## Know Your Percentages (By Marc Chawner)



## Introduction

- The 24 boards that were played in the session were designed to illustrate certain aspects of Bridge Strategy.
- This month's topic was "Know Your Percentages".
- All the results can be found with this link:
- https://play.realbridge.online/dt.html?p=240512124852\&q=EssexBootCamp12MayPlayer
- The 24 hands were devised in such a way so that each participant, within the session, found themselves declarer in a tricky contract on 6 occasions.
- There were several 'Strategies' that I have tried to illustrate within this month's topic of
"Know Your Percentages".
- We will look at the boards that were played, strategy by strategy and we will therefore jump around the boards demonstrating the different strategies in action.
- Within each board, I have given a suggested bidding sequence, however, for today's exercise, the bidding is not too much of a concern.
- I set the boards up, so that with accurate declarer play, every Game/Slam contract should have been made, providing declarer played their contract in a way that gave themselves the best chance of succeeding. If played correctly, there should be no guessing required.
- So, out of the possible 384 Suit Game/Slam contracts how many would be made?
- The scoring method was Cross-Imps.


## Introduction

- Bridge is a 'Numbers Game', however, hopefully today I will demonstrate that remembering lots of numbers is not required to become a good bridge player.
- The last thing that I want this to be, is a maths lesson.
- No maths is required, just common sense and logic.



## Introduction

- Understanding how the defenders' suits break can significantly impact our strategy as declarer.
- Here is a simple rhyme to help us remember.
- "Odd numbers divide Evenly, Even numbers divide Oddly".
- That is to say:
- If the defenders, between them, have an odd number of cards in a suit, say 5 , they tend to divide as evenly as possible, which is 3-2. ( $68 \%$ of the Time).
- If the defenders have an even number of cards in a suit, say 6, their cards will divide 3-3 only about $36 \%$ of the time as $4-2$ is the most likely division ( $48 \%$ of the Time).
- For the moment, we really do not need to remember these numbers.
- The only thing to focus on is the fact that the lesser likely divisions are always going to be below 50\%.
- I have mentioned the figure of $50 \%$, because if there is one percentage figure fact that we are all aware of and that is the fact that a simple finesse has a $50 \%$ chance of success.
- Let us see how our newly acquired knowledge helps us decide which strategy we should be using on board 12, when we have a choice of two possible lines of play.
- West is the player under the spotlight on board 12.


## Which Line To Take?

Board 12
West Deals
N-S Vul

- 5432
$-2$
- Q432
- K QJ 5


North leads - King.
Initial Analysis:
1 Spade loser; 2 Club losers, but 1 Club loser can be discarded on dummy's *King.
We also have 1 or 2 Heart losers.
If Hearts divide 2-2 ( $40 \%$ Chance), we only have 3 losers, in total.
If Hearts divide 3-1 or 4-0 (60\% Chance), we have 4 losers in total.
Calculations:
Hearts are more likely to divide 3-1 than 2-2, so we need to eliminate another Club loser by taking the Diamond finesse at trick 2. (50\% Chance).

Conclusion:
Win the opening lead with $\boldsymbol{*}$ Ace.
Run the Jack.
Play a Heart to dummy's 叉 Ace.
Cash dummy's * Ace and *King, discarding our 2 losing Clubs.
Continue drawing trumps.
We make our contract by losing just 2 Hearts and 1 Spade.

Which Line to Take? Contract: 4 by West (Board 12) Lead: © King

- After winning the opening lead with our Ace of Clubs we have a choice of 2 lines to take.
- Line A: Lead a Heart to dummy's Ace and play dummy's Ace and King of Diamonds, discarding one losing Club. We now play another Heart and 'Hope' for a 2-2 division.
- Line B: Lead and run the Jack of Diamonds at trick 2. We now play a Heart to dummy's Ace and play dummy's Ace and King of Diamonds, discarding two losing Clubs. We now play another Heart, and we don't mind if we lose 2 Heart tricks.
Line A will be a success, when Hearts divide precisely 2-2 ( $40 \%$ of the time).
Line B will be a success, when the Queen of Diamonds is onside ( $50 \%$ of the time).

We did not need to remember that a suit breaks 2-2 40\% of the time.
We just need to remember the rhyme: "Odd numbers divide Evenly, Even numbers divide Oddly".
This tells us that when we are missing an even number of cards, on this occasion 4, they are more likely to divide oddly, as in 3-1, so the Hearts dividing precisely 2-2 must be below 50\%, which is the chance of our Diamond finesse.

Let us now see which of our declarers decided to take the $50 \%$ line of the Diamond finesse and which of our declarers decided to put faith in Hearts dividing 2-2, which is the $40 \%$ line.
Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta
Nogueira
Simon Moorman \& lan Moss
Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen
Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth
Gahan
Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone
Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper
Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182
Mariana
Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin
Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall
Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg
Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins
Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller
peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey
Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal
Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray
71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro
Campos

| EW | Contract |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $4 \vee-2 ~ W$ |
| George Vede \& Maureen Vede | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Sally Allen \& John Pioli | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Monica \& BAVARESCoClaudio | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | $4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | Passed out |
| Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | $2 \vee+1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | $2 \vee+1 \mathrm{~W}$ |
| Graham Randall \& jayne randall | $3 \vee=\mathrm{E}$ |
| Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | $4 \vee=\mathrm{W}$ |

IMP

| Lead | Score |  | IMP |  | Which Line to Take? (Board 12) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \%K | 100 |  | +3.47 | -3.47 |  |  |  |  |
| 9 K | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  |  |  |  |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  |  |  |  |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  |  |  |  |
| $\%$ K | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 | Board 12 <br> Dealer W |  | $5432$ |  |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 | NS Vul |  | - Q432 |  |
| $\because \mathrm{K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  |  | \% KQJ5 |  |
| $\checkmark 2$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  | - KQJ <br> -1098765 |  | $10987$ |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  | - J |  | - AK10 |
| ¢K | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  | \%A109 |  | ¢ 876 |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ | 50 |  | +1.67 | -1.67 |  |  | - A6 |  |
|  | - | - | -0.13 | +0.13 |  |  | - KQJ |  |
| $\% \mathrm{~K}$ |  | 140 | -3.53 | +3.53 |  |  | -98765 |  |
| $\%$ K |  | 140 | -3.53 | +3.53 |  |  | \% 432 |  |
| -9 |  | 140 | -3.53 | +3.53 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 K |  | 420 | -9.40 | +9.40 |  |  |  |  |

- Just one declarer, which was Dave Embleton had the courage to run their Jack of Diamonds and make their contract. Incredible play Dave.
- In true 'EuroVision Song Contest' style, 12 points will be awarded by the 'Jury', which is me, to the declarers who play the contract 'Card Perfect'.
- Lesser points will be awarded to the declarers, who were 'Nearly' Card Perfect.
- Everyone else will be awarded 'Nil Points'.


## How to expect that the defenders' cards should break

- It is not so important to memorise the percentages, but it is crucial to know which breaks are most likely.
- The following table lists the most likely and next most likely breaks of 2-8 missing cards.

| Cards | Most likely | Next likely |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | $1-152 \%$ | $2-048 \%$ |
| 3 | $2-178 \%$ | $3-0 \quad 22 \%$ |
| 4 | $3-150 \%$ | $2-241 \%$ |
| 5 | $3-268 \%$ | $4-128 \%$ |
| 6 | $4-248 \%$ | $3-336 \%$ |
| 7 | $4-362 \%$ | $5-231 \%$ |
| 8 | $5-347 \%$ | $4-433 \%$ |

> An odd number of cards usually break as evenly as possible.

An even number of cards usually do not break evenly, except in the close case of two cards.

- Using this idea, let us see how South performed on board 23.

Which Line To Take

## Board 23

South Deals
Both Vul

A A 64
$\checkmark 6$
-6532
-K 8752


West leads * Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 4 Aces and 4 Kings, so we have 8 top tricks.
What is our best chance to make our 9th trick?
If Clubs break 3-3, we will have our 9th trick.
If Diamonds break 3-3, we will have our 9th trick.
If Hearts break 4-3, we will have our 9th trick.
Clubs dividing 4-2 will be of no use to us as there are not enough entries to dummy.

Calculations:
When we are missing 6 cards in a suit, the 3-3 division is not the most likely. (36\%).
When we are missing 7 cards in a suit, the 4-3 division is the most likely. (62\%).
So we must play on the Heart suit to develop our 9th trick.
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with • Ace.
We now lead the 2 of Hearts.
When we regain the lead, we continue playing the Heart suit, to establish the 7 of Hearts for our 9th trick.

We make our contract with 2 Spade tricks, 3 Heart tricks, 2 Diamond tricks and 2 Club tricks.

A A 64

- 6
-6532
- K 8752


- Q J 108
- J 109
- 87
- Q 1096

A K 32

- AK 732
- AK 4
- A 3
- We only have time to play on one suit to establish the one extra trick that we require.
- The Club suit must divide 3-3 to give us our $9^{\text {th }}$ trick. ( $36 \%$ Chance).
- The Diamond suit must divide 3-3 to give us our 9th trick. (36\% Chance).
- The Heart suit must divide $4-3$ to give us our $9^{\text {th }}$ trick. ( $62 \%$ Chance).
- The perfect technique is to play a small Heart first, rather than play the Hearts from the top, so if the Heart suit was to divide $5-2$, we have a small chance that we can try the Club suit, without the defenders taking too many tricks.
- Note that again we do not need to remember all these percentages.
- We just need to remember that when we are missing 7 cards, the most likely division is 4-3, whereas, when we are missing 6 cards, the 3-3 division is not the most likely division.
- Let us see how our declarers got on with these calculations.

| NS | EW | Contract | Lead | Score |  | IMP |  | Which Line To Take? (Board 23) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simon Moorman \& lan Moss | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | $3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~S}$ | -Q | 630 |  | +8.40 | -8.40 |  |  |  |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}$ | -Q | 600 |  | +8.00 | -8.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}$ | -Q | 600 |  | +8.00 | -8.00 | Board 23 |  | A A64 |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}$ | - Q | 600 |  | +8.00 | -8.00 | Dealer S |  | $\checkmark 6$ |  |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}$ | - Q | 600 |  | +8.00 | -8.00 | All Vul |  | -6532 |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}$ | -Q | 600 |  | +8.00 | -8.00 |  |  | * K8752 |  |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  | - 975 |  | - QJ108 |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  | - Q854 <br> QJ109 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { J10 } \\ & \bullet 87 \end{aligned}$ |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  |  | * Q1096 |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 3NT-1 S | -Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  | - K32 <br> - AK732 |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  | AK4 |  |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  | * A3 |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | 3NT-1 S | -Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | 3NT-1 S | - Q |  | 100 | -4.60 | +4.60 |  |  |  |  |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | 3NT-2 S | -Q |  | 200 | -7.00 | +7.00 |  |  |  |  |

- The Club suit looks very tempting to try and establish, but the only way that the Club suit can be established is with an inferior probability of a 3-3 division.
- Every declarer, apart from one, set about trying to establish dummy's Club suit.
- This line of play always fails.
- Some declarers got lucky with some inferior defending and made their contract.
- Kai Eckert was the only declarer to immediately play on the Heart suit and make their contract the correct way, so the jury award Kai Douze Points.


## The 5-1 Side Suit is Good

- We have seen from the previous hand that when we have a 5-1 fit in a side suit, there is a very good chance that we can establish the $5^{\text {th }}$ card within the 5 -card suit, especially when we play in a suit contract and another suit is trumps.
- Let us pretend that South is playing in a Spade contract.
- To establish the 6 of Hearts, we would play a Heart to the Ace and ruff our 3 of Hearts.
- We would now require three more entries to dummy, to be able to ruff our 4 of Hearts, to ruff our 5 of Hearts and finally to use our 6 of Hearts as a trick.
- For this strategy to succeed, we would require the Hearts suit to divide 4-3, which is very probable as it is the most likely division, when we are missing 7 cards.
- 'Very Probable', in this case, is 62\%, which is certainly better than a finesse.
- Let us see how we can use this knowledge to good effect.

- East is under the spotlight on board 14.

Which Line To Take?

Board 14
East Deals
None Vul

A 54

- KQ 73
-87653
\& 87


South leads ~ Queen.
Initial Analysis:
1 Club loser and potentially, 1 Spade loser.
A successful Spade finesse would more or less eliminate our Spade loser.
If we could establish our 5th Heart in dummy, we could use it to discard our losing Club.
Calculations:
A successful Spade finesse is $50 \%$, however, if North held $K x x x$ in Spades, we would still lose a Spade trick.
To establish our 5th Heart in dummy, we require Hearts to divide 4-3, which is $62 \%$.
To establish our 5th Heart in dummy, we require 3 entries outside of the Heart suit.
The $\star$ King is our first entry, the * Ace is our second entry.
Where is our 3rd entry? It is in Spades.
We must reject the $50 \%$ Spade finesse and instead go for the $62 \%$ chance of the Heart suit dividing 4-3.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with *Ace.
Play a Heart to the v Ace and ruff the 5 of Hearts with the Jack.
Play a Spade to dummy's 7 of Spades, when this loses, get back to dummy, with the $\boldsymbol{*}$ King.
Ruff the 3rd round of Hearts with a high Spade.
Return to dummy with the Queen.
Ruff the 4th round of Hearts.
We still have the *Ace in dummy to get to our established $\vee$ Jack, which we use to discard our losing Club.


