



EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE

9th EBL Main Tournament Directors Course
30th January to 3rd February 2013
Bad Honnef – Germany

MAIN TEST

Introduction

As usual, you are requested to express your final ruling indicating the result to be written on the score sheet, and the final outcome in IMP or mp. No other solution, lacking one of those elements, will be ever considered valid.

In all cases where you are called upon to chose among multiple answers, it is mandatory to quote the Law reference(s) in details (e.g. Law 27B1b), and some choice may lead to a minus score.

Whenever not otherwise specified, all questions come from a high level competition. Screens, whenever in use, are explicitly marked.

As, once more, usual, all questions come from real life, therefore there are no tricks.

The question n° 15 is a bonus: it does give extra points, but if not solved does not affect the final mark.

Good luck,

Maurizio Di Sacco

M 1)

Italian Open Teams Championship, Second League.

South plays 4♠ and has already lost three tricks. In the following position, with dummy on lead, he lays down his cards and says “all mine”.

		♠ ---	
		♥ J 10 2	
		♦ A Q	
		♣ ---	
♠ ---		N	♠ 9
♥ 5		W	♥ 7
♦ K 7 4		E	♦ 10 2
♣ 3		S	♣ J
		♠ 10 8	
		♥ 8	
		♦ 5	
		♣ 6	

- A) EW agree, but fifteen minutes after the end of the match, East reaches for the TD and asks for a ruling. Analyzing the whole hand, it will be clear that South had forgotten about East's ♠9.

The TD awards:

- 4♠= / NS +620
- 4♠-1 / NS -100
- 4♠-1 one time out of four and 4♠= three times out of four
- 4♠-2 / NS -200
- 4♠-1 one time out of two and 4♠= one time out of two

- B) EW immediately object. Analyzing the whole hand, it will be clear that South has forgotten about East's ♠9.

The TD awards:

- 4♠= / NS +620
- 4♠-1 / NS -100
- 4♠-1 one time out of four and 4♠= three times out of four
- 4♠-2 / NS -200
- 4♠-1 one time out of two and 4♠= one time out of two

M 2)

	♠ K 7 2	Board 10 E/All
	♥ 10 8 6 3	
	♦ 10 8 6 4	
	♣ 4 3	
♠ Q 5 4	N W S	♠ A J 8 3
♥ A Q		♥ K 9 7 2
♦ J 7		♦ Q 9 5 2
♣ A K Q 10 9 2		♣ 5
	♠ 10 9 6	
	♥ J 5 4	
	♦ A K 3	
	♣ J 8 7 6	

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1NT	P	2♣*	P
3NT**	P	4♠	P
6♣	P	6NT	X
All pass			

* It contains all game forcing hands.

** Explained by East as “both majors and maximum”. West, however, thought 3NT was not agreed, and had meant to make the final bid.

Play

W	N	E	S
♦7	♦6	♦2	♦K
♥A	♥3	♥2	♥4 !!
♥Q	♥6	♥7	♥5
♠Q	♠K	♠A	♠6
♠4	♥8	♥K	♥J
♣9	♣3	♣5	♣6

After running all clubs but one, the position is the following:

		♠ 7 2	Board 10 E/All
		♥ ---	
		♦ 10	
		♣ ---	
♠ 5	W N E S	♠ J 8	
♥ ---		♥ ---	
♦ J		♦ Q	
♣ A		♣ ---	
		♠ 10 9	
		♥ ---	
		♦ A	
		♣ ---	

West, on lead, plays the ♣A throwing the ♦Q and South is squeezed in ♠/♦.

Final result 6NTX =.

EW call the TD pointing at the 6♣ bid.

It is a KO match, and the result in the other room was 3NT+2 by East, NS -660.

The final result without the board under the spotlight is 128-120 in favour of the team which defended 6NTX.

