
| AUS-ARG (J) | POL-HUN (J) | BAN-FIN (J) | USA-FRA (Y) | HUN-NED (G) |
| POL-NOR (J) | NED-JPN (J) | CHN-COL (J) | USA2-AUS (J) | HKG-ITA (J) |

## MATCHES TODAY

| JUNTORSR 8 | dunlorsh9 | dUNLORSB 10 | dUNORSB11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USA1 ITA | SIN BAN | AUS ARG | POL NOR |
| CAN HUN | EGY USA2 | SWE FRA | NED JPN |
| FRA HKG | ENG GER | COL CAN | CHN COL |
| ARG ENG | HKG CHN | JPN USA1 | GER SWE |
| AUS EGY | HUN NED | NOR ITA | USA2 AUS |
| SWE SIN | ITA POL | POL HUN | BAN ARG |
| COL BAN | USA1 NOR | NED HKG | SIN FRA |
| FIN NED | CAN JPN | CHN ENG | EGY CAN |
| NOR GER | FIN AUS | GER EGY | ENG USA1 |
| POL CHN | ARG SWE | BAN FIN | HKG ITA |
| JPN USA2 | FRA COL | USA2 SIN | HUN FIN |
| TIME 10.00 | TIMES 13.30 | TIMIE 15.50 | TIME 18.10 |


| GIRLSB6 | GIRLSB7 | GIRLSB8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TPE ITA | ITA USA | TPE SIN |
| USA SIN | SIN HUN | USA CHN |
| FRA CHN | CHN IND | HUN NED |
| IND NED | NED NOR | FRA CHI |
| NOR CHI | CHI AUS | IND POL |
| AUS POL | POL TPE | NOR AUS |
| HUN Bye | FRA Bye | ITA Bye |
| TIVIEs 10.00 | TIVIE 13030 | TIMIEs 15.50 |


| FOUNGSTEERSR7 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ISR | GER |
| CHN | IND |
| USA | LAT |
| SWE | CHI |
| ITA | FRA |
| SIN | DEN |
| NED | TPE |
| BRA | POL |
| HKG | BER |
| TIVIEs 10,00 |  |

COUNESTERSB3

| IND | ISR |
| :--- | :--- |
| LAT | CHN |
| CHI | USA |
| FRA | SWE |
| DEN | ITA |
| BER | SIN |
| TPE | GER |
| POL | NED |
| HKG | BRA |

TIMES 13.30

| FOUNGSTEERSB9 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ISR | LAT |
| CHN | CHI |
| USA | FRA |
| SWE | DEN |
| ITA | SIN |
| IND | TPE |
| GER | POL |
| NED | HKG |
| BRA | BER |
| TIVIE8 | 15.50 |

[KIDSR7
ISR CHN
SWE CAN
ITA ENG
POL CZE
CHN1 FRA
USA HUN
NED IND
TIVIEs 10,00

| [JIDSR 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| IND | SWE |
| ISR | ITA |
| CHN2 POL |  |
| CAN | CHN1 |
| ENG | USA |
| CZE | NED |
| FRA | HUN |
| TUIVIE8 18.30 |  |

## PUT YOURSELF TO THE TEST!

## PRACTICE MAKES LESS IMPERFECT

Bridge is a bidder's game
Never interrupt your enemy when he is making a mistake.
(SUN TZU, Art of War)
2. With only the opponents vulnerable, you hold:

- 9754

○ K 5
$\diamond$ A Q 1098
\& A 2
The bidding starts:

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $? ?$ |

Do you agree with your pass? If not, what would you have done differently? What would you do now?
3. Your side is vulnerable. Your hand is:

A --
© A 74
$\diamond$ Q 9863
\& A Q 1074
The bidding goes unexpectedly:

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \wedge$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $4 \wedge$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |  |
| ? |  |  |  |

Do you agree with your pass over four hearts?
If not, what would you have done?
What would you do now?



## Round 1, board 9

There were several interesting boards in the first session, none more so than this one:

Board 9. Dealer North. E-W vul.

- Q 8
$\checkmark$ A 7
$\diamond$ A6532
\& AK6 2

|  | 732 |  | N | 4 | 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1098542 |  |  | $\checkmark$ | K Q J 6 |
| $\diamond$ | -- |  | W E | $\diamond$ | K Q J 7 |
| 4 | J 974 |  | S | ¢ | 853 |
|  |  | 9 | A K J 109 |  |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | 3 |  |  |
|  |  | $\diamond$ | 10984 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Q 10 |  |  |

You would want to bid these cards to slam, I think, since while six diamonds is no better than 2-2 trumps, six spades has significant extra chances.
For Italy in the Juniors, Roberto Sau and Alessandro Calmanovici reached six diamonds after an auction beginning $1 \diamond-1 \wedge$ - $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$. But when Koki Kobayashi from Japan greedily doubled, Calmanovici ran to six spades, also doubled.
After a top-heart lead, declarer could be sure of a bad diamond break. His best shot was surely an immediate club finesse, planning, if it worked, to pitch two diamonds from hand on the ace-king of clubs.
In the other room, Tadahiro Kikuchi played in six spades with no clue as to the bad diamond break.
After a heart lead, you win with the ace and draw trumps. What should your plan be?
At single-dummy, not knowing about the bad diamond split, you should pitch a diamond, not the last heart, from the dummy on the third round of trumps. (If East has four diamonds and four clubs, you
can throw that heart because East can be squeezed without the count on the run of the spades.)
You then plan to duck a diamond, and now the defence do best to return a club if East has \& 9-x-x-x.
You go up with the queen of clubs, play a diamond to the ace, ruff the heart back to hand, and run the trumps to squeeze an opponent long in both minors. But if you have discarded that heart, you will have no hand entry to run the trumps.

## Round 2, board 17

This board offered plenty of opportunity for play in slam here.

Board 17. Dealer North. None vul.
AK 63
$\diamond$ AQ 76
$\diamond 973$
\& 1042

$\bigcirc 92$
$\diamond$ K 82
\& 87

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \wedge$ |
| Dble | $3 \diamond$ | 4 NT | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \star$ | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

At the table I was watching, Tom van Overbeeke from the Netherlands led the $>9$ against six diamonds. Declarer won with dummy's ace and played a diamond to his queen. How would you have defended?

