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## Introduction



In 2022 the World Bridge Federation returned to Wrocław, which hosted the 2016 World Bridge Games. Under the honorary patronage of the President of the Republic of Poland, Andrzej Duda, the city again proved to be a magnificent setting for one of the major championships, this time the World Bridge Series.

The playing conditions were faultless and acknowledged the continuing battle against Covid-19 and its variants, the WBF again deciding against the provision of VuGraph. Given that the WBF had successfully staged the World Youth Transnational Championships which ended only 5 days before the start of the World Bridge Series one can safely say that 2022 represented one of the best years in its history.

This book could not have been produced without the help of a huge number of people. They include the contributors to the Daily Bulletin and the team of writers, David Bird, Brian Senior, Barry Rigal, Maurizio di Sacco and Ron Tacchi. Ron greatly simplified everyone's task by delivering within a couple of days of the end of the event various vital pieces of software that saved everyone a huge amount of time. Claudio Fossati was the photographer responsible for the magnificent pictures that adorn these pages. Countless players and officials were contacted in search of information, including Andrew Black, Anna Gudge, Sally Brock, Guy Mendes de Leon, Juan Carlos Ventin, Anna Sarniak, Zia Mahmood, Geoff Hampson, Christina Lund Madsen, Marion Michielsen, Marina Madia, Katherine Bertheau and Bas Drijver. Marc van Beijsterveldt was the incredibly brilliant chief proofreader, ably assisted by Monika Kümmel. I cannot thank them all enough.

# Women's Pairs by Barry Rigal 

My thanks to Herman De wael for helping with the initial reporting, and to my usual team of proof-readers.

The size of the women's field has been declining as the mixed field increases. This year was no exception. The initial qualifying round started when the McConnell qualifying tournament ended. Our coverage starts at the point where the A and B semi-finals begin. It would see 12 of the 16 pairs (which included drop-ins from the women's Teams Final) advance from the A semi-final, augmented by two from the 13 -strong B semi-final, to create a 14 -pair final.

The first deal of the set seemed to be about limiting the damage in a heart partscore.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.
A J 10642
-K7

- 1084
* A J 7


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brock | Dhondy | Smederevac | Nettleton |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ | Pass | 1NT |
| $2 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}$ |  |  |  |

Jovanka (Jovi) Smederevac stayed silent at her second turn but could not keep Sally Brock out. Heather Dhondy led the $\boldsymbol{A} \mathbf{J}$ after some thought (a low spade is certainly a palatable alternative) to South's king and Brock did not unblock the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathrm{Q}$. Back came a club. The defenders cashed three rounds ending in South - at which point the 13th club leaves the defence very nicely placed. In fact, though, Diana Nettleton shifted to the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, perhaps not envisaging her partner with a top heart; Brock won the ace and
continued with the 10 , trying to pin the nine. (Would South really have shifted to a high heart from KQ43?). Dhondy won and exited with a spade. Brock hopped up with the ace, crashing her $\uparrow Q$, finessed in diamonds and gave South her $\vee 9$ for down one and 4-10 MP.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kandolu | Inal | Elmas | Babaç |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| $\mathbf{1 v}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{2 \sim}$ | All Pass |  |  |

Gaye İnal decided not to overcall and heard the spades mentioned behind her. She selected the 4 as her lead. Özlem Kandolu took the $\quad J$, cashed the A, played a spade to the table and ran the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. North won her $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and played another spade and South won her king and played her $\leqslant$ K. Declarer ruffed, played the $\vee$ A (discarding a diamond), and the $\vee 10$, which South took to cash another heart. South now attacked clubs, letting the defenders cash out that suit for two down, 11-3.

On the second deal, at pretty much every table, South would have been faced with the problem of whether to cash out an ace-king against 3NT or try for more, a 2 NT opener by West having been raised to three.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

| A A Q J 3 <br> -AKQ <br> - A 6 <br> \& 7632 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ↔ } 8654 \\ & \bullet 10986 \\ & * 83 \\ & \& 108 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $w_{s}^{N} E$ | A K 2 <br> $\bullet 72$ <br> - Q J 1095 <br> \& Q J 94 |
|  | ヘ 1097 <br> - J43 <br> - K 742 <br> \& AK 5 |  |

The $\Upsilon 10$ lead went to declarer's king. Ace and another diamond saw partner following to show count. With declarer having shown 20 HCP , dummy having a nine-count,
and you holding an 11-count, there was a cast-iron case for taking your tricks before something bad happened. If you failed to cash those winners, the rats got at them, and declarer took all but one of the remaining tricks, instead of all but two...For the record, only two of the eight tables cashed out. Sophia Bałdysz and Dilek Yavaş each defended accurately here.