M 3)

	♠ A 6	Board 3 S/EW
	♥ Q 9 8 3	
	♦ A Q 6	
	♣ A Q 6 4	
♠ K Q 8 7 3	N W S	♠ J 10 5 4
♥ J 5		♥ 7 6 4
♦ K 8 7 4 2		♦ J 9
♣ K		♣ J 8 5 3
	♠ 9 2	
	♥ A K 10 2	
	♦ 10 5 3	
	♣ 10 9 7 2	

W	N	E	S
			P
1♠	X	2♠*	3♥
P	4♥	All pass	

* Alerted and correctly explained as weak support

Play

W	N	E	S
♠ K	<u>♠ A</u>	♠ J	♠ 9
♥ 5	♥ 3	♥ 6	<u>♥ A</u>
♥ J	<u>♥ Q</u>	♥ 4	♥ 2
♠ 7	♥ 8	♥ 7	<u>♥ K</u>
♣ K	<u>♣ A</u>	♣ 3	♣ 2
♦ 2	<u>♣ Q</u>	♣ 5	♣ 7
♠ 3	♣ 4	<u>♣ J</u>	♣ 9
<u>♠ Q</u>	♠ 6	♠ 4	♠ 2
♦ 4	♦ 6	<u>♦ J</u>	♦ 3
♠ 8	♣ 6	♣ 8	<u>♣ 10</u>

Here is the final position:

		♠ ---	Board 10 E/All
		♥ 9	
		♦ A Q	
		♣ ---	
♠ ---	W N E S	♠ 10 5	
♥ ---		♥ ---	
♦ K 8 7		♦ 9	
♣ ---		♣ ---	
		♠ ---	
		♥ 10	
		♦ 10 5	
		♣ ---	

At this point, West, addressing East, says “you don’t want any more trick, do you?”, and East replies “let’s carry on, please”. South plays then a ♦ to the A, goes down one, and calls the TD to complain about West’s comment and East’s reply, claiming he has been deceived by the combination of the two, leading him to believe the ♦K belonged to East, necessarily blank, since with the K doubleton he would have simply claimed one more trick and, furthermore, the ♦’s position was known.

The result in the other room had been 3♥+1, NS +170.

It is a Swiss competition, ten boards per match, and the result without that board is 21-15 in favour of the team that failed in 4♥.

Apart from the final outcomes, you must quote the Law(s) and write up the reasons that led to your decision.

M 4)

		♠ 8 4	Board 21 N/NS
		♥ J 8 6 3	
		♦ A Q J 9 5	
		♣ 8 3	
♠	K J 9 6 3 2	N W E S	♠ A 10 5
♥	2		♥ Q 5 4
♦	10 3 2		♦ 7 4
♣	A J 9		♣ K 10 7 6 5
		♠ Q 7	
		♥ A K 10 9 7	
		♦ K 8 6	
		♣ Q 4 2	

W	N	E	S
	P	P	1♥
2♠*	4♦**	4♠	P***
P	X****	All pass	

- * Alerted and correctly explained as weak
- ** ♦ and ♥
- *** After a pause of about 30 seconds
- **** After having alerted South's pass as forcing

Play

W	N	E	S
♥2	♥6	♥5	♥K
♦3	♦J	♦4	♦6
♠2	♥3	♥4	♥10
♦2	♦9	♦7	♦8
♠3	♥J	♥Q	♥A
♠6	♠4	♠A	♠7
♠K	♠8	♠5	♠Q
♣A	♣3	♣5	♣2
♣J	♣8	♣6	♣Q

At the end of play, West calls the TD to complain about North's double, stating that it might have been influenced by the tempo of the tray. Furthermore, West states that without the double he would have guessed the ♣Q. North explains that South's pass must be forcing, once his side had bid a game vulnerable versus not. South says that he had paused just because uncertainty about the forcing quality of his pass – his ♦ fit made attractive the five level – at the end deciding for that interpretation. EW object that once a game has been bid, or could have been bid, just on distributional basis, pass should not be forcing.