Turn to the next page for the solution.

This was the full deal：
© J 1095
© 10843
$\diamond 64$
\＆Q J 6
AK63
$\checkmark$ A Q 76
$\diamond 973$
\＆ 1042

－A Q 8742
$\bigcirc 92$
$\diamond$ K 82
\＆ 87
If you win the $\diamond Q$ with your king and return a heart， you will find you have let through the slam．

Declarer can use $\diamond 9$ and $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ as entries to finesse clubs twice．Of course，declarer did not follow this line， instead running $\diamond 9$ from dummy at trick two，after which there were not sufficient re－entries to dummy to bring in the clubs．

Three declarers played the slam successfully，two of them on a club lead，which made life easy for declarer．

The remaining successful declarer was Giovanni Donati from Italy，who received a trump lead，which he won with dummy＇s nine to repeat the trump finesse． When this failed，declarer still had two heart entries to play the clubs successfully．

The best defence is smoothly to duck the queen of diamonds．Declarer could still get home，but would be most unlikely to find a winning line．

Round 4，board 16
Board 16．Dealer West．E／W vul．
か 96
$\bigcirc 2$
$\diamond$ A Q 107432
\＆A 53


These cards were difficult to bid to the best spot for N／S．in Singapore－Poland the N／S pair for Singapore， Zhu Chin Chen and Zhou Ming Yang，reached 3NT after

（1ヵ）－2ゝ－（2ゅ）－Dble，when Zhu bid $3 \diamond$ and Zhou tried 3NT．On a low－heart lead declarer could simply win in hand and play on diamonds from the top．The defenders could get three hearts and one diamond，but that was it．
Note that if the heart spots are slightly weaker－say declarer has K9764 rather than his actual spots，he must win the heart lead and play a diamond towards the $\diamond \mathrm{AQ}$ ，ducking when the king appears，to keep East off lead．

## Round 4 Board 22

Board 22．Dealer East．E／W vul．
－A 10
๑A8753
$\diamond$ A 54
\＆Q 72

| ＊K 654 | N | ヘ Q 987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ৩K62 | $W^{\text {N }}$ | $\bigcirc 9$ |
| $\diamond$ Q 987 | W E | $\diamond$ K 6 |
| \＆K 10 | S | \＆A J 9543 |
|  | A J 32 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 104 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 1032 |  |
|  | \＆ 86 |  |

Any game for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ would fail unless you could find a very favourable lie of the spade suit．But the best game contract for $E / W$ is clearly 4a by West，since if you play that contract by East，repeated heart leads cause you real problems．Of the four tables that attempted $4 \uparrow$ by East，three succeeded－but best defence should prevail here．Imagine you ruff the second heart，cross to the club king，lead a spade to the queen，then duck the next spade．North wins and leads a third heart， and while you can ruff this in hand，you cannot reach dummy to draw the last trump，since North will duck the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ if you lead it from hand．
There is one more chance declarer has to succeed； at trick four，after crossing to the club king，he can try the $\$ 10$ from dummy－now to defeat the contract North must cover！Any defender who found that play would deserve our applause．（If you fail to cover， declarer reverts to spades and with clubs established he can lead clubs through South to neutralize his last trump，with the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ as a re－entry to hand later on．）

## Round 4 board 25

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W vul.

> AQ 8
> 勺 9872
> $\diamond 82$
> $\&$ Q J 542


If you look at the full deal here, you would have thought the practical chances of making 3NT were slim indeed. Oren Kriegel reached 3NT after an abortive Stayman sequence, and won $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ lead with his ace. He found the imaginative manoeuvre of advancing $\% 10$, and you can hardly blame West for ducking. Next, declarer led a spade to the queen and

king, and now the killing defence was hard to find. Assuming that East kept the ball in play by cashing his $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$, could he have found the play of a second club? If West gave count on the first round of the suit, it might just have been possible, but this was not found at the table, so 3NT came home.
Editor's note: Rodrigo Garcia Da Rosa also found this line of play and made three notrumps.

## YEH ONLINE BRIDGE WORLD CUP



OCTOBER $33^{\text {TT }}$ - NOVEMBER $2^{N D}$
BRIDGE WILL CONNECT THE WORLD

4 TEAMS FROM 3 DIFFERENT CONTINENTS.

## FEATURING sOme of the MOST BRILLIANT MINDS of our time and WORLD BRIDGE CHAMPIONS wL COMPETE TOGETHER ONLINE. WATCH ONLINE on BBO the BRIDGE EVENT of the YEARI

## Round 3, Junior Teams

Traditionally, the United States are allowed two teams in many world championship bridge events such as the Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup, etc. This applies also to this year's Jaime Ortiz-Patiño trophy. The all-American clash took place in Round 3, and it turned out to be a lopsided affair.

It all happened within the first half of the match. After a push on the first board, USA1 built an impregnable lead of 52-0 as early as board 7. In four out of those six deals (boards 2-7), there were no makeable games for either side (assuming perfect play and defence). However, when aggressive bidders are involved, there is still potential for big swings by penalising the overbidders.

Board 2 Dealer East, Vul N/S
762
©A87653
$\diamond 5$
\& K J 10
49853
© K J
$\diamond$ A K 10
\& 8532


A A Q J 4
$\checkmark 10$
$\diamond$ Q J 986
\&976

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brescoll | Tebha | Kaplan | Kriegel |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Adam Kaplan's 1NT rebid showed 11-13 points. Hence Zachary Brescoll's decision to pass 1NT with 11 HCP. Anam Tebha decided to balance with 29 .

Under different conditions this might have resulted in a favourable partscore swing, but in this case she was doubled and the defenders took their six obvious tricks (one diamond, two clubs and three trumps), so the effect of the vulnerable $2 \triangle$ re-opening was to change a probable -120 score into -200.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herman | A. Grossack | Jolly | Z. Grossack |
|  |  | $1 \%$ | 14 |
| Dble | 20 | Dble | $3 \diamond$ |
| Dble | 30 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Zachary Grossack interfered aggressively with a direct four-card 14 overcall. His partner's 20 response was a transfer - indicating a good threecard raise. Later, the $3 \diamond$ and $3 \diamond$ bids were natural. Eventually South preferred to play in their 4-3 fit at the dangerously high three-level. East/West doubled for takeout three times during the action, but the final contract was left undoubled.