On the next deal Brock heard the auction proceed $(1 \diamond)$-Pass-(1 © )-2 -(Pass) at favourable vulnerability back to her. She sportingly raised to $3 \square$ with a 3-3-2-5 six-count consisting of $\& K Q J$. Right she was! Dhondy now had to guess whether to bid 4 or $5 \star$, and got it wrong by bidding game. Had Brock passed, Dhondy's 4 call would have got her side to the right spot. To add insult to injury, Smederevac doubled, and -100 was somewhat surprisingly worth only $6-8$ - one pair sold out to $3 \downarrow$ for -140 and no one stopped in $4 \star$.

At the end of the first session Sandra Kolen/Carla Arnolds were comfortably in the lead. I watched them over the next three deals, where some interesting opportunities presented themselves both on play and defence.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.


Kolen took the $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ in hand, and correctly diagnosed to go after clubs not diamonds. She tried the \& 10 , West ducking impassively, and let it run. When that lost to the ace, she was well-placed already. Back came the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 7$, and when Kolen won this in hand it occurred to me that leading the $\$$ and letting it run if her LHO didn't put up the king was at least a plausible play. After all, an intra-finesse will get you in the bulletin whether it works
or not. Kolen actually played A and the $>7$ to the ten and queen. When a spade came back, she won the ace, and tried a diamond to the nine, leaving herself a re-entry to hand. That ensured her of nine tricks; when West carelessly let go a spade on the third diamond, declarer suddenly had 10 tricks. That was worth all 14 MP while +600 would have been 10 MPs.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yavas | Inal | Özgür | Babaç |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 2NT* | Pass | 3\&* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

2NT Puppet
3\% No 5-card major
Mine Babaç got the same $\vee \mathrm{J}$ lead, as indeed did all eight declarers, but took the ace in dummy. She did begin with a diamond to the ace and to the queen. That meant the contract ended up one down, when declarer lost four tricks in the minors and a long card in hearts. Presumably all four declarers who went down played on the wrong suit at trick two?

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

| A Q 74 <br> - Q 86 <br> - 8 <br> \& A Q 8653 | A AK 5 <br> - KJ532 <br> - J 43 <br> \& J 9 |  | A 1092 <br> - A 10 <br> -K 9652 <br> \& 1072 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | E |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & 4 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West | North | East | t South |
| Kandolu | Arnolds | Elmas | as Kolen |
| - | $1 \checkmark$ | Pass | 2NT* |
| 3\% | Pass | Pass | S 3V |
| Pass | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All P | Pass |

2NT Limit+, $3+\boldsymbol{}$ -
Arnolds correctly determined that her side had more than half the deck, and expected that $3 \boldsymbol{w}$ would have been

making (as it would probably have done). The double was certainly reasonable to try and protect her expected +140 . Now all she had to do was beat it.

She led a top spade and received discouragement, and now I think there is certainly a case for playing three rounds of spades, and not getting active. The heart shift at trick two was fatal. Declarer could arrange a heart ruff in dummy, trumps behaved in incredibly friendly fashion, and that was +510 and all the MP for EW. +100 would have been a dead average - there were three pairs making +140 and two other pairs doubling $4 \%$ but beating it.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yavas | inal | Özgür | Babac |
| - | $1 \downarrow$ | Pass | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ |
| $2 \propto$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ | $3 \downarrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The defence cashed two club tricks and prepared the diamond ruff, which materialized after the trump ace. The spade loser went on the diamond. Just made and 12-2.