The result in the other room had been 4♠X -1, NS +100.

It is a KO match, and the final result without that board is 112–100 in favour of the team which defended 4♠X.

M 5)
Pairs, first division

		♠ 6 5 2	Board 8 W/none
		♥ 9 4	
		♦ A 10 8 6 5	
		♣ 7 6 4	
♠ A 7 4	W N E S	♠ Q J 10 3	
♥ K 6 5 3		♥ A J 10 8 7	
♦ K 3		♦ 9 7 2	
♣ J 10 9 2		♣ Q	
		♠ K 9 8	
		♥ Q 2	
		♦ Q J 4	
		♣ A K 8 5 3	

A)

W	N	E	S
1♣	P	1♦*	1NT
2♥	2NT**	4♥	All pass

* Transfer to ♥, but not alerted by West until the tray comes back with 4♥.

** Lebensohl.

B)

W	N	E	S
1♣	P	1♦*	1NT / X**
2♥	P	4♥	All pass

* Transfer to ♥, but not alerted by West until he bids 2♥. WS agree on South being allowed to change his call, without calling the TD.

** Explained on both sides as T/O.

In both cases the contract is made, and NS complain because West has guessed the ♥ position.

The TD asks four players. One says that with just South's "Double" he would have played for the ♥Q to be in North. Two would have played AK, and one would have played for the ♥Q to be in South.

Here are the frequencies:

+100	19	-200	28	-590	21	-1100	5
+50	7	-420	18	-630	1		
-140	6	-450	8	-690	3		
-170	14	-500	1	-800	11		

Write up the final outcome for both sides in both cases.

M 6)

		♠ A 5	Board 9 N/EW
		♥ A K Q 10 4	
		♦ A K Q 2	
		♣ 9 7	
♠	10 8 6 4	N W E S	♠ K Q J 7 2
♥	8 2		♥ 9 5 3
♦	10 8 6 4		♦ J 9
♣	10 3 2		♣ A 5 4
		♠ 9 3	
		♥ J 7 6	
		♦ 7 5 3	
		♣ K Q J 8 6	

W	N	E	S
		1♠*	
	2♦ ^A	P	2♥ ^A
P	3♥	P	4♣
P	4♦	P	5♥
P	6♥	All pass	

You are the Chief TD of a Regional Mixed Pairs Championship.

One of your assistants shows you the above auction, explaining that North had not seen East's BOOT (*), and that the players had agreed to let him take it back. He adds to have been called at the end of the auction.

Unable to do anything about the auction, he offered South the option to either ask or prohibit the ♠ lead and South chose to forbid a ♠ lead. After the ♦ lead, South conceded the ♣A and made his contract.

Here are the frequencies:

+980	6
+480	11
+450	12
-50	6
-100	1

Are you able to overrule the already given ruling?

Please write all the Laws involved, as well as the final outcomes for both sides.

M 7)

Australian Open Team Trials

		♠ A 4 2	Board 5 N/NS
		♥ A K J 7 6 2	
		♦ 5 4	
		♣ 8 4	
♠ K 9 3	N W E S		♠ J 10 8 5
♥ 8 5 4			♥ Q 9 3
♦ Q 10 8 2			♦ A 9 7 6
♣ J 10 7			♣ K 5
		♠ Q 7 6	
		♥ 10	
		♦ K J 3	
		♣ A Q 9 6 3 2	

W	N	E	S
	1♥	P	2♣
P	2♥	P	3NT
All pass			

South, a few times member of the Australia Open Team, was declarer in 3NT, where he received the ♦2 lead for East's A, and the ♦6 back. The play develops as:

W	N	E	S
♦2	♦5	<u>♦A</u>	♦3
<u>♦Q</u>	♦4	♦6	♦J
♣J	♣4	♣K	<u>♣A</u>
...♥5*	♥J	<u>♥Q</u>	♥10
♣7	♣8	♣5	<u>♣Q</u>
<u>♣10</u>	♥2	♦7	♣2
♥4	<u>♥A</u>	♥3	♣3

* After a pause of about 10 seconds

Eventually Declarer lost a trick to the ♠K and called the TD complaining about West's pause. He claimed that the hesitation had deceived him first about the position of the ♥Q, wherefore it led him to overtake, and then he had thought that the hesitation could have been justified only by hearts not splitting 3-3, therefore the third round of ♣.