The bidding strongly indicated a trump lead, but Gregory Herman selected the uninspired $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. (In my opinion, even an ace-king combination is not a sufficient reason to lead declarer's second suit in which dummy implied a shortage.)

Now the only chance remaining for the defence was to force declarer to ruff by leading a heart, so that he wouldn't have time to develop a club trick. But Herman switched to a club, and after Jolly cashed his $\& \mathrm{AQ}$ it was plain sailing for declarer: Zachary Grossack ruffed out the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and $\diamond 10$, finessed trumps, and gave up only a late trump trick to West. USA1 +140 .


Board 3 Dealer South, Vul E/W
A A 4
$\checkmark$ A Q 1093
$\diamond 1075$
\& J 73
4986
$\bigcirc 42$
$\diamond$ A Q 942
Q Q 102


A K Q J 108
๑ J 87
$\diamond J$
\& A 986

| West <br> Brescoll | North <br> Tebha | East <br> Kaplan | South <br> Kriegel <br> 14 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  | 1 NT <br> Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 20 |  |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 3NT |

North's hand presents a serious problem for two-over-one bidders. First of all you are not allowed to bid a game-forcing $2 \checkmark$ at your first turn, and then after $2 \%, 2 \triangle$ would show a weak hand while $3 \triangle$ should show an invitational hand with a six-card suit. Perhaps one may make an exception with five such good cards?! Bidding 2NT without a diamond stopper was an unappetizing choice.

Had Oren Kriegel appreciated this potential problem, he may have saved the day by bidding $3 \triangle$ accepting the invitation and showing three hearts (as bidding $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ had already denied four hearts).

The defenders beat 3NT effortlessly by two tricks after Kaplan led fourth-highest of his longest suit.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herman | A. Grossack | Jolly | Z. Grossack |
|  |  |  | 14 |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 40 |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The Grossacks were better equipped for this deal by using the Bart convention where $2 \diamond$ was an artificial bid usually indicating five hearts and two spades, but with a few other possibilities. South's $2 \circlearrowleft$ showed tolerance for hearts, and North's $3 \circlearrowleft$ described an invitational hand with five hearts.

The play was not difficult, as East/West had no way to establish two club tricks before trumps were drawn (and even if they had one, there was a club discard available on spades). This time Herman led a trump. Christian Jolly won with the $๑ \mathrm{~K}$ and led a club. Declarer went up with the \&A, drew trumps, and claimed ten tricks.

| Board 4 Dealer West Vul All |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 108753$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 10864$ |  |
|  | \& 4 |  |
| 4 5432 | N | A Q 10 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 62 | W E | © J 94 |
| $\diamond$ KQ 973 | W E | $\diamond 2$ |
|  | S | \& Q 1097652 |
| \& A | A K J 76 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A J 5 |  |
|  | \& K J 83 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brescoll | Tebha | Kaplan | Kriegel |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \checkmark$ | Dble |
| Redble (a) | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Herman | A. Grossack Jolly | Z. Grossack |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | 1NT |
| Dble (a) | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) three hearts
during the play was whether declarer would go three or four down. After some misguessing, Herman managed to win only his two aces and two trump tricks, USA1 +400 .

Board 5 Dealer North Vul N/S

In yesterday's bulletin, we saw a three-card $1 \Omega$ response to a $1 \diamond$ opening successfully used by an Israeli player. This seems to be a rather common ploy at junior events - here it was used by both American Easts. Admittedly, it is a very awkward hand in response to a $1 \diamond$ opening.

The auctions diverged at South's first call. Kriegel doubled and then raised his partner's forced three-card 14 response to the two-level. Kaplan led his singleton diamond, which was ducked to West's king. Brescoll missed a chance to beat the contract by giving his partner two diamond ruffs and then leading trumps, preventing declarer from cross-ruffing. His trump return allowed Tebha to make 2 with careful play, USA2 +110 .

Zachary Grossack preferred to overcall 1NT with South's cards. This had the advantage of completely describing his strength in one bid and leaving his opponents enough room to hang themselves, which they did. Herman could hardly imagine that East had seven clubs, so he corrected $2 \diamond$ to $2 \diamond$, reasoning that the supposed $4-3$ heart fit was always an option. Jolly passed this, hoping that his partner had six diamonds.

With so many losers, the only question to be resolved
© J 109
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond$ Q 852
\& A J 865

|  | ¢ J 109 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 852 |  |  |
|  | \& A J 865 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 今 K } 74 \\ & \diamond \text { K Q J } 632 \\ & \diamond \text { K } 7 \\ & \& \text { Q } 3 \end{aligned}$ | $W_{S}{ }^{N}$ |  | A Q 86 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1063 |
|  |  |  | 10942 |
|  | 4 A5 32 |  |  |
|  | ๑A10985 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 94 |  |  |
|  | \& 7 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brescoll | Tebha Kaplan |  | Kriegel |
|  | Pass Pass |  | 10 |
| Pass | 1NT Dble |  | Pass |
| Pass | Redble Pass |  | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass Dble |  | All Pass |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Herman | A. Grossack Jolly | Z. Grossack |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \checkmark$ |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

A mutual case of colour-blindness: South's hand was not without merit, containing two aces and nine major-suit cards, but opening 19 with partner being a passed hand was a losing action at adverse vulnerability.

Kaplan exploited this well by doubling 1NT with good shape and 9 HCP , being also a passed hand. Kriegel/Tebha were on the run, with no making spot available. Eventually they settled for $2 \diamond$, which was also doubled.

The defence was accurate: MK lead. Declarer won and ruffed a heart, but East overruffed and led trumps. After three rounds of trumps, South led another heart, establishing a heart trick, but after the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ return the defenders had seven tricks, USA1 +500 .

At the other table, East-West kept silent, while North, unaware of his partner's weakness, raised to

$3 \diamond$. West led the $\Leftarrow \mathrm{Q}$ against this undoubled contract. Soon the defenders were crossruffing in hearts and clubs, but then East, assuming that declarer had four trumps, crushed his partner $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ with his $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, and a defensive trick was blown. USA2 had to be content with +200 and a loss of another 7 IMPs.