There is always some piquancy to watch teammates or compatriots play against one another. Over the next three deals I saw McCallum/Baker take on one of their teammates with whom they had played in the McConnell. On the first hand Baker brought home 3NT with $\vee \mathrm{J} 4$ facing $\vee$ Q5 even though the opponents led the suit. (The opening lead was the $\vee 10$, which Brock allowed to run to the queen - and yes, the defender in third seat with $\checkmark$ A863 didn't seem to have much reason to duck, since declarer had denied more than three cards in this suit). Moving on to stuff more suitable for display where readers are known to have sensitive stomachs:

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \wedge K \\ & \bullet 72 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | - Q J 8532 |  |  |
|  | \& A Q 63 |  |  |
| A A 7543 | N | A 10862 |  |
| - AJ 64 | $\mathbf{W}$ | - 1093 |  |
| - K |  | E 10 | 976 |
| \& 1074 |  | +95 |  |
|  | A Q J 9 |  |  |
|  | - K Q 85 |  |  |
|  | - A 4 |  |  |
|  | \% K J 82 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Eythorsdottir | Smederevac | Seamon-Molson | Brock |
| $1 \uparrow$ | 2 * | Pass | 2A* |
| Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Janice Seamon-Molson was unable systemically to make a pre-emptive raise in spades, so stayed silent. Brock declared 3 NT and won the heart lead in hand then thoughtfully played the $\quad$ A and was charmed with the result. Now she played a spade up. Eythorsdottir ducked, so Brock came to hand with the $\AA \mathrm{K}$ and led another top spade. Eythorsdottir won the A A as dummy pitched a heart, and, not knowing if the diamonds or spades were running for declarer, took her $\downarrow$ A. That meant declarer had +660 . I suppose this is the flip side of board two, where the failure to cash out cost a lot of matchpoints. I'm sure someone could explain why West should get it right, but if East's signal at trick two is Smith not count (and why would it be count?) I do not see how West is supposed to work this out. Of the five times 3 NT was played, only one pair held it to ten tricks. That was here:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yavas | Elmas | Özgür | Kandolu |
| $1 \uparrow$ | 2 , | 34* | 3NT |
| $4 \uparrow$ | Dble* | Pass | 4NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Yavaş's lead of the 4 did not cost. Özlem Kandolu was able to overcome the 4-1 split of the diamonds by starting with the ace. But since declarer had to expend a tempo to set up diamonds, she made only ten tricks.

On the last round of the stanza, I watched Cathy and Sophia Bałdysz take on Babaç and İnal. On the second deal Cathy had $\%$ Q1043 facing $\$ 92$ and the only point
of the deal after trick one was how to score a trick in this suit. (The opponents could not be sure this was so.) She led the $\$ 9$ from hand. Her LHO went up with the ace and shifted to a suit declarer could win in hand. Now should you stick with your original plan of playing for the jack onside or are diverted by LHO's decision to fly up with the \&A into playing for the \&AK onside. Be careful! If you go up with the queen and are wrong your LHO will 'own' you. If you lead to the $\$ 10$ and are wrong, you were never going to get the suit right anyway.

So thought Cathy - but indeed her LHO had \&AK without the \& J.

On the last board of the stanza Sophia Bałdysz had decisions in the bidding and play.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | A K Q 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ K Q 6 |  |  |
|  | - A 102 |  |  |
|  | * A Q J 5 |  |  |
| A A J 1093 | N A |  | A 864 |
| - J 94 |  |  |  |
| -K94 | S |  | J 8765 |
| \& K 9 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\bullet 108732$ |  |  |
|  | - 3 |  |  |
|  | \& 108763 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Babaç | C Batdysz | İnal | S Batdysz |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 14 | Dble | 2v* | Pass |
| 24 | 2NT | Pass | $3 * *$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pas |  |

2v Spade raise
3- Transfer
South did not hold back in the auction, on a sequence where partner rated at most to have a jack - and was not that likely to have even that. Babaç's choice of a low diamond rather than the $\downarrow \mathrm{Q}$ certainly fooled İnal, who put in the nine (admittedly, though, this did not cost a trick). Sophia won her 10 , ruffed a diamond, and led a heart to the king and ace. Back came a third diamond. Sophia pitched a spade and won her $A$, cashed the $\checkmark$ Q, and gave up a spade. With the club finesse working, declarer had her 10 tricks and a 12-2 split of the MP.

