



World Bridge Federation

International Sports Federation (IF) recognized by the International Olympic Committee

Reviews from the 2023 World Bridge Team Championships, Marrakech, Morocco

VC /RR

W-N/S

	♠ AQT32	
	♥ 764	
	♦ A	
	♣ QJ98	
♠ 65		♠ 874
♥ 9532		♥ AKJT
♦ QJT743		♦ K9
♣ 2		♣ AT53
	♠ KJ9	
	♥ Q8	
	♦ 8652	
	♣ K764	

W	N	E	S
3♦	3♠	pass	4♠
pass	pass	X	all pass

East led ♥K (West showed an even number of hearts) and continued with a spade. Heart back to the K and another spade. A heart ruffed, diamond to the ace, last trump drawn and another spade. Now declarer played the ♣J, which held, and then showed her hand saying: 'You get the ♣A'; no further statement was made. The opponents showed disagreement, after which the declarer closed her hand, took a card without showing it, put it back, and produced the ♣Q. Then the TD was called. Declarer stated that she had a full count of West's hand and knew the clubs were splitting 4-1. The TD considered this to be a convincing reason to allow the claim. Then they checked the camera and found out that declarer had taken out the ♣8 and only after some seconds had played ♣Q instead. It looked as though declarer was unaware of the possibility of losing two club tricks when she made the claim. The decision was changed in 4♠ -1.

The N/S team asked for a review, arguing that playing ♣8 is not reasonable when you know the distribution in this 4-card ending.

Decision: Law 68C tells us that a claim should be accompanied by a statement. Furthermore, declarer considered playing a wrong card even after the opponents disputed the claim. The decision was upheld. The deposit was returned due to the confusion created by the initial incorrect ruling.



Headquarters :
Maison du Sport International – 54 av. de Rhodanie – 1007 Lausanne – Switzerland
Tel. +41 21 544 7218



BB /RR #1

N - E/W

♠ 643		
♥ 9643		
♦ T		
♣ K8753		
♠ KJ87		♠ Q92
♥ --		♥ AKQJ82
♦ AKJ93		♦ 642
♣ Q642		♣ A
	♠ AT5	
	♥ T75	
	♦ Q875	
	♣ JT9	

W	N	E	S
	pass	1♥	pass
2♦	pass	2♥	pass
2♠	pass	3♦	pass
3NT	pass	4NT	pass
5♥	pass	6♥	all pass

North called the TD after the slow (80 seconds) 3NT and called him back after East had made 12 tricks and challenged East's continuation after the slow 3NT.

The TD discovered that 2♦ was game-forcing, that 4NT was intended as quantitative, and that 5♥ was intended to show two key cards for diamonds.

The TD polled 6 experts with the question of what the hesitation implied. Each considered it more likely that it involved the choice of denomination rather than showing extra strength, the more so for a longer hesitation. So, the continuation with 4NT was not demonstrably suggested. The case could be closed: no adjustment, but the TD continued his poll and asked about East's calls after 3NT. One bid 4NT quantitative and had 4♣ as a second choice. One bid 4♥, one bid 4♥ and seriously considered 4♣, two bid 4♣ with 4♦ as second choice, and one bid 4♣ with 4♥ as second choice.

N/S requested a review, challenging the 4NT bid after the hesitation. Since the poll determined that this bid was not suggested by the hesitation, that argument was not deemed valid. The result stands and the deposit is forfeited.

BB /RR #2

W - N/S

♠ Q753			
♥ KQJ94			
♦ T5			
♣ QT			
♠ J96		♠ AT8	
♥ AT7532		♥ 86	
♦ 63		♦ AQJ	
♣ 43		♣ AK762	
	♠ K42		
	♥ ..		
	♦ K98742		
	♣ J985		

W	N	E	S
2♦	2♥	X	

The system card showed 2♦ to be weak with diamonds. East had made a gesture with the intention to alert, but North had not seen it. After the double, North wanted to know more and discovered that 2♦ was multi. E/W had changed their system a month ago. North summoned the TD, who allowed North to withdraw his call and choose another. The TD also told East that the 2♥ bid would become UI for him.