## Which Line to Take? Contract: 6 by East (Board 14) Lead: ©f Queen

- Thinking out our plan at trick one is so important.
- The obvious plan is to win the opening lead with the King of Clubs and take the Spade finesse.
- When we find a plan, we must always be on the lookout for a better one.
- The Spade finesse plan is not even $50 \%$ as North could be holding Kxxx of Spades.
- Playing on the Heart suit, trying to establish the $5^{\text {th }}$ Heart, only requires Hearts to divide 4-3.
- So, we give up on our $50 \%$ plan and replace it with our $62 \%$ plan.
- By giving up on our $50 \%$ trump finesse plan means that by playing towards dummy's trumps twice, we always have a trump entry to go along with our two minor suit entries.
- Let us see if any declarer spotted the $62 \%$ plan.
- (It is, in fact a $65 \%$ plan because if Hearts divide 6-1, we can revert to the Spade finesse).

| NS |  | Contract |  | Score |  | IMP |  | Which Line To Take? (Board 14) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | 6-1 E | \%Q | 50 |  | +9.80 | -9.80 |  |  |  |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 6-1 E | 4 Q | 50 |  | +9.80 | -9.80 |  |  |  |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | 6NT-1 E | \%Q | 50 |  | +9.80 | -9.80 | Board 14 <br> Dealer E |  | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & \vee \mathrm{KQ} 73 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | 6a-1 E | \%Q | 50 |  | +9.80 | -9.80 | Dealer E <br> None Vul |  | $87653$ |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | $44+1 E$ | \%Q |  | 450 | +0.87 | -0.87 |  |  | \& 87 |  |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | $44+1 \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ Q |  | 450 | +0.87 | -0.87 |  | - Q7 |  | - AJ109832 |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | $44+1$ E | \%Q |  | 450 | +0.87 | -0.87 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ1065 } \\ & \text { AJ } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & \bullet Q \end{aligned}$ |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | 44+1E | \%Q |  | 450 | +0.87 | -0.87 |  | \% K654 |  | * A32 |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | $3 N T+2 \mathrm{~W}$ | -5 |  | 460 | +0.87 | -0.87 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \wedge \text { K6 } \\ & \vee 982 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | $4 \mathrm{~A}+2 \mathrm{E}$ | $\%$ Q |  | 480 | +0.40 | -0.40 |  |  | $\text { - } 10942$ |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | $4 \mathrm{H}+2 \mathrm{E}$ | $\checkmark 8$ |  | 480 | +0.40 | -0.40 |  |  | * QJ109 |  |
| Simon Moorman \& Ian Moss | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | $6 \Delta=E$ | \%Q |  | 980 | -8.87 | +8.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | $6 \pm=E$ | $\%$ Q |  | 980 | -8.87 | +8.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | $6 \Delta=E$ | $\%$ Q |  | 980 | -8.87 | +8.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | $64=E$ | $\%$ Q |  | 980 | -8.87 | +8.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | $64=E$ | \%Q |  | 980 | -8.87 | +8.87 |  |  |  |  |

- It was good to see so many pairs in the excellent contract of 6 Spades.
- This was a difficult board, so the two ladies who found the amazingly play of trying to set up dummy's Hearts, by sacrificing their Spade trick deserve more than 12 points.
- The two ladies who were 'Card Perfect' were Dido Coley and Audrey Hartley.
- Well done to both.
- Meanwhile, Brian Davies was also 'Card Perfect', however, his bidding was not up to his card play and Brian was only in a 4 Spade contract, however, for showing perfect technique, Brian is awarded 8 Points.


## The 6-1 Side Suit is Even Better

- We have seen from the previous hand that when we have a 5-1 fit in a side suit, there is a very good chance that we can establish the $5^{\text {th }}$ card within the 5 -card suit.
- Just imagine if we had a 6-1 fit in a side suit, then there is every chance that we can establish 2 or 3 extra tricks.
- To establish 2 extra tricks, we would require the suit to divide either $3-3$ or $4-2$, which is $36 \%+48 \%=84 \%$.
- However, as always, the question is: Are we going to have enough entries to reach our established tricks?
- Let us see whether North had enough imagination on board 8 to try and establish their 6-card side suit.


Which Line To Take?

## Board 8

West Deals
None Vul

A A K 1032

- AJ 1098
- Q
- A 4


East leads $\stackrel{\circ}{ }$ Jack.
Initial Analysis:
Potentially we have a Spade loser and potentially we have a Heart loser.
If we play the Ace and King of Spades, the Queen may drop and we make our contract.
If it turns out that we have a Spade loser, then there is a chance that the Diamond suit will generate us enough discards to eliminate all of our Heart losers.
If Diamonds divide 3-3, we have five discards to more than eliminate our losing Hearts.
Even if Diamonds divide 4-2, we have four discards, which we can use to eliminate our losing
Hearts.
Calculations:
The chances of Diamonds dividing 3-3 or 4-2 is extremely high (84\%).
The problem is that when Diamonds divide 4-2 (A 48\% Chance), we require 2 entries into dummy and we only have one, which is when we ruff our Club.
Can we find a second entry into dummy to establish our Diamonds?
If we reject the idea of trying to drop a doubleton ^ Queen (Only a 40\% Chance), we have a second Spade entry, if we play towards dummy's Spade suit twice.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with * Ace and we lay down the $\uparrow$ Ace and $\bullet$ Queen.
We play a Spade to dummy's ^ Jack and at some stage, we will play a Spade to dummy's 9 and
set up dummy's Diamonds and we still have a Club ruff to enter to our established Diamond suit.
We discard our 4 losing Hearts on our 4 established winning Diamonds.

A AK 1032

- AJ1098
- Q
- A 4

```
4.8
* 632
-9865
* K6532
```



```
- Q 76
- K 74
- J 10
- J 10987
- K 6532
A J 954
```


## ${ }^{18}$

```
12 AK7432
\(\div\) Q
```


## Which Line to Take? (Board 8)

## Contract: 6 by North Lead: Jack

- If the previous board was difficult, then this one was ultra difficult.
- However, it is very similar in that we must sacrifice a trump trick to generate an extra entry to our long suit in dummy.
- Let us see how everyone got on.


| NS | EW | Contract | Lead | Score |  |  |  | Which Line To Take? (Board 8) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $6 \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{N}$ | - J | 980 |  | +12.93 | -12.93 |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | $6 \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{N}$ | \% J | 980 |  | +12.93 | -12.93 |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | $4 \mathrm{n}+1 \mathrm{~N}$ | \% J | 450 |  | +8.13 | -8.13 |  |  |  |  |
| Simon Moorman \& lan Moss | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 6-1 N | - J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 | Dealer W |  | - AJ1098 |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 | None Vul |  | - Q |  |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 6-1N | *J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | \% A4 |  |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | 6-1N | *J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | - 8 |  | - Q76 |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | $\checkmark 632$ |  | - K74 |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | - 9865 |  | - J10 |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | \& K6532 |  | \& J10987 |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | - J954 |  |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \bullet \text { Q5 } \\ & \text { AK7432 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | 7-2N | \% J |  | 100 | -3.93 | +3.93 |  |  |  |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | 6-3N | \% J |  | 150 | -5.13 | +5.13 |  |  |  |  |

- First the good news: There were some good bidding sequences to arrive at an excellent 6 Spade contract.
- The unfortunate news is that everyone either tried to drop the Queen of Spades or took the unsuccessful Heart finesse. (Or Both).
- But not to worry, as I considered this hand to be the most difficult in the event.
- In summary:
- Be prepared to sacrifice a $50 \%$ finesse in exchange for generating an extra entry into dummy, which would result in increasing the probability of making the contract.


## Finesse Patterns

- One of the first finesse patterns that we encounter as a 'Declarer Student' is this one:
- The student learns that the correct strategy, in isolation, is to play a Spade towards the Queen of Spades, hoping that West is holding the King of Spades.
- This has a $50 \%$ chance of success.

- Another finesse pattern is this one:
- The strategy is to lead low towards the 10 and when this loses, lead low towards the Jack.
- We will win two tricks if West holds at least one of the missing honours.
- The 'Real Life' mathematicians would say that this is a $75 \%$ chance of success. (1 of 2 Finesses).
- However, what happens in 'Real Life', does not always happen at the bridge table and a 'Bridge


| X | X | X | X |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Mathematician', would say that because of 'Vacant Spaces', it is a $76 \%$ chance that we will win two tricks.

## Finesse Patterns

- Whether it is $75 \%$ or $76 \%$, it does not matter, because either way it is a very good strategy to give declarer an extra trick.
- The slight problem is that, for the strategy to be implemented, we do require to be able to lead twice from the South hand.

- Let us now look at some hands, where declarer must be very careful on how they implement this strategy.

- The first hand we shall look at is board 19, where South is under the spotlight.



# One of Two Finesses 

Board 19
South Deals
E-W Vul

- Q 653
$\bullet 94$
- 542
- A 752

A 42

- Q3 2
- QJ 1093
- 103
${ }^{6} 4$ 21
- J 109

AKJ 8

- AK

AK 87 - 10765 - 876 - J9 4

K Q 86
North South
2 NT
3. 3 •

3 - 3 NT
Pass
West leads • Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 7 top tricks and there is every chance that the Club suit will give us our 8th trick. We can certainly knock out the Ace and King of Spades, which will give us our 9 tricks, but do we have enough time to do this?
The most likely Diamond division is $5-3$, so by the time we have knocked out the Ace and King of Spades, the defence would have taken their 5 tricks.

We need a better plan.
We can take the Heart finesse, which is a $50 \%$ chance.
However, nicely disguised within the Heart suit is our 76\% chance finesse pattern.

## Calculations:

If we are able to lead Hearts twice from the North hand, we will make our extra trick, providing East has either the Queen or 10 of Hearts. This gives rise to a $76 \%$ chance of success.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with * Ace.
Play the $\approx$ King and $\approx$ Queen.
Lead the 8 of Clubs to dummy's $\boldsymbol{*}$ Ace and run the 9 of Hearts.
When we regain the lead, if necessary, lead our 6 of Clubs to dummy's 7 of Clubs and take

One of Two Finesses Contract: 3 NT by South (Board 19) Lead: $\downarrow$ Queen

- As we can see from this hand, the 'One of Two Finesses' pattern can easily be missed.
- Note that it is essential that we can generate two entries to North, the dummy hand.
- This is why we must first cash the King and Queen of Clubs, so that we know that we are able to enter dummy twice, once via the Ace of Clubs and the second time via the 7 of Clubs, providing that we have used our 8 of Clubs to get to our Ace of Clubs.
- If after cashing the King and Queen of Clubs, the Club suit is seen to be dividing 4-1, we would have no choice but to play on the Spade suit and hope that the Diamond suit divided 4-4 (33\% Chance).
- Let us see our declarers in action on this board.

| NS EW |  |  |  | Score |  | IMP |  | One of Two Finesses (Board 19) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $6 \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{N}$ | - J | 980 |  | +12.93 | -12.93 |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | $6 \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{N}$ | \% J | 980 |  | +12.93 | -12.93 |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | $4 \mathrm{+}+1 \mathrm{~N}$ | \% J | 450 |  | +8.13 | -8.13 | Board 19 <br> Dealer S <br> EW Vul |  |  |  |
| Simon Moorman \& lan Moss | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 6-1 N | - J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A42 } \\ & \text { Q32 } \\ & \text { QJ1093 } \\ & \div 103 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K87 } \\ & \vee 10765 \\ & * 876 \\ & * \mathrm{~J} 94 \end{aligned}$ |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | $\vee 94$ |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | - 542 |  |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  | \% A 752 |  |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | 6-1 N | $\% \mathrm{~J}$ |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | - J109 |  |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | - AKJ8 |  |  |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AK } \\ & * K Q 86 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | 6-1 N | \% J |  | 50 | -2.27 | +2.27 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | 7-2N | \% J |  | 100 | -3.93 | +3.93 |  |  |  |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | 6-3N | $\% \mathrm{~J}$ |  | 150 | -5.13 | +5.13 |  |  |  |  |

- We have 4 declarers who spotted that there was a double finesse available in the Heart suit.
- They also played the Club suit correctly, generating the two necessary entries into dummy.
- They were:
- Elizabeth Gahan

Brian Sharkey
Thomas Bradkin
Borje Dahlberg

They are all awarded 12 points from the jury.

## One of Two Finesses Strategy

- Up to now, when we have used the 'One of Two Finesses' strategy, we have used the same suit for both of our finesses.
- This does not always need to be the case.
- In this layout, if we were first to take the Spade finesse and then subsequently take the Heart finesse, the same $76 \%$ chance of successfully making an extra trick still exists.
- $A Q$
- AQ
-     - 

$\because-$


- 32
- 32
-     - 

: -

- AQ
- 32
- If, however, this was the layout and again we first took the Spade finesse and then subsequently took the Heart finesse, the chance of successfully making an extra trick is now $74 \%$.
- The reason being that we are taking the finesse against different defenders. (Law of Vacant Spaces).
- Let us see this strategy in action on board 10, where East is under the spotlight.

One of Two Finesses

## Board 10

East Deals
Both Vul

A J 1087

- Q 94
- K 765
- K 8


West leads v 6
Initial Analysis:
After the Heart lead, we have just 6 top tricks.
The good news is that a successful Club OR Diamond finesse will give us our 3 extra tricks.
Which finesse do we take first or can we take both finesses?
Calculations:
If we could take both finesses our chance of successfully making our extra 3 tricks is $74 \%$. (Finessing against two different defenders).

The problem is that if we take the Club finesse first and North wins, the defence will quickly take their 5 tricks and defeat our contract.

We must take the Diamond finesse first, because if this loses our vulnerable J 5 of Hearts holding is protected.