Brescoll-Kaplan's strong-club system was well-suited for this tough deal. $1 \checkmark$ was forcing for one round, maybe with a longer side suit. 14 showed four or more spades and 0-8 points. $2 \diamond$ described a limited red twosuiter, and Kaplan was satisfied with that contract.

After a high-club lead and a spade switch, declarer made an overtrick by playing high hearts from dummy, thus establishing this suit. USA1 +110 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Herman | A. Grossack | Jolly | Z. Grossack |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

In my opinion, East's multi- $2 \diamond$ opening was yet another case of colour blindness (opening such a hand is a legitimate approach at favourable vulnerability), but perhaps he was already dissatisfied with the state of the match and decided to make a move.

As expected, this wild call did not turn out well. West had to bid a game that was doomed from the outset, and he didn't find the best line either, going three down and losing 9 more IMPs in the process.

Then, after some frustrating boards for busy bidders, at last came a deal with game potential:

Board 7 Dealer South Vul All
A 9
© A J 10732
$\diamond$ J 4
\& K J 96
A J 108763
© K 6
$\diamond$ K 3
\&) 853


- K Q 2
$\bigcirc 95$
$\diamond$ A Q 98762
$\& A$
A A 54
© Q 84
$\diamond 105$
\& Q 10742

| West <br> Brescoll | North <br> Tebha | East <br> Kaplan | South <br> Kriegel |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

A simple and efficient auction led to the correct final contract. The defence did its best when South led a heart after winning the $\boldsymbol{A}$, holding declarer to ten tricks. USA1 +620.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Herman | A. Grossack | Jolly | Z. Grossack |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 18 | $2 \diamond$ | 29 |
| 24 | 30 | 3 | All Pass |

Adam Grossack's light opening bid fooled his opponents. Perhaps Jolly had become tired of going down a lot. He was satisfied with a competitive 3a call, but his cards merited a raise to game. Declarer decided to play it safe after a club lead by ruffing clubs, and the defence managed to cut him off from dummy's diamonds, preventing the overtrick, but it didn't matter at all, as USA2 were already booked for a $10-\mathrm{IMP}$ loss.

The rest of the match was not very exciting. USA1 added a few more IMPs, and it ended 66-7 in their favour for a 20-0 whitewash. This strong USA1 team is clearly one of the favourites for the world title along with Poland, Sweden and Norway, even though some of these names may change in the coming days.


## USA VS CHILE

## PHIILLIP ALDER

## Girls Teams，Round 3

As is our wont，let＇s start with a quiz．
1．With only the opponents vulnerable，you hold：

## A <br> 4 ○KQ108653 囚QJ5 <br> de J 9

Your partner shows a balanced 12－14 points．What would you do？Sign off in two hearts，invite game with three hearts，or insist on game with four hearts？

2．The vulnerability is again favourable．Your hand is：
ヘ6432 ○AK6
$\diamond 10$
A 10752

The auction starts like this：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responder | You | Opener <br> Partner |  |
|  |  | $1 ヵ$ | Pass |
| 1NT（a） | Pass | $2 \diamond(\mathrm{~b})$ | Pass |
| Pass | ？？ |  |  |

（a）Forcing
（b）Normally four－plus diamonds but perhaps $5=3=3=2$（doubleton club）and minimum values

Would you do anything but await partner＇s opening lead？

3a．With both sides vulnerable，you have：
かA1094 ○Q72 $\diamond$ AJ8542 \＆－－
The bidding begins thus：

| West <br> Partner | North <br> Intervenor | East <br> You | South <br> Advancer <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $2 \diamond$ |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \uparrow$ |  |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | ？？ |  |

What would you do now？
3b．Partner＇s diamond holding is $\diamond 10-7-6$ ．What is the best play for only one loser in the suit？

4．With neither side vulnerable，you pick up：
か 7654 ○Q2 $\diamond$ J 843 AK 4
The auction starts like this：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Opener | You | Responder | Partner |
| $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | $? ?$ |  |  |

Would you do something positive or just lead the ace of clubs？

5．With only your side vulnerable，you are dealt：
か1062 ○Q754 $\diamond 1042$ Q63
After two passes，lefty opens one notrump，14－16 points；partner doubles for penalty；and righty passes． What would you do？

If you pass，it goes compulsory redouble－－pass－－ pass back to you．Now what？

6．With both sides vulnerable，you hold：
か 976
$\bigcirc$ AK Q J
$\diamond$ K 1083
\＆ 104

The auction is：

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| You | Opener | Partner | Responder |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

What would you lead？


Partscore deals tend not to make great copy, but if your team gets on the right side of a deal at both tables, you can rack up the imps. That happened in this match.

After three boards, USA led 4-2. Then came:
Board 4. Dealer West. Both vul.
AK76
© Q
$\diamond$ K J 10872
\& Q 87

- Q 4
$\diamond$ A 7543
$\diamond 954$
$\&$ AK 10

| N | * 10953 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc$ J 92 |
| S | $\diamond \text { A Q } 63$ |
| ¢ A J 82 |  |
| ๑K1086 |  |
| $\diamond$-- |  |
| \& J 9542 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roman | Wernis | Molina | Lin |
| $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Marriott | Villegas | Hunt | Nacrur |
| $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

That was a very aggressive reopening double by Rebecca Wernis, and although it wasn't clear for Amber Lin to pass, her diamond void did look better for defence than offence.


South's pass must have made North a tad nervous, except that she had that obviously useful trump honour -- which she led at trick one.

When West ducked this trick, North switched to a club. Declarer, Valentina Roman, won South's jack with her king and played a diamond to dummy's queen. South ruffed and returned a club. West won and ruffed her last club in the dummy. Later, she also lost two spades, one heart and one diamond to go one down.
Against two hearts undoubled, Francisca Villegas led the six of spades. North-South played three rounds of the suit, Asya Marriott ruffing the last. This defence had the drawback that it established dummy's nine of spades as a winner. Declarer cashed her clubs and ruffed the ten of clubs in the dummy to reach this position:

|  | A -- |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K J 10872 |  |
|  | \& -- |  |
| A -- | N | ه 9 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 754 |  | $\bigcirc$ J 9 |
| $\diamond 954$ | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 63 |
| \& -- | S | \& -- |
|  | - 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 1086 |  |
|  | $\diamond$-- |  |
|  | \& J 9 |  |

West needed four more tricks. She led the nine of hearts (at double dummy, the only winning play), which was covered by South's ten and won by North's queen.
North returned the ten of diamonds. South ruffed dummy's queen and continued with the king of hearts, taken by the ace. Now declarer should have led another trump and would have made the contract, but she had an unfortunate blind spot and played a diamond to dummy's ace. When South ruffed and returned a club, declarer never scored the nine of spades and had to go one down. Still, USA gained 3 imps .