Time to try to get to see a few new faces for the second set. First up was Malene Christensen and Esther Visser against Dilek and Hatice Özgür. Honours were even off the first two deals, the Dutch pushing to a thin but playable game, down when although the other cards cooperated, they had an inevitable loser in trumps with Jxxx facing AK10x. On the second board they got back to average on the round, when Özgür was faced with an opening lead problem:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Christensen | Özgür | Visser | Yavas |
| - | Pass | 1\% | Pass |
| 2** | Pass | 2** | Pass |
| 2v* | Pass | 2A | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| 2\% *, GF |  |  |  |
| 2. Temporisi |  |  |  |
| 2 Stopper |  |  |  |
| Holding: | A AK 4 |  |  |
|  | - 8876 |  |  |
|  | -864 |  |  |
|  | \% 987 |  |  |

It wasn't clear whether $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ showed or asked so one could argue for leading the $\boldsymbol{A}$ A to have a look at dummy. The big winner would have been a small spade, since dummy had $A$ Q10xx and each of the minors was running. A heart lead lets through 12 tricks, a top spade would doubtless hold declarer to 10 tricks if you defended accurately thereafter. On the club lead found at the table, one of the defenders' three top tricks got away. +460 was worth 9-5 for declarer, +430 was only 3-11.


Cathy Bałdysz

The third board of the round certainly provided an interesting bidding decision:

| Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Q 106 |  |  |  |
| - A 872 |  |  |  |
| - A 63 |  |  |  |
| \& Q 96 |  |  |  |
| A A98532 | N |  | A J |
| $\checkmark 95$ | W E |  | $\checkmark 4$ |
| -975 |  |  | -K Q 1082 |
| +42 | 5 |  | \& J 108753 |
|  | A K 74 |  |  |
|  | 『 K Q J 1063 |  |  |
|  | - J 4 |  |  |
|  | \& $\mathrm{A} K$ |  |  |
| West | North | East | t South |
| Christensen | Özgür | Visser | $r$ Yavas |
| - | - | 3* | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

I admire Yavaş' 3NT call. They make you guess, you make them guess. Maybe Visser might have contemplated balancing into $4 \star$, but that would have been truly unilateral...of course an initial pass or even a weak 2 - if there is anyone left who plays one - might have done better. Against 3NT, the low spade lead to the ten, jack and king saw declarer take a few hearts, then lead a spade towards the $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ for the 12 th trick. +690 was a clear top. For the record, few found the spade ruff against $4 \vee$ to hold it to +650 .

I took a few moments to watch some play from Semi-final B and timed it well to encounter a fine point of defence found by Eva Caplan.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
A AJ 98643
$\checkmark$ A J

- 7
\& J 75


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thomson | U. Staniszewska Caplan | A. Staniszewska |  |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ | Dble | Rdbl |
| 2 | $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | Pass |
| 3 | $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ | All Pass |  |

Urszula Staniszewska might have jumped to $3 \boldsymbol{A}$ at her second turn if that showed extras rather than high cards, but she ended in a sensible spot. The defenders led a top diamond and shifted to a trump. Declarer won in hand and played $\vee$ A and another. Jenny Thomson took this and accurately shifted to a club, on which Caplan deviously contributed the king. Now it looked logical for South to lead a club towards the jack, but that play held her to nine tricks and 1 MP out of 10 instead of 4 . Had Caplan played the $\% \mathrm{Q}$ instead of the king, no doubt declarer might have ducked, then played for the club/heart squeeze on her LHO.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Urszula had won the battle by getting into the auction with sketchy values. Now the key was whether she could take all the tricks available. Thomson overtook the club king lead to shift to a trump; 10, 2, Q and A. Now came A A and a ruff, club ruff, $\boldsymbol{\wedge} Q$ covered and ruffed and another club ruff. Worried perhaps by a possible 4-1 trump break declarer cashed the fourth spade and without taking the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ led a diamond up. Caplan took her chance. She rose with the $\checkmark$ A and led her last club for her partner to ruff with $\vee 8$, promoting an extra trump trick. That was good enough to get back to average on the deal instead of 1-9 for -170 .