Conclusion:

We win the opening lead with the $\vee$ King.
Play a Club to the $\div$ Ace and run the 9 of Diamonds, carefully playing the 8 of Diamonds from the East hand.
Now run the Jack of Diamonds again carefully playing the 10 of Diamonds, so that we stay in dummy, so that we can repeat the Diamond finesse for the third time.

We end up making our 9 tricks via 3 Spades, 1 Heart, 4 Diamonds and 1 Club.

* Q 76
- 532
    - A 10862
    - 3
    - 5432


## Contract: 3 NT by East

## Finesses Strategy Lead: 6

- You are probably wondering why this is called 'One of Two Finesses', when we did not even take the Club finesse.
- We are going to take the Club finesse as our second finesse, later.
- i.e. If our Diamond finesse had failed, South is unable to continue the Heart suit, as our Jack of Hearts is protected and if South was to continue, this would give us our $9^{\text {th }}$ trick.
- So, assuming South comes back a Spade, we now take our 'Club Finesse', i.e. hoping that the King of Clubs is with South.
- There is also the additional problem with the Diamond suit.
- When we play the Diamond suit, we must either run the Jack of Diamonds, dropping our 10 underneath or run the 9 of Diamonds. This will ensure that we are able to remain in dummy after the second round of Diamonds, which is essential, if North holds a 4 card Diamond suit.
- How many declarers will spot the dangers on this hand?

| NS |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 |  |
| Mariana | Al |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Be |
| Simon Moorman \& Ian Moss | Ly |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | St |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth |  |
| Gahan |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Si |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Di |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Br |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Ar |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro |  |
| Campos | M |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Gr |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | G |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | M |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | C |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta |  |
| Nogueira | Al |

EW
IMP
.

- Three declarers, namely, Monica Mele, Colin Peden and Audrey Hartley were 'Card Perfect' on this deal, so they are awarded the top award of 12 Points.
- Four other declarers, namely Alan Bryant, Angeliki Politou, Gemma Fewster and George Vede, all correctly played a Club to dummy's Ace at trick 2, but then unfortunately, ran dummy's Jack of Diamonds and forgot to play their 10 of Diamonds underneath, so these declarers, who have got it half correct, are awarded 6 Points.


## One of Two Finesses Strategy

- As we have seen already, one of the criteria that needs to exist for a 'One of Two Finesses' strategy is that we have two entries to the hand that we are leading from to take our two finesses.
- Drastic action is sometimes required to generate those two entries.
- Let us see this idea on play on Board 15 , where West is under the spotlight.


## One of Two Finesses

## Board 15

South Deals
N-S Vul

A J 932

- QJ 109
- J 9
- K 54


North leads $\vee$ Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks and surely with a combined 27 count, we can find 1 extra trick?
If Diamonds divide 3-3, we have our 9th trick.
The Club pattern looks promising, if we could get to dummy twice.
Calculations:
Diamonds dividing 3-3 is only a $36 \%$ chance as it is not the mostly likely division, when we are missing 6 cards. (The 4-2 break is more likely at 48\%).

If we could get to dummy to lead Clubs twice, there is a $76 \%$ chance that we will make 3 tricks in Clubs, by using the 'One of Two Finesses' strategy, but how are we going to get to dummy twice?

Conclusion:
We duck a couple of rounds of Hearts and take the third round with the v Ace.
Now play a Diamond to the $\bullet$ Queen.
Run the $\because$ Jack and when North wins this and cashes their Heart, discard our small Spade and win their Spade continuation with the $\uparrow$ Ace,
Now lead the * King and overtake it with dummy's * Ace.
Now run the 10 of Clubs and subsequently the 9 of Clubs.
We end up making 3 Spade tricks, 1 Heart trick, 2 Diamond tricks and 3 Club tricks.

## One of Two Finesses Contract: 3 NT by West

 Strategy (Board 15) Lead: Queen- Note that the first thing that we must do, is to duck the first two rounds of Hearts.
- By doing this, we discover that the defenders can only cash 3 Heart tricks.
- This means that we can afford to lose one more trick, outside of the Heart suit.
- This sets up the opportunity to implement our 'One of Two Finesses' strategy in the Club suit.
- At first glance, it looks as if we have wasted a trick in the Diamond suit, when we overtake our King of Diamonds with dummy's Ace of Diamonds.
- However, although we collect one less Diamond trick, we win two extra Club tricks, which seems to be a good investment to me.
- Let us see if any of our declarers had the imagination to sacrifice the King of Diamonds for two extra Club tricks.

| NS | EW | Contract | Lead | Score |  | IMP |  | One of Two Finesses (Board 15) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | 3NT-2 W | $\checkmark$ Q | 100 |  | +6.80 | -6.80 |  |  |  |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | 3NT-1 W | $\bullet$ Q | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 | Board 15 |  | - J932 |  |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | 3NT-1 W | $\checkmark$ | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 | Dealer S |  | - QJ109 |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | 3NT-1 E | $\checkmark 2$ | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 3NT-1 W | - Q | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  | - AKQ4 |  | - 85 |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | 3NT-1 W | $\bullet$ Q | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  | - A73 |  | $\checkmark 654$ |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | 3NT-1 W | Q | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  | - K6 |  | - AQ872 |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 3NT-1 W | - Q | 50 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  | * A832 |  | \& J109 |
| Simon Moorman \& Ian Moss | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}$ | - Q |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  | $1076$ |  |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 3NT $=$ W | $\checkmark$ |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  | $10543$ |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | $3 N T=W$ | $\bullet$ Q |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  | * Q76 |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | 3NT= W | $\bullet$ Q |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  |  |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $3 N T=W$ | - |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | $3 N T=W$ | - ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  |  |  |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | $3 N T=W$ | - Q |  | 400 | -5.33 | +5.33 |  |  |  |  |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | $3 N T+1 \mathrm{E}$ | -3 |  | 430 | -5.87 | +5.87 |  |  |  |  |

- One absolutely 'Superhero' on this board and that was Dave Embleton, who was the only declarer to overtake their King of Diamonds with dummy's Ace of Diamonds, enabling him to be able to take two Club finesses.
- 12 Points are awarded to Dave.


## One of Two Finesses Strategy

- If that wasn't dramatic enough, let us look at board 9, where even more drastic action is required to obtain our two entries into dummy.
- North is under the spotlight on this one.


## Double Entry Bookkeeping

| General Journal |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Date | Details | A/C \# | Debit (Dr) | Credit (Cr) |  |
| 1 May 2018 | Cash |  | 301 | 10,000 |  |
|  | Sales |  | 401 |  |  |
| Sale of Inventory |  |  |  |  |  |

## One of Two Finesses

## Board 9

A A 72
North Deals

- A 75

E-W Vul
-A Q 1082
$\because \mathrm{A}$ Q


East leads • Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 7 top tricks.
Prospects look good as all we require is for the Club suit to divide 3-2.
Another source of extra tricks on this hand is the Diamond suit, as we have a 'One of Two Finesses' strategy available.

Calculations:
Clubs to divide 3-2 is a $68 \%$ chance and this will give us an extra 3 tricks.
Leading Diamonds twice from the South hand gives us a $76 \%$ chance of an extra 3 tricks.
Maybe we can use both strategies?
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the $\vee$ Ace.
Play the $\because$ Ace and then play the $\because$ Queen and overtake the $\because$ Queen with the $\div$ King.
If both defenders follow to the 2 nd round of Clubs, we know that the Club suit divides 3-2, so we can play a third round of Clubs, knowing that we still have the $\vee$ King as an entry to our Clubs, so we would end up making 5 Club tricks, 1 Spade trick, 2 Heart tricks and 1 Diamond trick.

However, when the Club suit does not divide kindly, we are in the perfect position to use our backup plan of taking 2 finesses in the Diamond suit, to make 2 Club tricks, 4 Diamond tricks, 2
Heart tricks and 1 Spade trick.

```
One of Two Finesses Contract: 3 NT by North
Strategy (Board 9) Lead: \ Queen
```

- It is certainly not easy to sacrifice a trick, but when it creates extra chances, it is worth it.
- Let us see if any declarer sacrificed their Queen by overtaking their Queen of Clubs with dummy's King of Clubs.


| NS | EW | Contract | Lead | Score |  | IMP |  | One of Two Finesses (Board 9) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | $3 N T+1$ N | $\bullet$ Q | 430 |  | +7.33 | -7.33 |  |  |  |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | $3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~N}$ | - | 430 |  | +7.33 | -7.33 |  |  |  |
| Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 5 C | $\bullet$ Q | 400 |  | +6.93 | -6.93 |  |  |  |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}$ | - Q | 400 |  | +6.93 | -6.93 | Board 9 |  | - A72 |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | $3 N T=N$ | - | 400 |  | +6.93 | -6.93 | Dealer N <br> EW Vul |  |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | $3 N T=N$ | - Q | 400 |  | +6.93 | -6.93 |  |  |  |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | 4NT-1 N | $\bullet$ Q |  | 50 | -3.20 | +3.20 |  | - Q1086543 | -K |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 3NT-1 S | $\uparrow 6$ |  | 50 | -3.20 | +3.20 |  | - 642 | QJ1098 |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | 3NT-1 N | - Q |  | 50 | -3.20 | +3.20 |  | - J6 | - K54 |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | 5\%-1 S | -10 |  | 50 | -3.20 | +3.20 |  | $\% 1$ | - J9 |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | 6\%-1 N | - Q |  | 50 | -3.20 | +3.20 |  |  | $\checkmark$ K3 |
| Simon Moorman \& lan Moss | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | 3NT-2 N | - Q |  | 100 | -4.87 | +4.87 |  |  | - 973 |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | 3NT-2 N | $\checkmark$ J |  | 100 | -4.87 | +4.87 |  |  | \% K76543 |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | 3NT-2 N | Q |  | 100 | -4.87 | +4.87 |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | 3NT-2 N | - Q |  | 100 | -4.87 | +4.87 |  |  |  |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 3NT-4 S | -6 |  | 200 | -6.93 | +6.93 |  |  |  |

- Holden Clark was the only declarer to be in the correct contract and to find the card perfect line of overtaking their Queen of Clubs with dummy's King of Clubs, so 12 Points to Holden.
- Spare a thought for Imogen La Chapelle, who also found this line, but unfortunately was in the contract of 4NT and therefore went one off, but 6 Points to Imogen.
- Two declarers, namely, Alberto Marinho Leite and Maks Blicharz have obviously become 'Obsessed' with using the 'One of Two Finesses' strategy at every opportunity, as they embarked on taking two Diamond finesses before they tested the Club suit.
- This is a very strong line, however, every now and again, both Diamonds will be offside and if that had been the case on this hand, they would have gone down, when potentially, Clubs could have been 3-2 all along, but 6 Points for Alberto and Maks for finding a line, which is better than just playing for Clubs to divide 3-2.


## One of Two Finesses Strategy

- Talking of being obsessed with the 'One of Two Finesses' strategy, just because we can see two finesses on a board, it doesn't mean that we must take them.
- As I have mentioned already, when we find a plan, we must look again to see if there is a better plan.
- On the next board, which is board 3, there are certainly two finesses available, but are there any better plans?
- South is the one who is under the spotlight on this board.


## One of Two Finesses

## Board 3

South Deals
E-W Vul
-A Q

- Q 109
- 764
-87543


West leads • King.

Initial Analysis:
We have 9 top tricks, so just one more trick is required.
We have two black suit finesses available plus we have a long Club suit in dummy.
Calculations:
To draw trumps and take the Club finesse followed by the Spade finesse is a 'One of Two Finesses' strategy, however, because we are finessing against two different defenders, this equates to a $74 \%$ chance that we will get our extra trick.

Trying to establish our 5th Club in dummy requires either a 3-3 or 4-2 division in the Club suit. The 3-3 break is a $36 \%$ chance and the $4-2$ break is a $48 \%$ chance, so the total chance of success is $84 \%$.