The result in the other room had been 3NT =, NS +600. It is a KO match, and the result without this board is 73–68 in favour of “our” declarer's team.

Write the final outcome for both teams.

M 8)

		♠ 10 7 6 3 2	Board 3 S/EW
		♥ 10 6	
		♦ J	
		♣ A 10 5 4 3	
♠ A Q 8	W N E S	♠ 9 5	
♥ 5 4		♥ Q J 9 3 2	
♦ A Q 10 7 6 2		♦ K 8 4	
♣ Q 7		♣ 9 8 6	
		♠ K J 4	
		♥ A K 8 7	
		♦ 9 5 3	
		♣ K J 2	

W	N	E	S
			1NT
2♦	2♠	... P *	P
3♦	All pass		

* After hesitation

Play

W	N	E	S
♥5	♥10	♥J	♥ <u>K</u>
♠ <u>A</u>	♠3	♠5	♠4
♦ <u>A</u>	♦J	♦4	♦3
♦2	♣4	♦ <u>K</u>	♦5
♠8	♠2	♠9	♠ <u>K</u>
♦ <u>Q</u>	♠7	♦8	♦9
♠Q	♣3	♣9	♠J

The revoke eventually becomes established, and the TD is called. Final result 3♦ -1.

The result in the other room had been 4♠ = NS +420
It is a Round Robin competition, 16 boards per match.

M 9)
Italy, Premier League

		♠ ---	Board 1 N/none
		♥ J 7 6 3	
		♦ K 10 4 3	
		♣ Q 9 6 4 2	
♠ K J 9 8 7 6 5	W	N	♠ 10 2
♥ A Q 10 5 2			♥ K 9 8
♦ 5			♦ A Q 7 6
♣ ---			♣ K J 10 8
		♠ A Q 4 3	
		♥ 4	
		♦ J 9 8 2	
		♣ A 7 5 3	

West is the declarer in 4♠, and North leads the ♦3.

Play

W	N	E	S
♦ 5	♦ 3	♦ <u>A</u>	♦ 2
♠ 5	♣ 2	♠ 10	♠ <u>A</u>
♠ 6	♦ 4	♦ 6	♦ 8
♥ 2	♥ 3	♥ <u>K</u>	♥ 4
♠ J	♣ 4	♠ 2	♠ 3
♠ <u>K</u>	♦ 10	♦ 7	♠ 4
♠ 9	♣ 6	♣ 8	♠ <u>Q</u>

Here is the position:

		♠ ---	Board 1 N/none
		♥ J 7 6	
		♦ K	
		♣ Q 9	
♠ 8 7	W	N	♠ ---
♥ A Q 10 5			♥ 9 8
♦ ---			♦ Q
♣ ---			♣ K J 10
		♠ ---	
		♥ ---	
		♦ J 9	
		♣ A 7 5 3	

At this point, West shows his cards saying: "all mine, unless ♥ don't run. If so, I'll be making just 10 tricks". South, rather nervous for the remark, intimates West to continue play, and declarer then says: "... but it is obvious, isn't it? I'm ruffing any continuation, drawing the last trump and running ♥!".

The defenders point out that the proposed line leads to down one, as South had foreseen, and call the TD.

The result in the other room had been 6♠X -2, NS +300.

It is a KO match, and the result without this boards is 214–200 in favour of “our” defenders’ team.