|  | A A Q 986 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bullet 76$ |  |  |
|  | -42 |  |  |
|  | \& 9642 |  |  |
| A K J 1052 | N ${ }^{\text {A }}$ |  | A 4 |
| - AK 43 | W E |  | 109 |
| - A - KQJ10863 |  |  |
| * K Q 8 |  |  | S \& 3 |  |  |
| A 73 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 852$ |  |  |  |
| -975 |  |  |  |
| \& A J 1075 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sarniak | Eythorsdottir | Kazmucha | Seamon-Molson |
| 1\%* | 14 | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | $3 \wedge$ | Pass |
| 4 * | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

1\% Polish; 12-14, or clubs $15+$, or any 18+
A nice, controlled auction, but it persuaded Eythorsdottir to lead the A A , then to shift to a club on seeing dummy. Cashing out was worth $10-14$ for the defenders. No fewer than two declarers brought home 6 NT here as West. Leaders Arnolds/Kolen and Baker/McCallum played 6NT on a club lead and the defenders did not find the spade shift.

After three sessions of the semi-final it was Sobolewska/Brewiak and Pyykko/Johannson who came back through the repechage to join the top 12 pairs from the A final to play a double round-robin of 52 deals in the Final.

A 1064
$\bullet 97$

- AJ 8754
\& 102
A AKJ 82
- K 103
- Q 109
\& J 3

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Smykalla | Eggeling | Vecchiato | Bell |
| - | - | $1 \&$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | 2 | $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brock | Dhondy | Smederavac | Nettleton |
| - | - | $1 \&$ | Dble |
| 1ヵ | 2 | $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

At both our tables, after a diamond lead the defenders cashed the first seven tricks. (It was a good job I was not on lead as North; sitting behind Marie Eggeling, I was wondering if a spade might have been right.) Unlucky or ill judged by West? The same thing happened at four of the seven tables and scored 9 MP for NS and 3 for EW.

I suppose Sally Brock might have explored with 3 over $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$, hoping partner would (as here) temporize with $3 \vee$ so that 3NT would express doubt. Then again, 3NT is the only making game a fair amount of the time partner has a doubleton diamond. And even here, 3NT makes 10 tricks when the $\boldsymbol{J}$ or AK are well placed. It might even be with the odds?
(If South starts with a $1 \vee$ overcall, that really doesn't make it any easier, does it? However, it did result in two Easts declaring 3NT, in one case on a spade lead for 11 tricks, the other on a heart lead for 13 tricks. Only Pyykko/Johansson bid the EW cards to 5\%.)

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


Would you as West have jumped to 3NT over partner's vulnerable overcall? Put me in the 'Yes' camp. Ylva Pyykko took a more restrained route and Özgür led a top diamond against 2 NT and shifted to a spade on receiving a discouraging signal. Declarer won and advanced the Q, taken by North for a belated club shift. Declarer won and dislodged the $\boldsymbol{A} \mathrm{A}$ and had nine tricks and 10-2 for declarer.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nettleton | Eggeling | Dhondy | Bell |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| 1 | 1 | $2 \boldsymbol{~ P a s s ~}$ |  |
| 2 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

The opening bid from West saved Eggeling from herself. There was little temptation to lead anything but a heart, with all those side entries as a way to establish the suit. Eggeling continued the suit, logically enough after getting in with the A. She ended up with two more heart tricks of her own and the contract was two down for a 10-2 split. Since game is no worse than the club break, maybe EW were just a little unlucky. Still, if you open aceless 11 counts with no defensive tricks, my cynical take is that you DESERVE to be unlucky.

## Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

A 642

- K 109
- Q J 103
\& K 92
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { A K Q J } 83 \\ \bullet & 3 \\ \bullet & \text { AK } 8765 \\ \& & 5\end{array}$


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nettleton | McCallum | Dhondy | Baker |
| - | Pass | $1 \%$ | Pass |
| 1 | Pass | 10 | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1 NT | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ | Pass | 3A | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $7 \boldsymbol{A}$ | All Pass |  |  |