We should reject the 'One of Two Finesses' strategy (74\% Chance), and instead use the 84\% strategy, which is to establish dummy's 5th Club.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the * Ace.
Play a Heart to the 9 of Hearts.
Play a Club to the $\because$ Ace and then play the $\because$ Queen
When the defenders play a Spade, go up with the \& Ace.
Now ruff the 3rd round of Clubs with the $\vee$ Ace and play a Heart to the 10 of Hearts.
Ruff the 4th round of Clubs with the $v$ King and play a Heart to the $v$ Queen.
We can now cash our 8 of Clubs, which gives us 6 Heart tricks, 2 Club tricks, 1 Spade trick and 1
Diamond trick.

```
    A A Q
- This hand demonstrates how powerful a 5-2 side suit fit is.
- To set up that \(5^{\text {th }}\) card is an \(84 \%\) chance, which is better than our 'One in Two Finesses' strategy.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NS & EW & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Contract} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{One of Two Finesses (Board 3)}} \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & \(4 V=S\) & - K & 420 & & +9.33 & -9.33 & & & & \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & \(4 \nu=S\) & - K & 420 & & +9.33 & -9.33 & \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Board 3 \\
Dealer S \\
EW Vul
\end{tabular}} & & & \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& Ian Moss & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & 4v-1 S & -K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & 4V-1 S & -K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & \[
\bullet \text { Q109 }
\] & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 4V-1 S & - K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & \[
\rightarrow 764
\] & \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & 4V-1 S & - K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{- 1863 \% 87543} & - K10742 \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(4 \vee-1 \mathrm{~N}\) & \%J & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & \(\bullet 754\) & & - 8 \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & 4V-1 S & * K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & -KQJ10 & & - 982 \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & 4V-1 S & -K & & 50 & \(-1.33\) & +1.33 & & \& K6 & & \& J 1092 \\
\hline Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & 4V-1 S & -K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & 4 95 & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & 4v-1 S & -K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & - AKJ632 & \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & 4V-1 S & * K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & - A53 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & 4V-1 S & * K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & \% AQ & \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & 4V-1 S & * K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & & \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & 4v-1 S & - K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & & \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & 4v-1 S & -K & & 50 & -1.33 & +1.33 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- This is a very good example how planning at trick one is so important.
- When dummy goes down and one extra trick is required, there is just one thing that should be on declarer's mind and that is how are we going to set up the \(5^{\text {th }}\) Club in dummy.
- If we have 3 entries outside of Clubs, we will always be able to set up the \(5^{\text {th }}\) Club.
- We have 4 entries, so we can first test that Hearts are not 4-0, but after that, it is just a matter of playing the Clubs from the top and setting up that \(5^{\text {th }}\) Club.
- Apart from Issac Stone, who refused the Club finesse at trick, when East led the Jack of Clubs, every declarer took the Club finesse.
- Unfortunately for Issac, having refused the finesse, drew too many trumps.
- The key is to draw the trumps at the correct time, using them as entries to dummy.
- This strategy can only be calculated in the 'Thinking Time' at trick one.

\section*{Combining Our Chances}
- In most contracts, there are several plans available to declarer.
- On the boards so far, declarer's dilemma has been to try and evaluate which one plan they should be using. Ideally the one which gives them the best chance of making the contract.
- These plans can involve finessing or maybe trying to drop honours etc.
- The 'Finesse Plans' are simple to calculate, because as we know, a simple finesse has a \(50 \%\) chance of being successful.
- The 'Trying to Drop an Honour Plans' are not so easy to calculate as this chart shows:

\section*{DROP Missing Honors}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\%} & H & Hx & Hxx & TOT \\
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{Honor Drop Missing:} & 8 & 0.4 & 4 & 18 & 22.4 \\
\hline & 7 & 1 & 9 & 27 & 37 \\
\hline & 6 & 2.4 & 16 & 36 & 54.4 \\
\hline & 5 & 6 & 27 & 41 & 74 \\
\hline & 4 & 12 & 41 & 37 & 90 \\
\hline & 3 & 26 & 52 & 22 & 100 \\
\hline & 2 & 52 & 48 & & 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

So, for Example, if we are missing 6 cards and say, one honour, the chances of that honour being a 'Doubleton Honour' is \(16 \%\).

\section*{Combining Our Chances}
- The good news is that we really do not need to commit all those numbers to memory.
- Sometimes, declarer has the luxury of being able to try more than one plan on one hand.
- The problem with a 'Finesse Plan' is that if the finesse loses, it usually means that the defence will take the lead and defeat our contract, so if we have two plans and one of them involves finessing, we leave the 'Finesse Plan' to last.
- Let us see this idea in action on board 18, where East is under the spotlight.


\section*{Combining Our Chances}

Board 18
East Deals
N-S Vul
- J 1098
- K 842
- 1095
* 64
- Q764
- 53
-K863
* K 52


\section*{N \\ N}
- 32
- QJ1097
- Q4

A 6
A
A A 82
- Q 1097

West East
2 NT
\(3 \% \quad 3 \mathrm{NT}\)
Pass
South leads v Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks, so just one more trick is required.
If the Spade suit divides 3-3, we have our 9th trick.
If the Club finesse is successful we have our 9th trick.
If the Diamond finesse is successful, we have our 9th trick.
If the Queen of Clubs is doubleton, we have our 9th trick.
If the Queen of Diamonds is doubleton, we have our 9th trick.
How can we combine all these chances, without losing a trick?

\section*{Calculations:}

We can perform the following tests, without losing the lead.
We can test the Spade suit for dividing 3-3 ( \(36 \%\) chance).
We can test the Club suit for the \& Queen being a doubleton ( \(16 \%\) chance).
We can test the Diamond suit for the - Queen being a doubleton ( \(27 \%\) chance).
We can finesse for the Queen in either Minor suit ( \(50 \%\) chance), but we risk losing the lead.
We must play the minor suit that offers us the best chance of dropping a doubleton Queen and then we take the finesse in the other minor suit.

Conclusion:
We win the 2nd trick with the v Ace.
Play 3 rounds of Spades.
Play the \(\bullet\) King and \(\bullet\) Ace.
When the * Queen drops, we make our contract.
If the \(\bullet\) Queen had not dropped, then we would have taken the Club finesse.
```

A J 109 8

- K 842
- 1095
Combining
Contract: 3 NT by East
$\stackrel{64}{ }$
- Q 764
$\bullet 53$
-K863

```

```

- AK 5 - A 6
-AJ72
$\div$ K 52
- A J 83
Chances
Lead: $\mathcal{V}$ Queen
(Board 18)
$\begin{array}{ll} & \text { ~32 } \\ 8_{8}{ }^{2} 21 & \text { QJ } 1097 \\ & \text { Q4 } \\ & \text { Q Q } 1097\end{array}$

```
- Let us see who tried to drop a doubleton Queen of Diamonds, before trying the Club finesse.

\section*{you dropped this}

QUEEN
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{NS EW} & Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Combining Chances (Board 18)}} \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & 3NT-2 E & - Q & 100 & & +6.67 & -6.67 & & & & \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & 3NT-2 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 100 & & +6.67 & -6.67 & & & & \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & 3NT-1 E & \(\checkmark\) & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & & & & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Board 18 \\
Dealer E
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { • J1098 } \\
& \sim \text { K842 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & NS Vul & & - 1095 & \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & 3NT-1 E & - Q & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & & & \% 64 & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & & - Q764 & & - AK5 \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +5.27 & -5.27 & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \vee 3 \\
& \text { K863 }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \begin{tabular}{l}
- A6 \\
- AJ72
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & \(3 N T=E\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 400 & -4.60 & +4.60 & & \% K52 & & \% AJ83 \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 430 & -5.13 & +5.13 & & & - 32 & \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 430 & -5.13 & +5.13 & & & - QJ1097 & \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 430 & -5.13 & +5.13 & & & - Q4 & \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 430 & -5.13 & +5.13 & & & \& Q1097 & \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & \(3 N T+3\) E & \(\bullet\) Q & & 490 & -6.60 & +6.60 & & & & \\
\hline Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & \(3 N T+3 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 490 & -6.60 & +6.60 & & & & \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & \(3 N T+3 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 490 & -6.60 & +6.60 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- The 'Good News' is that every declarer first tried the Spade suit.
- At this stage half of our declarers took the Club finesse and the other half played to drop the Queen doubleton Diamond.
- Well done to: Audrey Hartley, Graham Randall, Susan Thorburn, Dido Coley, Angeliki Politou, Jim Kenneally, Monica Mele and Brian Davies, who are all awarded 12 Points.

\section*{Combining our Chances}
- The Queen is not the only honour that can be dropped.
- Singleton Kings can be dropped as well.
- If we are missing 3 cards in a suit, one of which is the King, in isolation, the finesse of the King is certainly favoured.
- Trying to drop a singleton King, when we are missing 3 cards, looking at our chart, is only a \(26 \%\) chance and that is why we prefer the \(50 \%\) finesse option.
- If that is the case, why would we ever want to attempt to drop a singleton King, when we are missing 3 cards in the suit?
- Let us look at this idea in action on board 21, where North is under the spotlight.

DROP Missing Honors
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \% & H & Hx & Hxx & TOT \\
\hline \multirow[t]{7}{*}{} & 8 & 0.4 & 4 & 18 & 22.4 \\
\hline & 7 & 1 & 9 & 27 & 37 \\
\hline & 6 & 2.4 & 16 & 36 & 54.4 \\
\hline & 5 & 6 & 27 & 41 & 74 \\
\hline & 4 & 12 & 41 & 37 & 90 \\
\hline & 3 & 26 & 52 & 22 & 100 \\
\hline & 2 & 52 & 48 & & 100 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Combining Our Chances

\section*{Board 21}

North Deals N-S Vul
- 1098
- Q J 1098
- K Q
- A Q 10


East leads ^King.
Initial Analysis:
After the \(\uparrow\) King lead, we appear to have 2 Spades to lose and the * Ace to lose.
The only other potential loser that we have is the \(\vee\) King.
We can eliminate our potential Heart loser by taking a successful Heart finesse.
We could take a Club finesse, which, if successful, would allow us to discard one of our Spade losers.

Calculations:
We can take the Club finesse, which is a \(50 \%\) chance and if the finesse wins, then we can discard one of our Spade losers.
We can cross over to the Ace of Clubs and take the Heart finesse, which is also a \(50 \%\) chance.
We can lay down our Ace of Hearts and try to drop a singleton \(\vee\) King, which is a \(26 \%\) chance.
If we immediately take one of the finesses, we are 'Putting All Our Eggs in One Basket', because if the finesse loses, the defence will quickly take their 4 tricks.

We can increase our chances of success by combining our strategy of trying to drop the singleton \(\checkmark\) King with the taking of the Club finesse.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the \(\wedge\) Ace.
Lay down the \(\vee\) Ace and if this fails to drop the singleton \(\vee\) King, we take the Club finesse.


\section*{Combining our \\ Chances (Board 21) Lead: King}
- The simple rule is that when we have two plans, one involving a finesse and one involving the idea of trying to drop an honour, we try to drop the honour first and if we have a choice, of suits, where an honour can be dropped, we attempt to drop the honour in the suit that we hold the most cards in.
- Both the Club and Heart finesses have the same chance of succeeding, however trying to drop the singleton King of Hearts is a thousand times more likely than trying to drop the singleton King of Clubs and that is why we attempt to try and drop the singleton King of Hearts and when that fails, we attempt the Club finesse.

NS
Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182
Mariana
Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen
Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth
Gahan
peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey
Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin
Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall
Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg
Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray
Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone
Simon Moorman \& lan Moss
Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper
Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal
Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta
Nogueira
71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro
Campos
Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins
Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline , & - & - & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(4 v+1 \mathrm{~N}\) & \(\checkmark 2\) & 650 & & +7.33 & -7.33 \\
\hline Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & \(4 \mathrm{~V}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & \(4 V=N\) & * K & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Graham Randall \& jayne randall & \(4 V=N\) & * K & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Sally Allen \& John Pioli & \(4 V=N\) & AK & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & \(4 V=N\) & AK & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(4 V=N\) & - K & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & \(4 V=N\) & - K & 620 & & +6.40 & -6.40 \\
\hline Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & \(1 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~N}\) & \%6 & 120 & & -2.87 & +2.87 \\
\hline Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & 4V-1 N & - K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline George Vede \& Maureen Vede & 4V-1 N & - K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & 4V-1 N & - K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & \(4 \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{~N}\) & * K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & 4V-1 N & * K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & \(4 \mathrm{~V}-1 \mathrm{~N}\) & * K & & 100 & -6.53 & +6.53 \\
\hline Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & \(6 v-3 N\) & - K & & 300 & -10.07 & +10.07 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Combining our Chances (Board 21)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{12}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Board 21 \\
Dealer N \\
NS Vul
\end{tabular}} & & - 1098 & \\
\hline & & - QJ1098 & \\
\hline & & - KQ & \\
\hline & & \& AQ10 & \\
\hline & \multirow[t]{8}{*}{\[
\]} & & ^ KQJ5 \\
\hline & & & \(\checkmark 2\) \\
\hline & & & - 765 \\
\hline & & & * J8762 \\
\hline & & - A76 & \\
\hline & & \(\checkmark\) A7654 & \\
\hline & & - J1098 & \\
\hline & & *9 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

oard 21 ^1098

* QJ1098
*KQ
* AQ10
*

```

```

A A76
*9

```

\section*{Combining our Chances}
- When dummy goes down, quite often, declarer sees a plan involving a finesse, which, if the finesse was to succeed would instantly result in the contract making.
- It is very tempting for declarer to 'Put All Their Eggs In One Basket' and immediately take that finesse, knowing that the hand will be over very quickly, with a successful outcome, if the finesse was to succeed.
- The thing about this type of plan is that there is no rush to action it. That same finesse will be available right throughout the hand.
- If there is no imminent danger that the defenders can instantly defeat our contract, we should look for an additional plan. If that additional plan fails, then we can always fall back to our 'Finesse Plan'.
- Let us see this idea in action on board 7, where West is under the spotlight.


\title{
Combining Our Chances
}

Board 7
South Deals
Both Vul
- 1065
- J 1098
-A J9 8
* K 4
- K 97

AK
- Q 10654
- 1098
- Q J 82
- Q 6432
- 7
- 653

West East
1 NT 3 NT
Pass

North leads v Jack.
Initial Analysis:
We have just 5 top tricks and we require an additional 4 tricks.
There is the obvious Club finesse, which if successful, would give us those 4 additional tricks.
With some 'Guessing', the Diamond suit could also give us those 4 additional tricks.
Another idea is to try and 'Sneak' through one Diamond trick and having secured our 1 Diamond trick, we can now play the Club suit, knowing that we can afford to lose a Club trick.

It must be correct to play the Diamond suit first, because even if we 'Guess' wrong and we lead the wrong Diamond and the defence wins with their * Ace, there is still a chance that we can drop a doubleton \(\bullet\) Jack and still make 4 Diamond tricks. As a last resort, we can still fallback on the Club finesse.

The big question is, do we play a Diamond to our King or a Diamond to the Queen?