M 10)
Italy Teams Championships, Third Division

	♠ A Q	Board 13 N/all	
	♥ 5 4		
	♦ K J 6 5 4 3		
	♣ Q 3 2		
♠ 6 4 3	W	N	♠ 2
♥ A Q 10 9 8	W	N	♥ K J 7 6
♦ Q 10 2	W	N	♦ A 7
♣ 6 5	W	N	♣ A K 10 9 8 7
	♠ K J 10 9 8 7 5		
	♥ 3 2		
	♦ 9 8		
	♣ J 4		

W	N	E	S
	1♦	2♣	2♠*
P	P	X	All pass

* Not forcing but not alerted by neither South nor North.

The contract is made, and at the end West calls the TD, stating that if he had been properly alerted and explained, he would have immediately doubled – competitive – so that his side would have easily reached at least 4♥, and probably even 6♥ (via the sequence: Double–3♠–4♥–4♠–4NT–5♣–6♥).

The result in the other room had been 4♥+2, NS –680.
It is a KO match, and the result without this board is 179 for all.

M 11)

		♠ J 8 7 6 4	Board 16 W/EW
		♥ Q 7	
		♦ K Q 7 6	
		♣ 3 2	
♠ A Q 9 5	W N E S	♠ K 10 2	
♥ J 8 6 5		♥ A	
♦ ---		♦ A J 10 9 8 4 3	
♣ A K J 10 7		♣ 8 4	
		♠ 3	
		♥ K 10 9 4 3 2	
		♦ 5 2	
		♣ Q 9 6 5	

W	N	E	S
1♥ *	1♠	X **	2♣ ***
P	P	3♣	P
3NT	P	4NT	P
5♥	P	6♦	All pass

* strong ♣, canapé.

** negative free bids available.

*** South thought that his partner had overcalled 1NT, and explained it as 4♠ and a longer minor. Therefore 2♣ as "pass or correct".

The contract fails by one trick, and at the end EW call the TD, complaining about the two different explanations. East states that had he known that 2♣ was artificial, he would have reopened with a "Double" and not 3♣. West, on the other hand, states that had he known that 2♣ was natural, he would have doubled for penalty. EW's Convention Card shows a very frequent use of T/O and competitive doubles. East adds that other than the possibility of playing 2♣X, the misinformation was the cause for his pair to climb up to slam.

The result in the other room had been 3NT+2, NS -660.

It is a Round Robin event, 10 board matches. The result without this board is 18-11 in favour of the team which declared 6♦.

M 12)

		♠	A K Q J	Board 10 E/all
		♥	A K Q 4	
		♦	---	
		♣	10 8 6 4 3	
♠	10 9 6	N W E S	♠	3 2
♥	7 3		♥	10 8 6 5
♦	A J 10 9 8 7 3		♦	K Q 6 5
♣	7		♣	J 9 5
		♠	8 7 5 4	
		♥	J 9 2	
		♦	4 2	
		♣	A K Q 2	

A)

W	N	E	S
		P	P
3♦	X	4♦	... P*
P	4♠	P	5♣
P	5♦	P	5♠
P	6♦	P	7♠
All Pass			

B)

W	N	E	S
		P	P
3♦	X	4♦	... P*
P	5♦	P	6♣
P	6♦	P	7♣
P	7♠	All Pass	

C)

W	N	E	S
		P	P
3♦	X	4♦	... P*
P	X	P	6♣
P	7♣	All Pass	

D)

W	N	E	S
		P	P
3♦	X	4♦	... P*
P	X	P	5♠
P	6♦	P	7♣
All Pass			

E)

W	N	E	S
		P	P
3♦	X	4♦	... P*
P	5♦	P	6♦
P	6♥	P	6♠
P	7♠	All Pass	

In all 5 cases, the asterisk (*) shows a pause of more than 30 seconds.

It is a Board-A-Match event and the result in the other room had been 7♣= NS +2140.