With only the opponents vulnerable, you hold:
ヘ 4 ○KQ108653 $\diamond$ QJ5 \&J9
Your partner shows a balanced 12-14 points. What would you do? Sign off in two hearts, invite game with three hearts, or insist on game with four hearts?

At imps, I sympathise with blazing into four hearts, but this was the losing view on Board 5, there being four unavoidable losers. The United States stopped in three hearts to gain 5 imps and lead by 12-2.

Board 6 was another partscore triumph for the US.
Dealer East. N-S vul.

- 6432
$\checkmark$ AK 6
$\diamond 10$
\& A 10752


## A J 8

© 1043
$\diamond$ K J 82
d K 963

Finally we got a double-digit swing:
Board 7. Dealer South. Both vul.

- Q J 852
© K J 106
$\diamond$ K 3
\& Q 5

| A K | N | A A 1094 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 84 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 72 |
| $\diamond 1076$ | W E | $\diamond$ AJ 8542 |
| \& A J 10987 | S | \& 0 |
|  | - 763 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 953$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 9 |  |
|  | \& K 6432 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Roman | North <br> Wernis | East <br> Molina | South <br> Lin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \%$ | $1 ヵ$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \wedge$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass |  |  |

(a) Two key cards but no queen of diamonds

Closed Room:

| West <br> Marriott | North <br> Villegas | East <br> Hunt | South <br> Nacrur <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \propto$ | $1 ヵ$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \wedge$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Quite a difference of opinion. Hunt settled for game, whereas Diana Molina plunged into the slam.

Six diamonds is no great bargain. To avoid two trump losers, you should take two finesses, which in isolation will do the necessary just under 70 percent of the time. Here, though, East had to do something with all of her major-suit losers.

Molina gave it a good try. She won the first trick with dummy's king of spades, ruffed a club, ruffed a spade, ruffed a club, ruffed a spade, and ran the ten of diamonds to South's queen.

If South had switched to a heart, the contract would have gone two down, but she returned her second trump. East won, took her jack of diamonds and ace of spades, and played a heart to the ace, but cashing the ace of clubs did not establish the suit, so declarer had to concede a heart loser for one down.

In three notrumps, Hunt received a strange low-club

lead. North won and switched to a spade, of course, but declarer led the ten of diamonds and rose with her ace when North did not cover. A second round set up that suit, and shortly East was claiming nine tricks: two spades, one heart, five diamonds and one club.

Plus 100 and plus 600 gave the United States 12 imps on the board and the lead by $30-2$. But if six diamonds had made, it would have been 13 imps to Chile -- a small matter of 25 imps .

The next deal highlighted one of my hobby horses.
Board 8. Dealer West. None vul.

|  | A 7654 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 843 |  |
|  | \& AK 4 |  |
| A A 92 | N | A 1083 |
| へKJ9543 | $W^{\text {N }}$ E | $\bigcirc$ A 876 |
| $\diamond$ A 5 | W L | $\diamond$ Q 97 |
| -5 5 | S | \& J 103 |
|  | ¢ K Q J |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 1062 |  |
|  | \& Q 9876 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roman | Wernis | Molina | Lin |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Pass | 300 (a) | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

(a) Four hearts, 6-9 points

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Marriott | Villegas | Hunt | Nacrur |
| $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $2 \Omega$ | All Pass |

Board 12 was instructive also.
Dealer West. N-S vul.
A 1062
$\checkmark$ Q 754
$\diamond 1042$
\& Q 63
AK 4
© 10832
$\diamond 96$
\& K 10872


ヘ 8753
© K J 6
$\diamond$ K Q 75
\& $\mathrm{A} J$
A A Q J 9
$\checkmark$ A 9
$\diamond$ A J 83
\& 954
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roman | Wernis | Molina | Lin |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT | Dble |
| Pass | Pass | Redble | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Marriott | Villegas | Hunt | Nacrur |
| Pass | Pass | 1NT | Dble |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

With a flat hand like North's, you just have to pass over partner's double and hope for the best. You have four points more than you might! Two hearts could be ... and is! ... a 4-2 fit. Also, partner might have one notrump defeated in her own hand.

It would not have been too hard to beat one notrump, but it was very hard to make two hearts, both declarers going three down for a flat board.

Players just love to quote the Law of Total Tricks, but there is a big difference between a 4-3-3-3 hand and one with a singleton (or, even better, a void). I agree wholeheartedly with Hunt's raise to two hearts. Molina's forcing to the three-level with that flat hand just cannot be right. Then Roman made matters worse by shooting for game with minimum count and no singleton.

Both declarers took eight tricks to give 5 imps to USA.


Chile finally had a good gain:
Board 13. Dealer North. Both vul.
A AK
© 8764
$\diamond$ A 752
\& Q 32
A 96
$\checkmark$ AK Q J
$\diamond$ K 1083
d 104

| N | A Q J 54 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc$-- |
| S | $\diamond J 64$ |
| 10832 |  |
| 109532 |  |
| Q 9 |  |
| A 8 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roman | Wernis | Molina | Lin |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Dble | All Pass |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Marriott | Villegas | Hunt | Nacrur |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Dble |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 \%$ | All Pass |

Watching on BBO, after Hunt overcalled two clubs, I was expecting Marriott to leap into three notrumps. But then Francisca Nacrur made her brave negative double. Now Marriott only invited, and it was hard for Hunt to


anticipate that three notrumps would be a walk in the park.
Against three clubs, South led the queen of diamonds, which was covered by the king and ace. Now North should have cashed her spade winners, preparing for a ruff when partner was in with her ace of trumps. She erred, though, by immediately returning a diamond. Declarer won with dummy's ten and cashed her four heart winners, discarding all of her spades. Then the ten of clubs was run to South's ace. East ruffed the spade switch, cashed the king of clubs, and claimed an overtrick, conceding only one more trick to North's queen of clubs.