A thoughtful 3A call by Dhondy. Seated behind Karen McCallum I could see a good reason for not leading a spade. If partner had e.g., A Jx you didn't want to lead a trump, because you needed partner to retain their high trump to overruff dummy. After much internal cogitation McCallum did lead a trump to the 10 and jack. Diana Nettleton played a top diamond then ruffed a diamond, and now needed trumps 3-2 to survive, since she had to ruff two hearts to hand. After the trump lead has neutralized the $\boldsymbol{A} 10$, Dhondy pointed out to me later that a slight improvement would be to cash the AK - if someone ruffs in, you were doomed. Then you ruff a diamond with A 9 , and now if the diamonds break you simply draw trumps, if not revert to plan B of the trump break.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C. Batdysz | Özgür | S. Batdysz | Yavas |
| - | Pass | $1 \star * *$ | Pass |
| $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{*} *$ | Pass |
| $2 *$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Pass |
| 3^ | Pass | $4 *$ | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | $5 *$ | Pass |
| 7 | All Pass |  |  |

## 1\% Polish

2* 5\%, 15+
2. GF any 10+

4 $0-1$
$5 \quad 0 / 3$ of 5
Hatice Özgür also led a trump and Cathy Bałdysz crossruffed some hearts and diamonds before claiming 13 tricks. 10-2 for the declaring side. Three grand slams, one small slam, two games, and 6 NT one down is the sorry record of failure here.


Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
AK 986
-K Q J 7

- AQ 72
\& 10
A A Q 104
- A 1042
- K 96
\& K 3

| N | A 753 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 83$ |
| 5 | - 53 |
|  | ¢ A Q J 9 8 2 |
| A J 2 |  |
| $\checkmark 965$ |  |
| - J 1084 |  |
| \& 7654 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nettleton | McCallum | Dhondy | Baker |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 *$ | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3\& | Dble | Rdbl | $3 \downarrow$ |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

2. Majors<br>2NT Clubs

Nettleton ducked the first two top hearts and Karen McCallum shifted accurately to her singleton club. Alas for her, the fact that it was the ten allowed Nettleton to win the ace, unblocking the king; a thoughtful play. She next led a spade to the ten. When the king appeared, declarer claimed her nine tricks. Had the spade lost to the jack, North would have been endplayed at once, so long as she had started with the singleton club that the auction suggested.
(Incidentally, I think you can make a decent case, if North has a singleton small club instead of the 10 , for winning that club in hand and advancing the $A Q$, knowing North has the $\boldsymbol{A} K$. That achieves the same endplay. If instead you run the clubs first, you are likely to squeeze your own hand or at the very least have to decipher a complex ending.)

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C. Batdysz | Özoür | S. Batdysz <br> Yavas |  |
| - | - | Pass | Pass |
| 1NT | Dble* | $2 \mathbf{A}^{*}$ | Pass |
| 3** | All Pass |  |  |

## Dble 4M, 4+m

2A Transfer
3\% Not maximum with 3

Here too the fact that the spade jack was onside meant declarer had a safe route to nine tricks. But +110 was 2-10 for declarer, while +600 was $10-2$ the other way.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

| A A 1092 <br> - 63 <br> - J 984 <br> \& K 85 | A J 86 <br> - K Q 102 <br> - AK Q 107 <br> $\stackrel{2}{4}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $w_{S}^{N} E$ | A K 5 <br> - J 9754 <br> - 653 <br> \& A J 6 |  |
|  | $$ |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brewiak | Kazmucha | Sobolewska | Sarniak |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | 3\% | All Pass |  |

## 2NT Puppet to 3\%

Danuta Kazmucha showed a non-forcing reverse with extras (because of the implications of not having opened a Polish Club). Anna Sarniak's 2NT call puppeted 3\&; but with a singleton club wouldn't a 3 break be a


Ewa Sobolewska
possibility here for North...you really do not want to play $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ under just about any circumstances; in fact, maybe passing 2 NT is right if you deem partner to be weak here? Be that as it may, Kazmucha completed the transfer in disciplined fashion. Ewa Sobolewska found the incisive $\boldsymbol{A} \mathrm{K}$ lead against $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$. The defenders took three spades and shifted to hearts. Declarer took the A, pitched dummy's spade on the good diamond and led a club up. Sobolewska put in the jack, for the queen and king. Back came an accurate heart. Declarer won, ruffed a diamond and led a low club to drop the bare ace. She could now ruff the heart return high and draw the last trump for down one. Nice try...but the MP were 5-7 in favour of the defence.

Elsewhere there was interesting play in both $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ and 3NT.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eythorsdottir | McCallum | Seamon-Molson | Baker |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 3** |
| Pass | 3^ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

A heart was led and taken by the ace. South attacked diamonds and gave one up to West, who persisted in hearts. At the table for the last time, declarer cashed her tricks in hearts and diamonds and tried a spade. EW took the rest. Two down for 1-11.