\section*{Calculations:}

The Club finesse is going to be our 'Last Resort', so we will leave that until last.
If there is a doubleton \(\bullet\) Jack, then we cannot go wrong.
If the Diamonds divide 3-2, it is a complete 'Guess' how we play the Diamond suit.
If the Diamonds are 4-1 and a defender is holding AJxx of Diamonds and that defender is South, there is nothing we can do with the Diamonds, because if we lead a Diamond from the East hand, South will know that it is ok to rise with the - Ace and clear the Heart suit, because South is in control of the Diamond suit.
If North is the defender holding AJxx in the Diamond suit, they cannot rise with their Ace,
because the finesse of their Jack will show up on the next round of Diamonds, so for that reason, the percentage play is to lead a Diamond through North.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the \(v\) King and lead a Spade to our Ace.
We now lead a small Diamond towards dummy's \& Queen. When the * Queen wins, we play on
the Club suit. If North rises with their • Ace in front of our \(\bullet\) Queen, we will make 4 Diamond
tricks.

A 1065
- J 1098
- AJ9 8
\(\because \mathrm{K} 4\)
A A 43
- 75
- K32
- A Q J 72

- K 97
- AK
- Q10654
- 1098
- Q J 82
\(14{ }_{5}^{9} 12\)

\section*{Combining our} Chances (Board 7) Lead: Jack

Contract: 3 NT by West
- The Club finesse looks the obvious way to generate those 4 additional tricks, but what is the rush?
- There is no imminent danger that the defence will be cashing their 5 tricks, so what is the harm in trying to get those 4 additional tricks by first attempting to drop a doubleton Jack of Diamonds or 'Getting Lucky' in trying to win trick 2 with a Diamond honour, which would then mean that we can afford a losing Club finesse?
- The key to this hand is to realise that the Club finesse can be used at any stage during the hand and taking the Club finesse at trick 2 is putting all your eggs in one basket and not combining your chances which are available through the Diamond suit.
- Let us see how many declarers put all their eggs in one basket and took the immediate Club finesse.

\begin{tabular}{l}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{ NS } \\
Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper \\
Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 \\
Mariana \\
Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal \\
Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta \\
Nogueira \\
Simon Moorman \& lan Moss \\
Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen \\
Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth \\
Gahan \\
Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone \\
Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller \\
Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin \\
Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall \\
71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro \\
Campos \\
Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins \\
peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey \\
Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray \\
Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg
\end{tabular}

EW
Contract Lead Score


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{IMP} \\
\hline 3NT-1 W & \(\checkmark\) J & 100 & & +9.67 & -9.67 \\
\hline 3NT-1 W & \(\checkmark\) Ј & 100 & & +9.67 & -9.67 \\
\hline 3NT-1 E & \(\checkmark 3\) & 100 & & +9.67 & -9.67 \\
\hline 3NT-1 W & VJ & 100 & & +9.67 & -9.67 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\bullet\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=E\) & \(\checkmark 3\) & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\bullet\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline 3NT \(=\) W & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline 3NT \(=\) W & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T=W\) & \(\checkmark\) J & & 600 & -2.93 & +2.93 \\
\hline \(3 N T+1\) W & \(\bullet\) J & & 630 & -3.73 & +3.73 \\
\hline 3NT+1 W & \(\checkmark\) J & & 630 & -3.73 & +3.73 \\
\hline \(3 N T+2 \mathrm{E}\) & - 3 & & 660 & -4.80 & +4.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Combining our Chances (Board 7)}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Board 7 & & * 1065 & \\
\hline Dealer S & & - J1098 & \\
\hline All Vul & & - AJ98 & \\
\hline & & \% K4 & \\
\hline & - A43 & & - K97 \\
\hline & \(\bullet 75\) & & \(\checkmark\) AK \\
\hline & -K32 & & - Q10654 \\
\hline & \%AQJ72 & & \%1098 \\
\hline & & - QJ82 & \\
\hline & & - Q6432 & \\
\hline & & - 7 & \\
\hline & & ¢ 653 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- 14 declarers took an immediate Club finesse, which is certainly very premature and not utilising the potential of the Diamond suit.
- When the finesse loses, the defence have an obvious 5 tricks, what with the King of Clubs, Ace of Diamonds and three Heart tricks.
- Unbelievably, 12 declarers still managed to make their contract, when the defence were unable to organise their 5 tricks.
- I feel sorry for Lily Kearney and Angeliki Politou, who were the only declarers to realise that the Club finesse can wait and that playing on the Diamond suit offers declarer extra chances.
- Unfortunately, they played the Diamond suit the wrong way around and went off.
- So, the two declarers who played the hand correctly, were virtually the only declarers, who went off.
- However, for recognising that the Club finesse can wait, Lily and Angeliki have been awarded 10 Points.

\section*{More Than One Plan}
- What you will find is that good declarers, when they see a 'Good Plan', will always assume the worst and will therefore, before they action their 'Good Plan', look for a 'Backup Plan', just in case their 'Good Plan’ fails.
- Mind you, as we will see on board 2, where East is under the spotlight, sometimes we must action our 'Backup Plan' before our main plan.


\section*{More Than One Plan}

\section*{Board 2}

East Deals
N-S Vul
- 632
- Q 85
- Q 102
- J 1087


South leads a Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks, so we just require one additional trick.
We can get that one additional trick from the Club suit.
As a 'Backup Plan', if the Club suit divides badly, there is a possibility that the Diamond suit divides 3-3, which would provide us with our 9th trick.

Calculations:
If the Club suit divides \(3-2\), which is a \(68 \%\) chance, then we have more than enough tricks. Failing that, we can hope that the Diamond suit divides \(3-3\), which is a \(36 \%\) chance.

However, although it is called, our 'Backup Plan', we must action our 'Backup Plan' first.
If we play on the Club suit first and it fails, even when the Diamond suit divides 3-3, we will not be able to get to our winning Diamond in dummy.

\section*{Conclusion:}

We win the opening lead with the \(\uparrow\) Ace and play 3 rounds of Diamonds.
When the Diamonds divide 3-3, we have our 9th trick waiting for us in dummy.


\section*{More Than One Contract: 3 NT by East Plan (Board 2) Lead: Queen}
- This is a straightforward case of declarer, pausing at trick one, and realising that there are two suits that can produce the extra trick that is required.
- However, the Diamond suit must be played first, otherwise there will be no entry to the \(4^{\text {th }}\) Diamond in dummy.
- Let us see how many declarers paused long enough at the start of the hand and spotted the Diamond play.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & & & & & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{More Than One Plan (Board 2)}} \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & 3NT-1 E & - Q & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & & & & \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 3NT-1 E & - 0 & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & & & & \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & 3NT-1 E & - 0 & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & & & & \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & 3NT-1 E & \(\wedge\) - & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & Board 2 & & - 632 & \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & 3NT-1 E & - 0 & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & Dealer E & & - Q85 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & 3NT-1 E & - 0 & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & NS Vul & & - Q102 & \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & 3NT-1 E & - \({ }^{\text {Q }}\) & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & & - 75 & \% J1087 & - AK4 \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & 3NT-1 E & - 0 & 50 & & +5.40 & -5.40 & & \(\checkmark 3\) & & - A10972 \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & 5 * \(=\) W & -3 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & -8654 & & - AK3 \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - 0 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & * AQ5432 & & * K6 \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - 0 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & & - QJ1098 & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - 0 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & & - KJ64 & \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - 0 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & & - J97 & \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - 0 & & 400 & -5.07 & +5.07 & & & *9 & \\
\hline Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{E}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & & 430 & -5.60 & +5.60 & & & & \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+3 \mathrm{E}\) & -Q & & 490 & -7.20 & +7.20 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Four declarers found the play of the Diamond suit at trick 2 and have been awarded 12 Points.
- The four declarers are:
- Brian Davies

Graham Randall
Susan Thorburn
Audrey Hartley

Well done to those four declarers.

\section*{More Than One Plan}
- Board 22, where South is under the spotlight, is another good example of where declarer should always be on the lookout for a 'Backup Plan'.
- Having found a backup plan, declarer should be mindful that some preparation may be required for our backup plan, if our main plan was to fail.

\section*{My backup plan is just my original plan but with more alcohol.}

More Than One Plan
- J 1098

\section*{\(\checkmark\) K J}
- 104
* K Q 876

- A 64
- Q 109
-AJ52
* A 54

North South
NT
\(2 * \quad 2\) 。

West leads v Four.
Initial Analysis:
After the initial Heart lead, we have 6 top tricks and most likely a 7th in the Heart suit.
We require 2 additional tricks.
The Club suit can most certainly provide us with those 2 additional tricks.
The Spade suit can also provide us with those 2 additional tricks.
Is there a way that we can utilise both of these plans?

\section*{Calculations:}

If the Club suit divides 3-2, which is a \(68 \%\) chance, then we have enough tricks.
If East has at least one Spade honour, then we should have enough tricks.
However, for the Spade strategy to work, we require 2 entries in dummy to lead the Spades twice through East and probably a third to reach our established last Spade in dummy.

We have 2 Club entries and we find ourselves winning the first trick in dummy with the Jack.
We must use this early entry to dummy wisely.
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with dummy's \(\vee\) Jack and run the \(\uparrow\) Jack.
When West cashes Ace and another Heart, lead the \&Ace and then a Club to dummy's \& Queen. Now run the 10 of Spades, cash the A Ace and enter dummy via the \(\%\) King and cash dummy's last Spade.
- J 1098
- K J
- 104
\(\because K\) Q 876
AK 75
- A8743
- Q763
\(\div 9\)

\section*{10}
\(9 \quad 6\)
15

\section*{More Than One}

Plan (Board 22) Lead: \(\begin{aligned} & \text { Four }\end{aligned}\)
- Again, it is all about the 'Thinking Time' at trick one.
- It should be spotted that although the Club suit offers us the best chance of making our extra tricks, the Spade suit is a good 'Backup Plan', however, entries are short for dummy and that is why we lay the foundation of our backup plan, by running the Jack of Spades at trick 2.
- When our Clubs fail to produce us tricks, we can now revert to the backup plan of the 'One of Two Finesses' plan in the Spade suit.
- Let us see who put their thinking time, at trick one, to good effect.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{NS EW} & Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{More Than One Plan (Board 22)}} \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+2 \mathrm{~S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 460 & & +3.60 & \(-3.60\) & & & & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth
Gahan & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~S}\) & v \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 430 & & +2.60 & -2.60 & & & & \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~N}\) & \(\checkmark 5\) & 430 & & +2.60 & -2.60 & Board 22 & & - J1098 & \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 430 & & +2.60 & -2.60 & Dealer E & & \(\bullet\) KJ & \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & Dealer E & & & \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & EW Vul & & - 104 & \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & -3 & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & & \% KQ876 & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & - K75 & & - Q32 \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 3\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & - A8743 & & - 652 \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & - Q763 & & -K98 \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & \%9 & & \& J1032 \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & & & \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{S}\) & \(\checkmark 4\) & 400 & & +1.73 & -1.73 & & & & \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & 3NT-1 S & \(\checkmark 4\) & & 50 & -8.60 & +8.60 & & & - Q109 & \\
\hline Bary Capal \& Hazel Capal & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & 3NT-1 S & \(\checkmark 4\) & & 50 & -8.60 & +8.60 & & & - AJ52 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 3NT-2 S & -3 & & 100 & -9.80 & +9.80 & & & \& A54 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- It is now board 22 and everyone is 'Warming Up', because no less than ten declarers took the Spade finesse at trick 2, which is very good.
- Seven declarers, as in, Mariana Jordao, Elizabeth Gahan, Kai Eckert, Sophie Harper, Thomas Bradkin, Pedro Campos and Borje Dahlberg were card perfect, because they took the Spade finesse at trick 2, tested the Clubs and then reverted to the backup plan in the Spade suit, so these declarers are awarded the full 12 Points.
- Three declarers, as in Ian Moss, Brian Sharkey and Paddy Murray, although they took the Spade finesse at trick 2, did not subsequently test the Club suit and instead carried on with the 'Backup Plan', by taking another unnecessary and risky Spade finesse.
- On this occasion they got away with it, but normally 'Backup Plans' are only actioned once it is known that the main plan has failed. For correctly taking the initial Spade finesse, these 3 'Lucky' declarers are awarded 6 Points.

\section*{More Than One Plan}
- In the 'Real World', when we have been given a task to perform and we have two or three different plans to complete the task, we would always try first the plan that is most likely to succeed and we usually call that 'Plan A'.
- When 'Plan A' fails, then we revert to 'Plan B'.
- If 'Plan B' was to fail, then we might even be lucky enough to have a 'Plan C'.
- This is not a good approach at the bridge table.
- The danger of calling our 'Bridge Plans', \(A, B, C\), etc is that we might feel obliged to action our bridge plans in that sequence, which is not a good idea.
- So, from now on, instead of calling our 'Bridge Plans', Plan A, Plan B, Plan C, etc, we are going to be calling them 'Plan Tom', Plan Dick' and 'Plan Harry'.
- Let us look at 'Tom, Dick \& Harry' in action on board 16, where North is under the spotlight.

\section*{More Than One Plan}

\section*{Board 16}

West Deals
E-W Vul
A 8765
- AK 72
- Q 3
- A Q 10


West leads ^ King.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks and therefore require just 1 more additional trick.
We have 3 plans:
Plan Tom: Hope for an additional trick in the Diamond suit, when the Diamonds divide 3-2.
Plan Dick: Hope for a 3-3 division in the Club suit.
Plan Harry: Hope for a singleton or doubleton \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) Jack to be held by one of the defenders.

\section*{Calculations:}

Plan Tom is certainly our best hope as Diamonds will divide 3-2 68\% of the time.
Plan Dick will succeed \(36 \%\) of the time, when the Clubs divide 3-3.
Plan Harry requires a singleton or doubleton \(\boldsymbol{\sharp}\) Jack, which will occur \(18.4 \%\) of the time.
We can try all 3 of these plans, providing we try them in the correct order.
Conclusion:
We let the defenders cash their first 4 Spade tricks.
It is very important that we do not discard any Clubs from dummy, otherwise plan Dick and Plan Harry will have no chance of success; we must discard 2 Diamonds from dummy.