In the Open Room, Roman must have so happy to convert her partner's takeout double into one for penalties.

I expected West to start by cashing her trump winners, then switch to the ten of clubs. This would have resulted in three down. But she led the seven of spades. I will draw a veil over the play, which was inaccurate on both sides. The contract eventually went two down.

Plus 500 and minus 130 gave Chile 9 imps.
On the final board, Villegas judged well, with neither side vulnerable, to sacrifice in five clubs, two down, while her teammates were making four spades.

The final score was 36-14 to USA, or 15.66-4.34 in victory points.

My selection today at the Kids Corner is the fourthround match between England and Sweden. I knew I had made the right choice when I noticed that spectators were three deep at the table, namely, myself, the England Kids Team Coach Michael Bell, and the grandmother of the Swedish pair at the table, Mrs. Elisabeth Lundqvist. Is it a first that a kibitzer's name is mentioned in a Daily Bulletin?

The first four boards were uneventful, although a couple of opportunities for picking up a few imps existed for both sides. Then came:

Board 5. Dealer North. NS vul.
A AK 1076
$\bigcirc 94$
$\diamond 6$
\& 107542

| A 4 | N | ¢ J 95 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ10865 | $53 \mathbf{W}$ ( | $\bigcirc$ A 2 |
| $\diamond$ Q J 5 | $W^{\text {E }}$ | $\diamond 10432$ |
| \& J 9 | S | \& A Q 86 |
|  | ¢ Q 832 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 7 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 987 |  |
|  | \& K 3 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| T.Lundquist | Selby | I.LundquistMadden |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | $3 \wedge$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

Oscar Selby, the English North, had a problem at his second turn to speak. Should he make a negative double? After tanking for a while, he emerged with the bold bid of three spades, which his partner raised to four. The defence started with two rounds of hearts, after which Tiger Lundqvist, the Swedish West player, advanced the nine of clubs. Selby's hopes were raised. Declarer inserted his ten, East covered with the queen, and dummy's king won. Correctly expecting the clubs not to break 3-3, all Selby needed now was to find a way to ruff two clubs in dummy. He came to hand with the ace of spades and played a second round of clubs. East, Isis Lundqvist, put up her ace, crashing her partner's jack, but her club pips were still strong enough to prevent a ruffing finesse. She continued with a diamond, won in dummy. Now

Selby made the mistake of returning to hand with a high spade, after which the contract was unmakable, as the trumps were 3-1. Soon declarer conceded one down and made a little black dot in his score card, which universally means "I know I could have made it, but I was distracted".

This board brought 9 IMPs to Sweden as the English pair in the other room climbed up to five hearts doubled and went two off.

Board 7. Dealer South. All vul.
A Q J 852
© K J 106
$\diamond$ K 3

- Q 5

A K
©A 84
$\diamond 1076$
\& A J 10987


A A 1094
$\bigcirc$ Q 72
$\diamond$ AJ 8542
\& -
4 763
$\bigcirc 953$
$\diamond$ Q 9
\& K 6432

| West <br> T.Lundquist | North <br> Selby | East <br> I.Lundquist | South <br> Madden <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \%$ | Dble | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Isis Lundqvist, Swedish East, probably realized that her two diamonds was an underbid, so she must have been relieved to hear her partner's three-diamond bid, which she hastily raised to five.
South led a spade. The distribution of the red suits was friendly, and the declarer could have made her contract with the loss of a trump and the king of hearts, but she lost her way during the play and went one down.

As the English pair played in three notrumps in the other room and made an overtrick, England gained 12 IMPs from this board.

England won the match 49-18 in IMPs, which converted to $17.19-2.81$ VPs.

## Solutions to the Quiz on page 3

1. With only your side vulnerable, you (South) pick up:

か Q 10865 ๑3 $\diamond$ KQ865 \&86
The auction starts like this:

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 |  | Pass | You |
| $1 \Omega$ | $1 N T$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | $? ?$ |

What would you do now?
Most tournament players use Lebensohl in this situation, in which an immediate bid at the three-level is encouraging or (if a jump) forcing; with a weaker hand that wishes to stop at three clubs or three diamonds, South bids two notrump, asking partner to bid three clubs. There are added nuances, of course, and other variations like Transfer Lebensohl (which is better than regular).
Some other pairs would double to show five or more spades -- "East stole my bid, partner."
Playing in a pro-am, my partner and I had no such agreements. If I had held her hand, I think I would have jumped to three spades, gambling that we could make four spades or three notrump. Here, I would have raised to four spades, which partner surely would have made.
My partner bid two clubs! When it was pointed out that it was insufficient, she corrected to three clubs. (Yes, I know, there are ramifications here, because two clubs would have been conventional -- Stayman -- but three clubs was natural. However, since this was a social event, we did not worry about that.)
I had to take three clubs at face value, but had no clue how strong partner might be. I just bid three notrump and hoped for the best.

| This was the full deal: |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dlr: East | - K 92 |
| Vul: N-S | ¢ AJ 64 |
|  | $\diamond$ A 93 |
|  | ¢ A J 10 |
| - A 3 | N か J 74 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10982$ | w E $<$ Q 75 |
| $\diamond 1074$ | S |
| ¢ K 75 | \& Q 9432 |
|  | - Q 10865 |
|  | $\bigcirc 3$ |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 865 |
|  | ¢ 86 |

Partner passed out three notrump. I had no trouble getting home, especially after East led the queen of hearts rather than the five of hearts.
2. With only the opponents vulnerable, you hold:

$$
9754 \text { ऽK5 } \leqslant \mathrm{AQ} 1098 \& \mathrm{~A} 2
$$

The bidding starts:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Partner |  | You |
|  | 10 | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2 | 30 | 3 | ?? |

Do you agree with your pass? If not, what would you have done differently? What would you do now?