Award a score in all five cases. Please say a few words on the matter explaining each decision.

M 13)

		♠ 6 5	Board 13 N/all
		♥ Q 9 7 6 2	
		♦ 10 3 2	
		♣ J 5 4	
♠ K Q 10 9 3	N W E S	♠ J 7 4	
♥ 5		♥ K J 8 4	
♦ A 9 8 4		♦ Q J 7	
♣ K 10 2		♣ 9 7 6	
		♠ A 8 2	
		♥ A 10 3	
		♦ K 6 5	
		♣ A Q 8 3	

W	N	E	S
	P	P	1NT
2♠*	2NT	P	3♣
P	3♥	All Pass	

* West correctly explains it as "♠ and a minor", but East explains it as "both minors".

Play

W	N	E	S
<u>♦A</u>	♦2	♦Q	♦K
♦9	♦10	<u>♦J</u>	♦5
♦4	♦3	<u>♦7</u>	♦6
♠3	♠5	♠4	<u>♠A</u>
♥5	♥2	♥4	<u>♥A</u>
♠9	♥6	<u>♥J</u>	♥10
♠10	♠6	<u>♠J</u>	♠2
<u>♣K</u>	♣4	♣6	♣3
♦8	♣5	<u>♥8</u>	♣8

The contract fails by four tricks.

At the end, North calls the TD, complaining about the misinformation, stating that with both minors in West, having three cards in both of them made him thought it was likely to find some good heart fit in his partner's hand. Had he received the right explanation, he would have passed. EW point out that both North's bid and play – specifically the ♦K on the first round – were extremely poor.

North states that even the ♦K was due to the wrong explanation, whereas from the remaining play he had simply lost his concentration once he had realized to have been misinformed.

The result in the other room had been 2♠+1, NS –140.

It is a Swiss, ten boards per round, and the result without this hand is 41–8 in favour of the team which overcalled 2♠.

M 14)

Australian Open Team, Semifinal

		♠ A 9 7 3	Board 2 E/NS
		♥ 8 2	
		♦ A 9 5 4	
		♣ K 6 3	
♠ J 5 2		N	♠ 8
♥ K 7 6	W	E	♥ A Q J 9 5 3
♦ Q 8 7 6			♦ K J
♣ J 9 5		S	♣ 10 7 4 2
		♠ K Q 10 6 4	
		♥ 10 4	
		♦ 10 3 2	
		♣ A Q 8	

W	N	E	S
		1 ♥	1 ♠
3 ♦ *	3 ♥	P	4 ♠
All Pass			

* Systemically “fit showing, 3/4 ♥, 6/9 hcp”, but explained as “♦ singleton, 3/4 ♥, 6/9”.

After two rounds of ♥, the defense switched to ♣. Declarer pulled trumps and played two more rounds of ♣ ending in dummy. Then he ducked a ♦, hoping for a singleton honour in West’s hand.

At the end, South calls for the TD, and explains him that with the right information he would have easily made the contract endplaying East.

EW point out that South’s line of play at the table was based on East holding no less than 15 cards.

The result in the other room had been 3♠+1. NS +170.

It is a KO match, and the result without this board was 124–123 in favour of the team that defended 4♠.

M 15)

Italian Open National Cup, Quarter Finals

		♠	J 10 9 4	Board 6 E/EW		
		♥	9 6 5 3			
		♦	---			
		♣	A Q 10 9 5			
♠	A	N		♠	K Q 6 5	
♥	J 8 4	W	S	E	♥	K Q 10
♦	7 4			♦	K 10 9 6 5	
♣	K J 7 6 4 3 2			♣	8	
		♠	8 7 3 2			
		♥	A 7 2			
		♦	A Q J 8 3 2			
		♣	---			

W	N	E	S
		1♣ *	1♦
3♣ **	X ***	P	4♠
P	P	X	P
5♣	X	All Pass	

- * “Strong ♦” system; can be void in clubs.
- ** 9/11, inviting.
- *** North → East Penalty.
South → West T/O.