We must now cash the \(\because\) Ace and \(\approx\) Queen and when we observe the \(\star\) Jack from West, we cash our 10 of Clubs.

We now have 4 Club tricks, 2 Heart tricks and 3 Diamond tricks.
```

    A.8765
    * AK72
    -Q3
    * A Q 10
    ```
- A 92
- Q854
-J986
- J 8
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More Than One Plan (Board 16)

Contract: 3 NT by North Lead: King
- This is just a simple case of identifying the three possible ways, which can generate us the additional trick that is required.
- Having identified our three plans, it is just a matter of actioning them in the correct sequence.
- Let us see how our declarers get on with , 'Tom', 'Dick' and 'Harry'.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & EW & Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{More Than One Plan (Board 16)}} \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & \(4 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & * K & 430 & & +3.87 & -3.87 & & & & \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & * K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & & & \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & & & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Board 16 \\
Dealer W
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \wedge 765 \\
& \text { AK72 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & -10 & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & EW Vul & & - Q3 & \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & & * AQ10 & \\
\hline Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & - A92 & & - KQJ10 \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Brackin & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & - Q854 & & \(\checkmark\) J1093 \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & - J986 & & - 2 \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & \(5 *=S\) & -4 & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & * J8 & & -9432 \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{N}\) & - K & 400 & & +3.13 & -3.13 & & & \[
\text { ^ } 43
\] & \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & \(3+1 \mathrm{~N}\) & - K & 130 & & -3.67 & +3.67 & & &  & \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & 3NT-1 N & * K & & 50 & -7.47 & +7.47 & & & * K765 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & 5*-1 N & * K & & 50 & -7.47 & +7.47 & & & & \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & 3NT-1 N & * K & & 50 & -7.47 & +7.47 & & & & \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & \(4 \mathrm{~A}-3 \mathrm{~N}\) & -2 & & 150 & -9.13 & +9.13 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Too many declarers were discarding their Clubs, when East was cashing their Spades, so these declarers had no chance.
- Five declarers are awarded 12 Points for being 'Card Perfect' and they are:
- Paul Mollison

Imogen La Chapelle
Maks Blicharz
Holden Clark
Peter Backlund.

\section*{More Than One Plan}
- One ability that a declarer requires to learn, is the ability, when dummy goes down, to visualise how the play will go for all 13 tricks.
- So many declarers play each suit in isolation without realising the impact that their play has on the tricks later in the hand.
- This is why at trick one, it is so important that we think not just about the first two or three tricks, but all thirteen.
- Let us look at Tom, Dick \& Harry in action on board 20, where West is under the spotlight.

" I see a girl,I see a marriage, I see her not understanding you,I see a beer belly. Do you

\section*{More Than One Plan}

Board 20
West Deals
Both Vul
- Q J 1096
- K 76
- 3
- J 1093
- AK
- A 92
- 7652
\(\because \mathrm{AKQ} 4\)
- 543
- 872
\(20 \quad \vee \mathrm{~J} 10543\)
- Q J 109
\(\rightarrow 8\)
West East
2 NT 3 NT
Pass
North leads ^ Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks and therefore require just 1 more additional trick.
We have 3 plans:
Plan Tom: Hope for an additional trick in the Club suit, when the Clubs divide 3-2.
Plan Dick: Hope for an additional trick in the Diamond suit, when the Diamonds divide 3-2.
Plan Harry: Play a Heart towards dummy's Queen and hope that North holds the King of Hearts.
Calculations:
Plans Tom and Dick are a \(68 \%\) chance and Plan Harry is a \(50 \%\) chance, however, the percentages are irrelevant as we can action all 3 plans, but only if we action them in a precise order.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the a Ace.
We must play the *Ace and *King first, when we have no luck with that suit, we return to our \(\because\) Ace and lead towards the \(\vee\) Queen. This plan works.
If it had not worked, we would have then tried the Club suit for our additional trick.
Cashing our Club tricks too early or ducking a Diamond, will lead to trouble, later in the hand.
- Q J 1096
- K 76
- 3
* J 1093
```

A AK

- A 92
- 7652

```

```

- AKQ4 $W \leftarrow E$
S

```



\section*{Avoidance Play Contract: 3 NT by West (Board 20) Lead: Queen}
- At first glance, this looks such an easy hand.
- It is not until you get to tricks 7 or 8 , that you suddenly realise that things are not going well.
- The ability to look into the future certainly comes in handy.
- Let us see how many 'Mystic Meg' declarers we have on this board.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NS & EW & Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{More Than One Plan (Board 20)}} \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & 3NT-2 W & \(\bullet\) Q & 200 & & +8.80 & -8.80 & & & & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Brakkin & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & 3NT-2 W & \(\wedge\) Q & 200 & & +8.80 & -8.80 & & & & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth
Gahan & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & 3NT-1 W & \(\bullet\) Q & 100 & & +6.80 & -6.80 & Board 20 & & . QJ1096 & \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 3NT-1 W & \(\wedge\) Q & 100 & & +6.80 & -6.80 & Dealer W & & - K76 & \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & 3NT-1 W & \(\bullet\) - & 100 & & +6.80 & -6.80 & All Vul & & -3 & \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & 3NT-1 W & \(\wedge\) Q & 100 & & +6.80 & -6.80 & & & & \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & 3NT-1 W & \(\wedge\) Q & 100 & & +6.80 & -6.80 & & & \% J1093 & \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\bullet\) - & & 600 & -5.67+ & +5.67 & & - AK & & - 543 \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\wedge\) Q & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & - A92 & & - Q8 \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & - 7652 & & - AK84 \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\wedge\) & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & \& AKQ4 & & \& 7652 \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & 3NT \(=\mathrm{W}\) & - Q & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & +AKQ4 & . 872 & \\
\hline Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & - Q & & 600 & \(-5.67+\) & +5.67 & & & - J10543 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\wedge\) & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & & - QJ109 & \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 600 & -5.67 + & +5.67 & & & * 8 & \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Marcia Levan-Haris \& John McCoy & \(3 \mathrm{NT}+1 \mathrm{~W}\) & \(\wedge\) Q & & 630 & \(-6.27+\) & +6.27 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Why are so many declarers cashing their Club tricks at trick 2?
- Any plan that can be used later in the hand should be put on hold.
- Why are so many declarers ducking a diamond on the first round of Diamonds?
- This hand is about discovering how the suits break, without losing the lead.
- The best way to discover how the Diamonds break, without losing the lead, is to lay down the Ace and King of Diamonds.
- There was no way back once a declarer tried one of those tactics.
- However, Dave Embleton, Maureen Vede and John Pioli had enough 'Psychic Powers' to realise what was going to happen and they immediately played their Diamonds from the top and subsequently played a successful Heart to dummy's Queen, so they are awarded 12 pts.
- 4 Points to Jane Huxter and Geoff Webber, whose 'Psychic Powers' were beyond belief, when they made their contract by playing a Heart towards dummy's Queen at trick 2.

\section*{More Than One Plan}
- Only two plans available on this hand.
- Such a simple idea, but a great example of knowing which of the two plans should be actioned first.
- Will East be up to the task on board 17?


More Than One Plan

\section*{Board 17}
- 9743

North Deals
None Vul


South leads ^ Queen.
Initial Analysis:
We have 8 top tricks and therefore we require just 1 more additional trick.
We have lost Plan Harry for the moment, but we still have 2 plans.
Plan Tom: Hope for an additional trick in the Heart suit, when North holds the \(\vee\) King.
Plan Dick: Hope for an additional trick in the Club suit, when North holds both \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) King and * Queen.

Calculations:
Obviously, 'Plan Tom' has a much better chance of success than 'Plan Dick' as a simple finesse (Plan Tom), is a \(50 \%\) chance whereas hoping for North to hold both Club honours (Plan Dick), is only a \(24 \%\) chance.

However, if we execute both plans in the correct order, we can attempt both plans.
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with the \(\uparrow\) King.
We play a Club to the \(\because\) Jack, when this wins, we have our 9 tricks.
If the Club finesse had lost, we would subsequently have tried the Heart finesse.
Playing the Heart finesse before the Club finesse is a losing play.

A K 6
- 9652
- K J 103
\(\because 853\)


\title{
More Than One Contract: 3 NT by East Plan (Board 17) Lead: Queen
}
- Without stating the obvious, if we take the Heart finesse first and it loses, we will not make our contract as we must lose the lead to make our additional Club trick.
- This again is a situation where we can take the Heart finesse at any stage throughout the hand.
- I will say this again: If there is no imminent danger that the defence can take enough tricks to defeat us, there is no rush to take a simple finesse; we can take that simple finesse, to make our contract, at any stage during the hand. It is much better to look for another plan, which might involve losing a trick first.
- Let us see which declarers were in a rush to take the Heart finesse and which declarers had spotted another plan, which could also be attempted.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NS & EW & Contract & Lead & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Score} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{IMP} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{More Than One Plan (Board 17)}} \\
\hline Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen & Graham Randall \& jayne randall & 3NT-1 E & -Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & & & \\
\hline peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey & George Vede \& Maureen Vede & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & & - 9743 & \\
\hline Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana & Sally Allen \& John Pioli & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & \[
\text { Dealer } \mathbf{N}
\] & & J84 & \\
\hline Bary Capal \& Hazel Capal & Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio & 3NT-1 E & - \(Q\) & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & None Vul & & -84 & \\
\hline Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin & Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter & 3NT-1 E & \(\wedge\) Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & & * KQ96 & \\
\hline Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira & Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber & 3NT-1 E & \(\wedge\) & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & - K6 & & - A5 \\
\hline Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg & Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & - 9652 & & \(\checkmark\) AQ7 \\
\hline Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray & Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson & 3NT-1 E & \(\bullet\) Q & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & -KJ103 & & - AQ65 \\
\hline Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins & Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton & 3NT-1 E & - 2 & 50 & & +4.67 & -4.67 & & * 853 & & * AJ42 \\
\hline Simon Moorman \& lan Moss & Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}\) & -7 & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & - QJ1082 & \\
\hline Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan & Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & \(\wedge\) - & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & \(\checkmark\) K103 & \\
\hline Kai Eckert \& Isaac Stone & Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & \(\bullet\) Q & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & \[
972
\] & \\
\hline Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper & Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & *10 & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & & \\
\hline Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller & Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & - Q & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & & \\
\hline Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall & Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & \(\wedge\) Q & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & & \\
\hline 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos & Brian Davies \& Val Mollison & \(3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}\) & \(\wedge\) Q & & 400 & -6.00 & +6.00 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Just the four declarers were in no rush to take the Heart finesse.
- Everyone else could not wait to take the Heart finesse.
- 12 Points are awarded to:
- Gemma Fewster

Dido Coley
John McCoy
Brian Davies.

\section*{Plan Ahead}
- To become a great declarer requires the ability to see into the future, especially when danger is only around the corner.
- When a hand looks too easy, that is when we stop and think about what can go wrong and whether we can take some pre-emptive action.
- Did South on board 13 look into their 'Crystal Ball'?

```

Plan Ahead

- 84
- 432
-A 1063
- Q 854

```

\section*{- KQJ95 N 763}
```

8765 N VKJ10

- K J 1
- A 102
$\bullet$ A Q
- Q J 92
- AK 32
North South
Pass 2NT
$3 \% \quad 3 N T$
Pass

```

North Deals
Both Vul
- 875
- 10

\section*{West leads ^ King.}

Initial Analysis:
We have 6 top tricks and therefore we require 3 additional tricks.
A successful Diamond finesse will certainly produce those 3 additional tricks.
If we hold back on taking our a Ace until the 3rd round, we can probably afford to lose the Diamond finesse as there will be no entry into the West hand and we can probably get our 9th trick from an expected favourable Club division and we even have a Heart finesse as a last resort, but we must plan ahead.

Calculations:
Using the 'Rule of 7' (See previous notes on declarer play), we must hold up 2 rounds of Spades, cutting off West from all their tricks.

When we take a losing Diamond finesse and East comes back the v Jack, do we take the Heart finesse or do we rely on the Club suit dividing 3-2 for our 9th trick?

The Heart finesse is a \(50 \%\) chance and the Clubs dividing 3-2 is a \(68 \%\) chance.
If we had planned ahead, we would not be faced with this dilemma.
Conclusion:
We duck the first 2 rounds of Spades and win trick 3 with the Ace.
Planning ahead, we know that if the Diamond finesse was to lose and East returns the inevitable Heart, we would have the dilemma of not knowing whether to take the Heart finesse or trust that the Clubs suit will divide 3-2.
Why don't we solve that future dilemma at trick 4, by immediately playing our 4 Ace and our
н King at tricks 4 and 5?
When we observe that the Clubs divide 4-1, we know that our only hope of making our 9 tricks,
```