You passed because you hoped partner would reopen with a takeout double, when you would have passed again, going for a juicy penalty.
The snag with this plan is primarily that two diamonds is passed out. Then you will get a penalty in 100s when you are surely making game, presumably three notrump.
However, I agree that that is not likely, so passing is feasible. The alternatives are a negative double (to show your spades) and three notrump. I much prefer the latter.
After you passed, the auction took a surprising path. Clearly, partner has long hearts and very short spades, probably a void. I think it is eminently sensible to jump to six hearts; bidding anything less is not right.
If partner would read four notrump as (Roman Key Card) Blackwood, that would be feasible too.
If partner is void in spades, you could well have a grand slam. But do you know how to show a void in answer to four notrump?
The Bridge Encyclopedia has six methods, and in England I employed a seventh. However, the "Standard" method is to reply five notrump with two aces and a void; to jump to six of a longer-ranking suit with one ace and a void in that suit; or to jump to six of the trump suit with a higherranking void and one ace.

So, here, if partner jumps to six hearts, showing a spade void and one ace, it would be reasonable for you to bid seven hearts.

But I can understand if you are happy with a small slam.
3. Your side is vulnerable. Your hand is:

$$
\text { A -- } \diamond \text { A } 74 \diamond \text { Q } 9863 \text { \& Q } 1074
$$

The bidding goes unexpectedly:

| West | North <br> Partner | East | South <br> You |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | ?? |

Do you agree with your pass over four hearts? If not, what would you have done? What would you do now?

Most experts would pass over four hearts, giving partner some leeway since he was bidding under pressure. But if you did move, it would be correct to control-bid four spades.

Now, though, you have an opportunity to punish West for not bidding four spades immediately. The simplest answer is to control-bid five spades, suggesting a grand slam. It is not inconceivable that partner holds something like:

## - 85 ○KQJ632 $\diamond \mathrm{AK} 74$ \& 3

You could even bid five notrump if partner would read that as a Grand Slam Force in diamonds, asking him to bid seven with two of the top three diamond honors. If he does and turns out to hold only something like $\circlearrowleft$ Q-J-10-$6-3-2$, there is a good chance that the heart finesse will work.
© www.bridgeforeveryone.com


## RESULTS - JUNIOR TEAMS

| $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{9} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | HONG KONG | ENGLAND | 29 | 26 | 10.97 | 9.03 | RANKING <br> AFTER ROUND 7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 | HUNGARY | EGYPT | 27 | 12 | 14.19 | 5.81 |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | FINLAND | JAPAN | 50 | 3 | 19.18 | 0.82 |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | USA1 | BANGLADESH | 39 | 13 | 16.38 | 3.62 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RANKING } \\ & \text { AFTER ROUND } 7 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | 5 | CANADA | USA2 | 34 | 21 | 13.72 | 6.28 |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | FRANCE | GERMANY | 64 | 19 | 18.98 | 1.02 |  |  |  |
|  | 7 | ARGENTINA | CHINA | 16 | 19 | 9.03 | 10.97 |  |  |  |
|  | 8 | AUSTRALIA | NETHERLANDS | 8 | 19 | 6.77 | 13.23 | 1 | NORWAY | 110.28 |
|  | 9 | SWEDEN | POLAND | 27 | 43 | 5.58 | 14.42 | 2 | USA1 | 110.02 |
|  | 10 | COLOMBIA | NORWAY | 9 | 53 | 1.13 | 18.87 | 3 | POLAND | 107.32 |
|  | 11 | ITALY | SINGAPORE | 25 | 25 | 10.00 | 10.00 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SWEDEN | 100.98 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 1 | CANADA | USA1 | 20 | 74 | 0.17 | 19.83 | 5 | SINGAPORE | 91.64 |
|  | 2 | FRANCE | ITALY | 35 | 49 | 6.04 | 13.96 | 6 | NETHERLANDS | 89.25 |
|  | 3 | ARGENTINA | HUNGARY | 52 | 18 | 17.63 | 2.37 | 7 | ITALY | 86.98 |
|  | 4 | AUSTRALIA | HONG KONG | 56 | 11 | 18.98 | 1.02 |  |  |  |
|  | 5 | SWEDEN | ENGLAND | 50 | 9 | 18.53 | 1.47 |  | CHINA | 85.65 |
|  | 6 | FINLAND | CHINA | 16 | 43 | 3.45 | 16.55 | 9 | ARGENTINA | 80.67 |
|  | 7 | JAPAN | SINGAPORE | 27 | 24 | 10.97 | 9.03 | 10 | FRANCE | 79.79 |
|  | 8 | NORWAY | BANGLADESH | 60 | 16 | 18.87 | 1.13 |  |  |  |
|  | 9 | POLAND | USA2 | 63 | 16 | 19.18 | 0.82 | 11 | HONG KONG | 78.97 |
|  | 10 | NETHERLANDS | GERMANY | 38 | 19 | 15.06 | 4.94 | 12 | AUSTRALIA | 72.78 |
|  | 11 | COLOMBIA | EGYPT | 13 | 32 | 4.94 | 15.06 | 13 | FINLAND | 57.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | JAPAN | 57.17 |
| N | 1 | CHINA | NETHERLANDS | 35 | 27 | 12.44 | 7.56 | 15 |  |  |
|  | 2 | GERMANY | POLAND | 3 | 53 | 0.53 | 19.47 |  | ENGLAND | 52.93 |
|  | 3 | USA2 | NORWAY | 24 | 57 | 2.51 | 17.49 | 16 | HUNGARY | 48.91 |
|  | 4 | BANGLADESH | JAPAN | 45 | 28 | 14.64 | 5.36 | 1 | CANADA | 47.03 |
|  | 5 | SINGAPORE | COLOMBIA | 59 | 21 | 18.17 | 1.83 |  | BANGLADESH | 45.23 |
|  | 6 | EGYPT | SWEDEN | 23 | 40 | 0.36 | $\begin{array}{r}14.64 \\ 2.96 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 18 | USA2 | 42.05 |
|  | 8 | USA1 | FINLAND | 43 58 | 13 | 17.04 | 2.96 1.47 | 20 | EGYP | 34.04 |
|  | 9 | HUNGARY | FRANCE | 27 | 28 | 9.67 | 10.33 |  |  | 34.04 |
|  | 10 | ITALY | CANADA | 33 | 26 | 12.16 | 7.84 | 21 | COLOMBIA | 25.97 |
|  | 11 | ENGLAND | AUSTRALIA | 27 | 25 | 10.66 | 9.34 | 22 | GERMANY | 21.96 |