By contrast, Sarah Bell won West's heart lead in hand and ran the diamonds with the aid of the finesse. The discards told her hearts were 5-2 so she cashed a heart to strip West of her exit and led a club in this ending, having taken the first seven tricks:


After a club to the jack, queen and king, the defenders could take their four black winners one way or another
but no more. The board ended at 10-2 for Bell/Eggeling against the leaders, Meyers/Sanborn.

Brock/Smederevac defended $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ on $1-1 \boldsymbol{-} \boldsymbol{A}$, which seems a very sensible auction to a nasty spot. On Brock's heart lead declarer won in hand and ducked a club to East, won the heart return in hand and ruffed a club, then cashed three diamonds pitching clubs. When she tried a third top heart, Brock ruffed, and played A A and another spade to her partner. Smederevac cashed a club and led a fourth heart to re-promote the $\boldsymbol{A} 10$ for the setting trick.

Time to mount a hobbyhorse. 5-3-3-2 may constitute a balanced hand but any time you pick up AKQxx in a major with a small doubleton, someone up there is trying to send you a message even if you are in your notrump range. If you ignore it, it's on you. With both vulnerable in third seat the field had the option of what to open: ^A43 AKQ96 K106 \& 43. Sure enough, the atheists, to a woman, treated their hand as a strong notrump and played a partscore in notrump facing a 4-3-3-3 eight-count with no club stopper, making +120 , with one exception, where Johansson led the $\vee 7$ from $\vee 1075$ rather than a club from \&Axxx - for which I certainly couldn't blame her. Eythorsdottir emerged with +180 after the defenders subsequently went wrong. The honorable exception to the point-counters was Lynn Baker, who opened $1 \boldsymbol{\square}$ and elected to raise $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ rather than going round the houses with a $2 \diamond$ rebid. That got McCallum to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ making +170 on a benign lie of the cards. Deserved? You be the judge.

## Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.




With a horrible lead problem, Arnolds guessed very well to start with a diamond. (Again, your scribe would have done far worse.) Eythorsdottir took the third diamond to lead a club to the queen - and yes, running the jack might well be a sensible alternative if you believe the opening leader has led from a 4 -card suit hence some club length?

Kolen won and led a diamond to her partner's king. Dummy had pitched two spades, so when Arnolds continued her accurate defence by playing a spade, declarer could not duck, or a second spade would squeeze dummy. Having taken the A A, declarer could only succeed by cashing \& J then playing $\vee \mathrm{AK}$ and running the nine. (If no key doubleton appeared from West, declarer would play clubs from the top, or take her best guess in clubs should the eight have appeared on her right). Should you trust your opponents to give true reverse count even in world championships? I'm not telling.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sarniak | Dhondy | Kazmucha | Nettleton |
| - | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 * *$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ |
| Dble | 3 NT | All Pass |  |

2NT 5-card Stayman
3 1 or both 4-cards
3 A Is it hearts?
3NT No

As a good partner, Danuta Kazmucha led her singleton spade. Heather Dhondy took the ace and started on the clubs (here leading the \& J would certainly have been reasonable but Dhondy led to the \&Q and \&K). Anna Sarniak tried the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$, saw that North had a stopper, and switched to diamonds. Dhondy took the second one and played $\downarrow K$ and $\downarrow$ A. Noting the drop of the jack, she ran the $\vee 9$, took the \&J, crossed to the \&A and cashed the $\checkmark$ Q. Admittedly, that brought her only to eight tricks but still 9-3 MP. For the record the whole field went minus as NS here. Five of the seven Souths thought their hand was a drive to game facing a 15-17 notrump. Hmmm. I guess you would know better than partner if they had a maximum or not...

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


Playing a variety of XYZ, even by a passed hand, Jill Meyers could invite game and suggest only four hearts. Kerri Sanborn wasn't interested, but 3NT does have nine tricks - and how is one supposed to work that out? With most of the field in $3 \%$ or wrapping up 150 in notrump, the play in clubs was critical.