- 84
- 432
-A 1063
- Q 854
* KQJ95
- 8765
- 875
$\div 10$

```

```

A 763

- K J 109
- K 4
- J 976
- A 102
- A Q
- QJ 92
- AK 32

```

\section*{Plan Ahead \\ (Board 13) Lead: King \\ (Board 13) Lead: King}

\section*{Contract: 3 NT by South}
- It is always about planning ahead and realising what dangers are waiting for us.
- Let us see which of our declarers planned ahead.


- Just two declarers were able to look into the future and see what problems were ahead of them.
- 12 Points are awarded to Sheena Millins and Thomas Bradkin, who had the foresight to play two rounds of Clubs before they attempted the Diamond finesse.

\section*{Plan Ahead}
- Before we play a critical suit, it is important that we ask ourselves, how many tricks are we trying to make from the suit.
- The only way that we can answer that question is to do some preparation.
- Did North have the foresight to do some preparation on board 5 ?


Plan Ahead

Board 5
North Deals
N-S Vul
- A J 6
- A Q 5
-A 953
\(* \mathrm{AK} \mathrm{K}^{2}\)
- K 9752
- 642
-
-85432
\(4 \quad\) K 73
10 QJ742
+ Q 76
North South
\(2 \div 2\)
\(2 \mathrm{NT} \quad 6 \mathrm{NT}\)
Pass

East leads v Jack.

Initial Analysis:
We have a potential Spade loser and at least 1 potential Diamond loser.
A successful Spade finesse will remove our potential Spade loser.
A successful Diamond finesse, will remove our potential Diamond loser, but only if West holds precisely the doubleton \(\bullet\) King.

The worrying factor is that there are scenarios, if we were to lead the \(\bullet\) Queen, hoping not to lose any Diamond tricks, we could end up losing 2 Diamond tricks.

\section*{Calculations:}

The only way we can avoid our Spade loser is with a successful finesse.
The big question is: How should we be playing the Diamond suit?
The answer to that question is: "It Depends".
If it turns out that we have a Spade loser, then our only hope is to find West with the doubleton - King and we must therefore run the Queen of Diamonds.

However, if it turns out that we have zero Spade losers, we can afford the luxury of a 'Safety Play' in the Diamond suit, which guarantees that we can never lose more than 1 Diamond trick.

The only way to find out how to play the Diamond suit is to first find out how many Spade losers that we have.

Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with dummy's \(\vee\) King and take an immediate Spade finesse.

\title{
Plan Ahead Contract: 6 NT by North (Board 5) Lead: Jack
}
- This is quite a common situation we find ourselves in.
- The situation where we must find out how many losers, we have outside the suit we are going to play, so that we know how best to play the suit.
- Let us see who took that Spade finesse before tackling the Diamond suit.

- Imogen La Chapelle was the only declarer to play the Spade finesse at trick 2 and subsequently make the correct safety play in the Diamond suit, so 12 Points are awarded to Imogen.
- Rafael Latorre is awarded 9 Points as he correctly took the Spade finesse at trick 2 and although he correctly refrained from leading the Queen of Diamonds, he led a Diamond to the Ace and although it worked on this occasion, if West had held the 4 card Diamond suit, Rafael would have lost two Diamond tricks.

\section*{The Deletion Principle}
- The time has come to consider how the probabilities change during the play of the hand.
- At the start of the hand, before a card has been played, we have seen 'Boring' charts of the probabilities relating to the division of the opponents' cards.
- E.g. When we are missing 6 cards in a suit, at the start of the hand, then it is a \(36 \%\) chance that the suit divides evenly with a 3-3 split.
When we are missing 2 cards in a suit, at the start of the hand, then it is a \(52 \%\) chance that the suit divides evenly with a 1-1 split.
- These are known as the 'a priori' probabilities.
- However, as cards are played, and certain distributions become impossible, the odds of an even split will change, and these are called 'a posteriori' probabilities.
- Let us look at a common mistake bridge players make, when trying to calculate the changing odds, half-way through a hand.

\section*{The Deletion Principle}

- In this situation, the probability that the Heart suit is evenly divided, as in \(3-3\), is \(36 \%\) and the probability that the Heart suit is unevenly divided, as in 4-2 is 48\%.
- The ratio of that is about 11 to 15 .
- Let us now cash the Ace and King of Hearts.
- Both defenders follow to both rounds of Hearts, so there are now 2 Hearts left outstanding.
- What are the odds that the Heart suit is now evenly divided, as in a 1-1 even split?
- According to our charts, the 'a priori' probability of a \(1-1\) split is \(52 \%\) and that the \(2-0\) split is \(48 \%\), however it doesn't work like that.
- The chance of an even split of 3-3 was \(36 \%\) and understandably the chance of an even split (1-1), have certainly increased since the chances of an original 5-1 or an original 6-0 split have been eliminated.

\section*{The Deletion Principle}
- There is something known as the 'Deletion Principle'.
- It goes something like this:
- "When the opponents follow to the play of a suit with insignificant cards, the impossible distributions are deleted, and the probabilities of the remainder retain their relative magnitudes".

What this means 'In English' is that, when the distributions of 5-1 and 6-0 become impossible, because both defenders have followed to two rounds of Hearts, the 11 to 15 ratio that existed between the even split of \(3-3\) and the uneven split of \(4-2\), when the defenders held six cards between them, is retained. So, the ratio of 11 to 15 still exists between the even split of 1-1 and the uneven split of 2-0 now that the defenders have two Hearts between them.

This means that the new 'a posteriori' odds of a 1-1 split have risen to \(42.3 \%\) and the new 'a posteriori' odds of a 2-0 split have risen to \(57.7 \%\). (The odds have retained their 11-15 ratio). Let us see this concept in action on board 6, where West is under the spotlight.

\title{
The Deletion Principle
}

\section*{Board 6}

East Deals
E-W Vul

A K QJ 32
\(\bullet 76\)
- 986
\(\div\) K 54

A. 7654
- J 1098
- Q J 10
\(+87\)
West East
Pass
2 NT 3 .
\(3 \vee 3 N T\)
Pass
North leads ^ King.
Initial Analysis:
We have 7 top tricks and we require an additional 2 tricks.
There is the obvious Club finesse, which, if successful, would give us those 2 additional tricks.
There is also the Heart suit, which, if the suit was to divide \(3-3\), would also give us 2 extra tricks.
Calculations:
At the start of the hand, the chance of the Heart suit dividing evenly at 3-3 is a \(36 \%\) chance and the chance of the Heart suit dividing unevenly at 4-2 is a \(48 \%\) chance, however, when both defenders follow to two rounds of Hearts, both of these percentages rise as we have eliminated the possibilities of the Heart suit dividing 5-1 and 6-0.

According to the 'Deletion Principle' they both rise proportionally to their original values. So, although the even split (1-1), has risen, the uneven split (2-0), is still the favourite, which means that the even split of 1-1 will be less than \(50 \%\) ( \(42.3 \%\) Chance).

Meanwhile, the Club finesse has remained static at 50\%.
Conclusion:
We win the second round of Spades with our a Ace, and "Just for Fun", we can cash our • Ace and \(\vee\) King, however we are next going to take the Club finesse, by playing our Club towards

\title{
The Deletion Contract: 3 NT by West Principle (Board 6) Lead: King
}

A A 10
- AK
- AK 73
- Q9632
- K 54

- 87
- Let us look at the 'Deletion Principle' again:
- "When the opponents follow to the play of a suit with insignificant cards, the impossible distributions are deleted, and the probabilities of the remainder retain their relative magnitudes".
- The key word is 'Insignificant'. In our example on board 6, the six cards that our opponents hold are all 'Worthless' in that all six of those cards could have been played at any stage, whilst our opponents are following suit, when we cashed our Ace and King of Hearts and whilst that is the case, the finesse is a better prospect than the 1-1 split.
- Let us see how many of our declarers correctly applied the 'Deletion Principle'.

- Out of the 11 declarers who were in 3NT, 6 played for the Hearts to have originally divided 3-3 and 5 declarers took the Club finesse.
- It is these five declarers, namely, John Pioli, Claudio Bavaresco, Geoff Webber, Val Mollison and John McCoy who have correctly applied the 'Deletion Principle' and have been awarded 12 Points.

\section*{The Deletion Principle}
- Let us now look at board 1.
- At first glance it looks as if declarer's and dummy's hands are identical to board 6.
- In fact, they are identical apart from one card.
Board 1
- A 10
\(\checkmark\) AK
- AK73
- Q9632
- 98
- Q10543
- 542
- A J 10

Board 6

- Dummy's Hearts now include the ten, which is quite a significant card, as it increases declarer's chances of making extra tricks in the Heart suit, because now, not only do we make 5 Heart tricks, when the Hearts divide evenly with a 3-3 split, but we also make 5 Heart tricks, when one of the defenders is holding the doubleton Jack of Hearts. (A 16\% Chance).
- So, after the King of Spades lead, the first thing that the declarer must do is cash their Ace and King of Hearts, looking for the doubleton Jack of Hearts.
- Both defenders follow, but no sign of the Jack of Hearts.
- So, we have the same dilemma as the previous board, where we must now decide whether to take the finesse in Clubs or play for the remaining two Hearts to now split evenly at 1-1.

\section*{The Deletion Principle}
- So, having cashed our two top Heart tricks and there is no sign of the Jack of Hearts is it like board 6 in that it is again a \(42.3 \%\) chance that the suit

A A 10
- AK
- AK 73
- Q 9632
- 98
- Q 10543
- 542
- A J 10 will break 3-3?
- The answer is 'No'.
- The difference this time is that one of the six outstanding cards, is a significant card and that card is the Jack of Hearts.
- Significant in the sense that a defender would never play it unless forced to do so.
- In applying the 'Deletion Principle', we must rule out, not only the 6-0 and 5-1 divisions, but also those 4-2 divisions that contain a doubleton, Jack.
- There are 30 4-2 combinations of which 10 of them contain a doubleton Jack, so we must rule those ones out.
- The 20 3-3 combinations are all still in play as no one holding Jxx would have played their Jack on the two rounds of Hearts.
- So, we are left with odds for the 3-3 and the remaining 4-2 distributions in the ratio of 35.53 to 32.3 , or 11 to 10 .
- In percentage terms, the probability of the 3-3 break has risen to \(52.4 \%\).
- Let us see how this plays out on board 1, where North is under the spotlight.

\title{
The Deletion Principle
}

Board 1
North Deals
None Vul
- A 10
v AK
- AK7 7
\(\because\) Q9632


East leads ^ King.
Initial Analysis:
We have 7 top tricks and we require an additional 2 tricks.

There is the obvious Club finesse, which, if successful, would give us those 2 additional tricks.

There is also the Heart suit, which, if the suit was to divide \(3-3\) or the \(v\) Jack is a doubleton, this would also give us 2 extra tricks.

Calculations:

At the start of the hand, the chance of the Heart suit dividing evenly at \(3-3\) is a \(36 \%\) chance and the chance of the Heart suit dividing unevenly at 4-2 is a \(48 \%\) chance, however, when both defenders follow to two rounds of Hearts, both of these percentages rise as we have eliminated the possibilities of the Heart suit dividing 5-1 and 6-0.

A certain number of 4-2 divisions have also been eliminated, the ten 4-2 divisions that contain a doubleton v Jack.
So, using the 'Deletion Principle' the even break in Hearts has now risen to \(52.4 \%\)
Meanwhile, the Club finesse has remained static at 50\%.

Conclusion:

We win the second round of Spades with our a Ace and we can cash our \(\vee\) Ace and \(\vee\) King.
We now play a Club to dummy's \& Ace.
We now cash our \(\vee\) Queen, when the \(\vee\) Jack appears, we cash 2 more Hearts.

```

AKQJ72

- 98
$7^{20} \quad \vee$ Q 10543
7 - 542
- A J 10

```
```

* 6543

```
* 6543
* J9 8
* J9 8
-QJ 10
-QJ 10
*Q9632
```


## The Deletion Contract: 3 NT by North

 Principle (Board 1) Lead: King- It is amazing that just the presence of one card in a suit should make such a difference.
- "When the opponents follow to the play of a suit with insignificant cards, the impossible distributions are deleted, and the probabilities of the remainder retain their relative magnitudes".
- Let us see how many declarers brought their calculators to the bridge table for this one.


- This time, out of the 10 declarers, who were in 3 NT, 6 went for the Club finesse and 4 declarers went for Hearts dividing 3-3.
- These 4 successful declarers are Imogen La Chapelle, Kai Eckert, Barry Capal and Peter Backlund and are all awarded 12 Points.


## The Deletion Principle

- We have the 'Deletion Principle' in play on our next board, which is board 24.
- This time the defenders are holding a significant card, which is the Queen of Diamonds.
- East is under the spotlight this time.



# The Deletion Principle 

^ Q J 109
West Deals

- 32

None Vul

- 1086
$\therefore 6543$


South leads • Queen
Initial Analysis:
We have 6 top tricks and we therefore require an additional 3 tricks.
We can finesse for the $\because$ Queen, which if successful, would give us those 3 additional tricks.
There is also the Diamond suit, which if it divides 3-3 or a defender holds the $\bullet$ Queen doubleton, would also provide us with enough tricks.

## Calculations:

At the start of the hand, the chance of the Diamond suit dividing evenly at 3-3 is a $36 \%$ chance and the chance of the Diamond suit dividing unevenly at 4-2 is a $48 \%$ chance, however, when both defenders follow to two rounds of Diamonds, both of these percentages rise as we have eliminated the possibilities of the Diamond suit dividing 5-1 and 6-0.