NS have no Convention Card and disagree with each other about the meaning of DBL. The contract drifted -4; NS +1100. The TD was called at the end by West, who complained that without the misinformation he would never have bid 5♣. Interviewing experts of the same caliber of West, the TD found out that nobody would have removed the DBL even with the misinformation, and that action is unanimously considered silly. Interviewing the same experts, the TD found that with a different information, most of them (3 out of 5) would not have doubled 4♠ with the East cards.

The result in the other room had been 4♠X -3. NS -500. It is a KO match, and the result without this board was 123-116 in favour of the team that declared 5♣.

Main Test – Answers

M 1)

- A) Law 69B2. It is quite unlikely for EW to win a trick, therefore the table result stands, or “a”.
- B) Law 70A. There’s a possibility for EW to score a trick: whenever South starts cashing the \spadesuit A. One trick to EW, or “b”.

M 2)

West has UI and $6\clubsuit$ could have been suggested by it (to make sure to shut his partner up). We should wonder would have happened, if West would not have used the UI: he may have asked for aces, leapt straight to $6\spadesuit$, or cue bid $5\clubsuit$. For EW the result should be a weighted that takes into account $5\spadesuit$ -1 and $6\spadesuit$ -2. Further than that, a severe disciplinary penalty should be imposed upon West for the blatant use of a UI. I suggest 10 IMPs.

For NS, South’s defense clearly qualifies as a “serious error”, hence we have to apply the “consequent-subsequent” principle. Since NS should have benefit from the infraction, the damage was totally self-inflicted, and they just keep the table result.

For the calculation, both teams are losing 13 IMPs, thus making the final score 128–110 (due to the penalty).

M 3)

East did not commit any infraction when he asked to play forth, neither did West, who was right in conceding all the tricks. Further than that, South played West to have opened with 9 HCP and a stiff King. Result stands.

M 4)

EW are right. A general principle in competitive auctions says that a pass is forcing only when a game has been bid because of general strength, and not just on mere distributional values (if you are not applying this principle, you are going to see your opponents score a few doubled contracts). South’s uncertainty about the pass’s nature is self-explaining, and the claim that he at last decided to pass because the pass had to be forcing is quite odd, with a minimum hand.

We should now wonder whether North’s double could have been influenced by the UI, and the answer is certainly “yes”. Finally, we have to decide whether, without the double, West would have had reasons to get the \clubsuit Q right. Once more “yes”, even though perhaps not all the times. A weighted score like $\frac{3}{4}$ of $4\spadesuit$ = seems right, but even $4\spadesuit$ = all the times is acceptable.

M 5)

- A) This is a case of misinformation. If properly alerted, South would not have overcalled 1NT without the \heartsuit stopper, but doubled instead. After that, West would not have necessarily found the \heartsuit Q, as shown by the poll and the frequencies. A weighted score which takes into account the result of the poll is the right solution.
- B) This is a case of UI, and since there is a logical alternative to play South for the \heartsuit Q, the result has to be adjusted to $4\heartsuit$ -1 all the times.