Sanborn won the diamond lead and ducked a heart. When South cashed a second heart before playing spades, alarm bells went off. Sanborn won the spade shift, pitched spade losers on the diamonds, and ruffed a spade. Then she cashed \& K and saw the jack fall. After a few seconds she took the \&Q (heart discard from North) and followed up with the $\& 10$, hoping North had
begun with a 4-5-3-1 shape, when she would be caught in an overtaking squeeze. If she pitched a spade Sanborn would overtake the $\& 10$ and ruff a spade, if a heart Sanborn would ruff out the hearts. Alas for the lovers of aesthetics, North pitched a pedestrian diamond. But Sanborn still knew enough from her inferential count on the hearts to overtake the trump and set up spades. Well done if only for a 7-5 MP split.

There was one more fun deal to come (well, not everyone found it fun, but I did).

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
A Q962

- A63
- K 72
\& A 86
A A 3
- Q 104
- 10953
\& K Q J 10


A K J 108754
$\bullet$ K 9

- A 64
\& 5

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eythorsdottir | Yavas | Seamon-Molson | Özgür |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | 6 A | All Pass |  |

$6 \uparrow$ has 11 tricks, but not 12 . To have a chance to make the slam you need one suit singly guarded, and perhaps avoid a lead that severs communications.
(To show you what I mean by that, switch the club eight and nine so West has sole guard of clubs. A diamond lead or shift cuts the communications for the double squeeze. If declarer had heart not diamond length, then you would need to play that suit.)

At the table, the defence naturally led a top club, then took the $\boldsymbol{A} \mathrm{A}$ to return a club. Declarer ruffed and ran trumps. Now the critical point of the defence is for West to abandon clubs to her partner, who has the menace over dummy.

This is the winning position for the defenders if West unguards a red suit, East still having to make a pitch on trick seven (she must discard a heart):


There are really only two rules you need to know about double squeezes - the rest is commentary, go and follow it.

Where the defenders have to abandon a suit, keep the suit guarded over your opponent, not under them.

Where (as here) declarer has a positional menace - in clubs, once East lets go their guard - West's club stop is under the threat and West will have to abandon either hearts or diamonds early. BEFORE cashing the last threat, take the winners in the suit they have abandoned. THEN play the last card in the trump/long suit. If you do not you squeeze the dummy prematurely.

Thus, in the six-card ending when East keeps three cards in hearts and diamonds, West having unguarded diamonds earlier, declarer could have succeeded by taking the $\bullet$ AK, which she did, and leading her last trump as she did.

However, seeing the position coming Eythorsdottir nonchalantly abandoned her club stop...and declarer pitched the club eight from dummy, so the slam still went down.

Sanborn also reached this ending in 4a and did play the double squeeze successfully when the defenders fell into the same trap. That was 11-1 for her.


Janice Seamon-Molson


Jill Meyers
At the end of the ten-board stanza Sanborn/Meyers had a six percent lead (2 boards) over Bell/Eggeling and Eythorsdottir/Seamon-Molson.

Sometimes you can be at the mercy of your opponents as to whether you get a top or bottom. Witness the first round of the second stanza:

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
A 1032
$\checkmark 63$

- Q 543
\& 10654
AKJ85
- J 92
- A 9
\& Q 732


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yavas | Meyers | Özgür $^{\text {zon }}$ | Sanborn |
| - | Pass | $1 \mathbf{D}$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Özgür's decision not to retreat from $1 \vee x x$ to $2 \checkmark$ at her first turn, or from $1 \boldsymbol{A} \mathrm{x}$ at her second, worked very well. While Meyers' pass of $1 \vee \mathrm{xx}$ is surely right, had she bid $2 \%$ I suspect East might have taken her off the hook.

After a heart lead and club shift, declarer could not avoid a club ruff as well as an eventual club loser, with two trumps and three red-suit top tricks to lose as well. That was 200 for the defence, while 4 went down on an early trump shift and continuation on two out of the three times it was played. This was 5-7 for declarer.

On the next deal EW also pushed the boat out, with less success.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


Sanborn was looking at three possible defensive tricks so was not unhappy to defend a grand slam. She led a top club and in due course declarer took the spade finesse. Down one and all 12 MP to NS. If the finesse works, EW get the 12 MP , with the whole field in the small slam here.

A few boards later it was the Americans' turn to go head-hunting.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