A certain number of 4-2 divisions have also been eliminated, the ten 4-2 divisions that contain a doubleton Queen.
So, using the 'Deletion Principle' the even break in Diamonds (1-1), has now risen to 52.4\%
Meanwhile, the finesse for the - Queen has remained static at $50 \%$.
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with our $\vee$ Ace and we can cash our • King and get back into dummy with our Ace.
We now cash our Ace.
Note that at this stage it is still not too late to run dummy's $\boldsymbol{m}$ Jack and finesse for the $\boldsymbol{m}$ Queen, however, even though the * Queen has not appeared the probability of the Diamond suit now

```
    A QJ 10 9
    - 32
    -1086
    &6543
```

A A 5

- AK
-AJ5432
- J 92
$17{ }_{11}^{3} 9$


## The Deletion Principle Contract: 3 NT by East (Board 24)

- This board is very similar to the previous board, where again of the six Diamonds that the defenders hold, one of them, the Queen of Diamonds is known as a 'Significant Card' and the 4-2 breaks, that involve that card (10 of Them), can be eliminated, when we apply the 'Deletion Principle'.
- It could be argued that the 10 of Diamonds could be a significant card and would therefore make the possibility of the Diamonds dividing 3-3 an even higher possibility.
- Let us see how our declarers got on with this one.

| NS | EW | Contract | Lead | Score |  | IMP |  | The Deletion Principle (Board 24) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paul Mollison \& Gary Howchen | Bernard Kaye \& Pat Watson | 3NT-2 W | $\wedge$ | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Imogen La Chapelle \& Elizabeth Gahan | Audrey Hartley \& Dave Embleton | 3NT-2 W | $\wedge$ Q | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 | Board 24 <br> Dealer W <br> None Vul |  |  |  |
| peter richardson \& Brian Sharkey | Marcia Levan-Harris \& John McCoy | 3NT-2 W | $\wedge$ Q | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  |  | - QJ109 |  |
| Kai Eckert \& lsaac Stone | Graham Randall \& jayne randall | 3NT-2 W | - $Q$ | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  |  | $\vee 32$ |  |
| 71 Ana Garcia \& 73 - Pedro Campos | Colin Peden \& Valdie Poter | 3NT-2 E | - Q | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  |  | $\div 6543$ |  |
| Peter Backlund \& Börje Dahlberg | Dido Coley \& Lily Kearney | 3NT-2 E | - Q | 100 |  | +5.20 | -5.20 |  | - A5 |  | - K432 |
| Simon Moorman \& lan Moss | Angeliki Politou \& Artemis Christaki | 3NT-1 W | $\wedge$ | 50 |  | +3.53 | -3.53 |  | $\checkmark$ AK |  | - 7654 |
| Alberto Marinho Leite \& 182 Mariana | Lynn Webster \& Carol McCue | 3NT-1 W | $\wedge$ Q | 50 |  | +3.53 | -3.53 |  | - AJ5432 <br> * J 92 |  | -K <br> *K1087 |
| Mike Harbour \& Sheena Millins | Brian Davies \& Val Mollison | 3NT-1 W | $\wedge$ - | 50 |  | +3.53 | -3.53 |  |  | - 876 |  |
| Barry Capal \& Hazel Capal | Susan Thorburn \& Mike Wright | 3 +1 W | $\checkmark 3$ |  | 130 | -0.60 | +0.60 |  |  | $\bullet \text { QJ1098 }$ |  |
| Bernie Hunt \& Sophie Harper | Gemma Fewster \& Steve Abbott | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}$ | $\wedge$ |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  | - Q97 |  |
| Ashley Sawyer \& Gary Waller | George Vede \& Maureen Vede | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}$ | $\bullet$ Q |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  | \& AQ |  |
| Maks Blicharz \& Thomas Bradkin | Jim Kenneally \& jane huxter | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}$ | - Q |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Holden Clark \& Cecilia Birdsall | Sally Allen \& John Pioli | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{W}$ | $\wedge$ |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Rafael Latorre \& 75-Marta Nogueira | Monica \& BAVARESCOClaudio | 3NT $=$ W | $\wedge$ Q |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  |  |  |
| Chris Chorley \& Patrick Murray | Alan Bryant \& Geoff Webber | $3 \mathrm{NT}=\mathrm{E}$ | - Q |  | 400 | -6.87 | +6.87 |  |  |  |  |

- Five declarers were 'Card Perfect' on this board, by correctly playing on the Diamond suit.
- These five declarers are: Maureen Vede, Jim Kenneally, John Pioli, Claudio Bavaresco and Alan Bryant, so they are all awarded 12 Points.
- Poor old Carol McCue who had played the first 9 tricks, perfectly, but then forgot to cash her Ace of Spades, which would have been her $9^{\text {th }}$ trick. (Well, it was board 24 and getting late).
- 8 Points to Carol for a ‘Good Effort'.


## Restricted Choice

- Over the years, there have been many articles written on the subject of 'Restricted Choice', so we won't spend too much time on this.
- The typical scenario is this one:


We lay down the Ace of Spades and West follows with the 8 of Spades and East plays the Queen. We now play our 2 of Spades and West plays their 9 of Spades. What do we do? There are two possible layouts that could exist:


## Restricted Choice

- So, why is East twice as likely to hold the singleton Queen of Spades than the Queen-Jack doubleton of Spades?
- That can very 'Simply' be explained with Bayes' Theorem, which goes something like this:

Bayes' theorem is stated mathematically as the following equation: ${ }^{[16]}$

$$
P(A \mid B)=\frac{P(B \mid A) P(A)}{P(B)}
$$

where $A$ and $B$ are events and $P(B) \neq 0$.

- $P(A \mid B)$ is a conditional probability: the probability of event $A$ occurring given that $B$ is true. It is also called the posterior probability of $A$ given $B$.
- $P(B \mid A)$ is also a conditional probability: the probability of event $B$ occurring given that $A$ is true. It can also be interpreted as the likelihood of $A$ given a fixed $B$ because $P(B \mid A)=L(A \mid B)$.
- $P(A)$ and $P(B)$ are the probabilities of observing $A$ and $B$ respectively without any given conditions; they are known as the prior probability and marginal probability.


## Proof [edit]

For events [edit]
Bayes' theorem may be derived from the definition of conditional probability:

$$
P(A \mid B)=\frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}, \text { if } P(B) \neq 0
$$

where $P(A \cap B)$ is the probability of both A and B being true. Similarly,

$$
P(B \mid A)=\frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(A)}, \text { if } P(A) \neq 0
$$

Solving for $P(A \cap B)$ and substituting into the above expression for $P(A \mid B)$ yields Bayes' theorem:

$$
P(A \mid B)=\frac{P(B \mid A) P(A)}{P(B)}, \text { if } P(B) \neq 0
$$

## Restricted Choice

- Most bridge players don’t worry about that.
- They just accept it and apply the 'Principle of Restricted Choice'.


## Principal of Restricted Choice (PRC)

- When the opponents hold two equally important cards and one has appeared on a previous trick, then take the finesse for the remaining important card.
- On board 4, it is West who must show us whether they have an IQ of 379 or not.


## Restricted Choice

## Board 4

West Deals
Both Vul

AJ 97

- AKQ
- 765
$\therefore 8754$


South leads $\vee$ Ace.
Initial Analysis:
After the defence cash their 3 top Hearts, our only other potential loser is going to be in Spades.
How do we play the trump suit?

Calculations:
If Spades are 2-2, we have zero Spade losers (40\% Chance).
If Spades are 3-1, we will lose a Spade, unless South has a singleton Spade honour.
Conclusion:
We play our $\wedge K$ and observe South playing their $₫$ Queen.
According to the 'Restricted Choice' rule, South is twice as likely to have started with the singleton a Queen than the alternative holding of the Queen, Jack doubleton Spade holding. Consequently, we now play a winning Spade finesse, by playing a Spade to dummy's 10.

|  | * J 97 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - AKQ |  |
|  | -765 |  |
|  | -8754 |  |
| * K6432 | N | * A 1085 |
| - 432 | $W_{\text {N }}^{N}$ | - 765 |
| - A | $\mathrm{W} \leftarrow \mathrm{S}$ | - KQ 108 |
| * AKQ 6 |  | - J 10 |
| 10 | $\wedge \mathrm{Q}$ |  |
| 1610 | - J 1098 |  |
| 4 | -J9432 |  |
|  | - 932 |  |

Contract: 4 by West Lead: ${ }^{\text {Ace }}$

- So, let us find out who has an IQ of 379.


- It appears that we have six declarers who have an IQ of 379, because they all took the Spade finesse.
- They are: John McCoy, Pat Watson, Artemis Christaki, Val Mollison, Lily Kearney and Claudio Bavaresco.
- These six players are all awarded 12 Points.


## Once in a Lifetime

- We come to the last hand, which is board 11.
- Let's hope that South did not 'Mess this Up', because this type of hand only occurs 'Once in a Lifetime' and this was South's 'Once in a Lifetime' opportunity to show how imaginative they are.



## Once in a Lifetime

Board 11
South Deals
None Vul

Initial Analysis:
It appears that we have 2 Heart losers and 2 Club losers.
The only suit that we could potentially set up, is dummy's Diamond suit, when the Diamond suit divides 4-3 ( $62 \%$ Chance), but that is going to require 3 entries outside of the Diamond suit.

Our only hope is that dummy's Spades provide us with those 3 required entries.
Calculations:
For the 9 of Spades to be a singleton, the Spades are required to divide 2-1 (78\% Chance).
It is a 1 in 3 chance that the singleton will be the 9 of Spades ( $26 \%$ Chance).
It is a $50 \%$ chance that West is holding the 9 of Spades.
Conclusion:
We win the opening lead with our \& Ace and play our Diamond to dummy's * Ace and ruff the 2 of Diamonds with our Ace.
We now play a Spade to dummy's 7 of Spades.
When that wins, we ruff what is the 3rd round of Diamonds with our a King.
We now play our Spade to dummy's 10 of Spades and ruff the 4th round of Diamonds with our a Queen.
We now play a Spade to dummy's 8 of Spade to reach our established 5 of Diamonds.
We now fill out our 'Lotto Ticket'.

- 1087
- Q J
-A5432
-962
- 95
- A432
- K76
$\because K$ Q J 10



## - 2



- K 10986
- J 1098
- 873
- AKQJ643
$13^{7} 4$


## Once in a Lifetime (Board 11) <br> Contract: 4 by South Lead: ©f King

$\downarrow 75$

- Q
- A 54
- This hand requires a bit of imagination, however, when you think about it, how else are you going to make your contract?
- Let us see how many imaginative declarers we have.


- Three declarers were absolutely ‘Card Perfect’, namely, Ian Moss, Brian Sharkey and Pedro Campos, so they are awarded the full 12 Points.
- There were a couple of declarers, namely, Isaac Stone and Thomas Bradkin, who were nearly 'Card Perfect'. They ducked the opening lead, which in theory, although not in practice, gave West the opportunity of finding the killing Spade switch at trick 2, which would prematurely remove one of dummy's vital entries, so Isaac and Thomas are deducted a couple of points, so they are awarded 10.
- Spare a thought for poor old Elizabeth Gahan, who I am sure would have found the correct play, had it not been for an inspired lead from Mike Wright of the 9 of Spades, which prematurely removes one of dummy's vital entries, so we better award Mike 4 Points for that imaginative, killing lead.


## Essex EuroVision Boot-Camp Results

The votes have been counted and the winner of the Essex EuroVision Boot-Camp is:

## Neme Imogen La Chapelle

| 1st | Imogen La Chapelle | Junior International | 54 Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2nd | Audrey Hartley | Essex | 48 Points |
| 3rd | Thomas Bradkin | Junior International | 46 Points |
| 4th | Brian Davies | Essex | 44 Points |
| 5th= | Claudio Bavaresco | Italy | 36 Points |
| 5th= | Dave Embleton | Essex | 36 Points |
| 5th= | Dido Coley | Junior International | 36 Points |
| 5th= | John McCoy | Essex | 36 Points |
| 5th= | John Pioli | Essex | 36 Points |
| 5th= | Kai Eckert | California | 36 Points |
| 5th= | Peter Backlund | Sweden | 36 Points |
| 12th= | Brian Sharkey | Essex | 30 Points |
| $12 \mathrm{th}=$ | Maks Blicharz | Junior International | 30 Points |
| 14th | Angeliki Politou | Greece | 28 Points |
| 15 th= | Borje Dahlberg | Sweden | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Elizabeth Gahan | Junior International | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Graham Randall | Essex | 24 Points |
| 15th= | Holden Clark | Junior International | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Jim Kenneally | Essex | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Maureen Vede | Essex | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Monica Mele | Italy | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Pedro Campos | Portugal | 24 Points |
| 15 th= | Susan Thorburn | Essex | 24 Points |


| 15th= | Val Mollison | Essex | 24 Points |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25th | Lily Kearney | Junior International | 22 Points |
| 26th= | Alan Bryant | Essex | 18 Points |
| 26th= | Gemma Fewster | Essex | 18 Points |
| 26th= | Ian Moss | Essex | 18 Points |
| 29th | Geoff Webber | Essex | 16 Points |
| 30th= | Peter Richardson | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Artemis Christaki | Greece | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Barry Capal | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Colin Peden | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Mariana Jordao | Portugal | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Pat Watson | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Paul Mollison | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Sheena Millins | Essex | 12 Points |
| 30th= | Sophie Harper | Essex | 12 Points |
| 39th | Isaac Stone | California | 10 Points |
| 40th | Rafael Latorre | Spain | 9 Points |
| 41st= | Alberto Marinho | Portugal | 6 Points |
| 41st= | George Vede | Essex | 6 Points |
| 41st= | Paddy Murray | Essex | 6 Points |
| 44th= | Jane Huxter | Essex | 4 Points |
| 44th= | Mike Wright | Essex | 4 Points |

- Previous Boot-Camp analysis documents on the subjects of:
- "Declarer Play in a No-Trump Contract" (April 2023)
- "Declarer Play in a Suit Contract"
- "Defence"
(September 2023)
(February 2023)
- Can be found here:
- https://www.bridgewebs.com/essex/No\ trump.pdf
- https://www.bridgewebs.com/essex/Suit\ contracts.pdf
- https://www.bridgewebs.com/essex/Defence.pdf
- "Congratulations" for participating in this latest Boot-Camp.
- Hopefully, this Boot-Camp has gone a long way to "Making Your Mind Up",
- That you can go "One Step Further" to making your next bridge tournament,
- not your "Waterloo".