- M 6) The table TD made a mistake. In case of a violation of Law 9 (once the attention is drawn to an irregularity, the TD should be called), the TD has to wonder what would have happened if he had been called: he would have explained all the possible options, and East, aware of the lead penalties, may well have decided to overcall 2♠. Hence, Law 26A cannot be applied here. However, Law 16D still applies, and we have to wonder whether there is a logical alternative to the ♠ lead. West's cards already, in themselves, call for the ♠ lead, as well as NS's auction, making it a standout. 6♥-1 for both sides.
- M 7) There are two problems here: did West's hesitation influence South as for overtaking the ♥10? The answer, taking into account the caliber of the player involved, is a clear "no". Overtaking is the right play (it wins whenever the Q is third or fourth onside, and loses only when the Q is doubleton offside). We should then wonder whether there is any link between West's hesitation and the ♥ split. The answer is "none". South knew that West had no reason to think, and how ♥ divide cannot be related to the pause. Result stands, but EW have to be penalized, since West was under the obligation to apologize for her pause before South played from dummy. How much? In the real life, EW got a penalty of 3 IMPs, but some more are ok.
- M 8) A gift: a textbook case of subsequent-consequent. West used the UI, but NS were responsible for some self-inflicted damage. The calculation is not as straightforward as in other cases, since the damage was only partially self-inflicted. The damage caused by the infraction is equal to 3 IMPs (NS would have lost 6 playing 2♠, and 9 for scoring +50 in 3♦-1); the table result cost 11 IMPs to NS, minus the damage caused by the infraction => NS -8 IMPs, EW +6 IMPs.
- M 9) Was the claim correct? Yes. May West, when playing the fatal round of trump, have been influenced by South's behavior? Yes. 4♠=
- M 10) If properly alerted, West would have certainly doubled 2♠, and his side would have reached at least the ♥ game. For NS, the result should be a weighted score that takes into account some possibility of 6♥: let's say ¼. However, West's pass over 2♠x is grotesque, so much as to qualify for a wild (gambling) action. The damage caused by the infraction is equal to 3 IMPs (1/4 of 13 IMPs), whereas EW lost 16 IMPs at the table. NS +13, and final score equal to 185.5-179 in NS's favour.
- M 11) East cannot claim any damage, since he was properly informed about NS's agreements. Regarding West, the CC shows that he didn't have any penalty double available. Result stands.

- M 12)
- A) Pass is not a logical alternative to 4♠, and 4♠ it is not in relation with the UI (South's hesitation does not necessarily suggest ♠!). However, there's certainly a logical alternative to 5♦, and 5♦ may well have been influenced by the UI. 5♣+2.
 - B) Pass is not a logical alternative, but there's a logical alternative to 5♦, which may well have been influenced by the UI. North's normal action is double, after which there are various possibilities. A weighted score that takes into account some 4♠, some 5♣ and some small slams looks appropriate.
 - C) Ok for the double, but 7♣ may have been influenced by the UI (actually, South should have clearly doubled 4♦ with those cards, thus he should not have them). 6♣+1.
 - D) North is going to bid 6♠ anyhow, therefore 6♦ is for free, and allowed. Result stands.
 - E) Same as in B).
- M 13) There is clearly no relation between North's crazy bid and the infraction, but North can claim damage in the play, specifically when he put up the ♦K (in his point of view, the ♦Q could have likely come from Qx, and shortening East's alleged ♥ length looked profitable). 3♥-3.
- M 14) Without the infraction, South would have almost certainly made his contract, thus EW should score -10 IMPs. As for NS, we shall decide whether South's sloppy play qualifies as "serious error". South didn't count East's hand because he thought he already knew his distribution, and being the non-offending side we should be quite lenient with him. 4♠= for both sides deserves a full mark, but even the "serious error" version gets a half mark. In the former case, the result would be 134-123 for NS, while in the latter it would be 125.5-123 for NS.
- M 15) For EW, the most favourable situation is, when it is East who has been misinformed, because in the opposite case, even though it is obvious that West would not have removed the double (if properly informed), West's 5♣ would be classified as a "wild, gambling" action, and EW would lose 17 IMPs. We know from the poll that there was some chance for East not to double 4♠: giving EW some benefit of the doubt, we may award a weighted score equal to $\frac{3}{4}$ 4♠-3 and $\frac{1}{4}$ 5♣x-4. In total for EW -10 IMPs. For NS, the worst situation is, when West has been misinformed, because West would pass 4♠x with the right information. EW 4♠x-3, or a flat board. Final result 123-121 for EW.