## RESULTS - GIRLS TEAMS

| $\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ & \frac{9}{2} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 31 | SINGAPORE | CHINA | 13 | 47 | 2.37 | 17.63 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 32 | ITALY | NETHERLANDS | 9 | 68 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
|  | 33 | USA | CHILE | 36 | 14 | 15.66 | 4.34 |
|  | 34 | HUNGARY | POLAND | 6 | 38 | 2.66 | 17.34 |
|  | 35 | FRANCE | AUSTRALIA | 29 | 47 | 5.15 | 14.85 |
|  | 36 | INDONESIA | NORWAY | 11 | 36 | 3.79 | 16.21 |
|  | 37 | CHINESE TAIPEI | Bye | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.00 |
| $\text { ROUND } 4$ | 31 | CHINESE TAIPEI | USA | 25 | 70 | 1.02 | 18.98 |
|  | 32 | HUNGARY | ITALY | 11 | 42 | 2.81 | 17.19 |
|  | 33 | FRANCE | SINGAPORE | 27 | 44 | 5.36 | 14.64 |
|  | 34 | NORWAY | CHINA | 20 | 36 | 5.58 | 14.42 |
|  | 35 | AUSTRALIA | NETHERLANDS | 31 | 45 | 6.04 | 13.96 |
|  | 36 | POLAND | CHILE | 40 | 46 | 8.13 | 11.87 |
|  | 37 | INDONESIA | Bye | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.00 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 10 \\ 2 \\ 2 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 31 | CHINESE TAIPEI | HUNGARY | 36 | 20 | 13.92 | 5.08 |
|  | 32 | FRANCE | USA | 20 | 82 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
|  | 33 | INDONESIA | ITALY | 16 | 3 | 13.72 | 6.28 |
|  | 34 | NORWAY | SINGAPORE | 46 | 27 | 15.06 | 4.94 |
|  | 35 | POLAND | CHINA | 21 | 51 | 2.96 | 17.04 |
|  | 36 | CHILE | NETHERLANDS | 31 | 55 | 3.97 | 16.03 |
|  | 37 | AUSTRALIA | Bye | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0.00 |

RANKING
AFTER ROUND 5

| 1 | CHINA | 85.42 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | NETHERLANDS | 74.96 |
| 3 | USA | 71.01 |
| 4 | NORWAY | 66.90 |
| 5 | INDONESIA | 52.64 |
| 6 | AUSTRALIA | 52.58 |
| 7 | CHILE | 45.42 |
| 8 | POLAND | 41.89 |
| 9 | SINGAPORE | 39.99 |
| 10 | ITALY | 36.46 |
| 11 | FRANCE | 33.61 |
| 12 | CHINESE TAIPEI 31.56 |  |
| 13 | HUNGARY | 26.56 |


@WorldBridgeFed

## RESULTS - YOUNGSTERS TEAMS



RESULTS - KIDS TEAMS

|  | 41 | INDONESIA | CHINA2 | 9 | 73 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 42 | CANADA | ISRAEL | 12 | 36 | 3.97 | 16.03 |
|  | 43 | ENGLAND | SWEDEN | 49 | 18 | 17.19 | 2.81 |
|  | 44 | CZECH REPUBLIC | ITALY | 25 | 23 | 10.66 | 9.34 |
|  | 45 | FRANCE | POLAND | 22 | 10 | 13.48 | 6.52 |
|  | 46 | HUNGARY | CHINA1 | 2 | 131 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
|  | 47 | NETHERLANDS | USA | 25 | 39 | 6.04 | 13.96 |
| $1{ }^{1}$ | 41 | INDONESIA | CANADA | 17 | 45 | 3.28 | 16.72 |
|  | 42 | ENGLAND | CHINA2 | 16 | 71 | 0.09 | 19.91 |
|  | 43 | CZECH REPUBLIC | ISRAEL | 7 | 23 | 5.58 | 14.42 |
|  | 44 | FRANCE | SWEDEN | 52 | 19 | 17.49 | 2.51 |
|  | 45 | HUNGARY | ITALY | 12 | 88 | 0.00 | 20.00 |
|  | 46 | NETHERLANDS | POLAND | 24 | 48 | 3.47 | 15.53 |
|  | 47 | USA | CHINA1 | 36 | 35 | 10.33 | 9.67 |
| $\text { ROUND } 6$ | 41 | INDONESIA | ISRAEL | 29 | 72 | 1.24 | 18.76 |
|  | 42 | CHINA2 | SWEDEN | 47 | 39 | 12.44 | 7.56 |
|  | 43 | CANADA | ITALY | 65 | 26 | 18.29 | 1.71 |
|  | 44 | ENGLAND | POLAND | 29 | 44 | 5.81 | 14.19 |
|  | 45 | CZECH REPUBLIC | CHINA1 | 25 | 55 | 2.96 | 17.04 |
|  | 46 | FRANCE | USA | 29 | 8 | 15.46 | 4.54 |
|  | 47 | HUNGARY | NETHERLANDS | 13 | 76 | 0.00 | 20.00 |

RANKING AFTER ROUND 6

| 1 | CHINA2 | 96.92 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 2 | FRANCE | 96.77 |
| 3 | CHINA1 | 91.07 |
| 4 | POLAND | 83.25 |
| 5 | ISRAEL | 78.23 |
| 6 | ENGLAND | 65.03 |
| 7 | USA | 62.21 |
| 8 | NETHERLANDS | 59.20 |
| 9 | CANADA | 46.27 |
| 10 | CZECH REPUBLIC45.65 |  |
| 11 | ITALY | 42.83 |
| 12 | SWEDEN | 37.71 |
| 13 | INDONESIA | 27.66 |
| 14 | HUNGARY | 6.20 |

We are taking photos of all the Teams!
If you haven't had your Team's picture taken yet, come to the Bulletin Room (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ floor,
first door on your right) and set your meeting with the Photographer!

$8^{\text {th }}$ European Open Championships


Móntecatini Terme，Italy