The auction continued:

2♦ pass 2♥ all pass

That contract went one off. N/S had problems with the 2♥ bid and so informed the TD. The TD polled 6 players with the information that 2♦ showed multi with 3 to 5 points. Only one bid 2♥, and the TD decided to adjust the score to a weighted one based 4♥X. E/W then asked for a review because the players were wrongly informed, 2♦ showed 0 to 5 points. The reviewer asked the TD to hold a new poll, which had the same outcome: only one player bid 2♥.

So, the decision was upheld, but the deposit was returned due to a mistake in the process.

d'Orsi Trophy /RR

S - all

	♠ J42		
	♥ T984		
	♦ K432		
	♣ 75		
♠ A4		♠ KQT873	
♥ J752		♥ ---	
♦ AT65		♦ QJ	
♣ 632		♣ AKQJT	
	♠ 65		
	♥ AKQ63		
	♦ 987		
	♣ 984		

W	N	E	S
			pass
pass	pass	1♠	pass
1NT	pass	3♣	pass
3NT	pass	4♣	pass
4♦	pass	4♥	pass
4♠	pass	5♣	pass
6♣			

The TD was called after a slow 5♣ and again after declarer had made his contract. N/S had problems with the 6♣ bid after the hesitation. According to E/W, 1NT showed 6-11 and 4♦, 4♥, and 4♠ were first or second-round controls.

The procedure is straightforward. Poll peers. The outcome was somewhat surprising, with strong arguments for a pass (West has shown it all) to the far other side: 6♣ (It is impossible not to bid 6♣ with two aces). The votes broke evenly, so the TDs ruled that Pass was a logical alternative and adjusted the result to 5♣ by East, E/W +620.

E/W requested a review.

Given these numbers, E/W should not have asked for a review, but the procedure followed had started with a wrong auction given to the players asked, and then their choice was a unanimous 6♣, which led to accepting the 6♣ bid—enough reason to return the deposit.

VC /QF

E - N/S

	♠ AJ96		
	♥ A86		
	♦ 7532		
	♣ A9		
♠ K		♠ T542	
♥ 9754		♥ KQJT	
♦ Q864		♦ KJT	
♣ J842		♣ T6	
	♠ Q873		
	♥ 32		
	♦ A9		
	♣ KQ753		

W	N	E	S
		pass	1♣
pass	1♥	X	2♠
pass	4♠	all pass	

1♥ was alerted as a transfer for spades. The double showed hearts and was not alerted. Declarer took the double as takeout and started trumps by leading ♠Q. The contract went 2 off.

The TD was called after the play and declarer told him that she felt misinformed: the double should have been alerted.

The TD decided that both meanings (hearts and take out) were quite normal and that declarer should have protected herself by asking about it. No infraction, the result stands. N/S asked for a review, one of the arguments being that had East not passed on the previous round, the double would have been takeout according to the system.

It is the task of the TD to interpret the laws and regulations, and only if that interpretation is apparently wrong will the reviewer advise to reconsider it (L93B3). That is certainly not the case here. This review should not have been requested; the deposit was forfeited.

WC /QF

In the fourth session, North entered a score in the tablet, and to be sure about the first lead, he took LHO's card out of the board and saw the ♣Q. Then, it appeared that he had taken cards from the next board, which had been put on the table in the meantime. This mistake cost his team a 3-imp penalty. Between sessions 5 and 6, the team complained about the penalty, explaining that an opponent sitting East had put the next board on the table. The TDs watched the video, which confirmed this account. Considering both teams partly at fault, they waved the given penalty. Then, the opponents asked for a review.

No law or regulation justifies the decision to make the opponent's action (putting the next board on the table as E/W) an infraction. So, the reviewer advised the TDs to reconsider. Only thereafter, other relevant facts became clear: the protest time for anything that happened in the fourth session had long been passed, and the TD is bound to that time limit. Conclusion: A change in the result of the fourth session is no longer possible.

Transnational Swiss, 10th and final round.

W - none

♠ J87			
♥ KQ853			
♦ --			
♣ KQ763			
♠ Q96542		♠ 3	
♥ 72		♥ AJT4	
♦ Q43		♦ AJ87652	
♣ T9		♣ 2	
	♠ AKT		
	♥ 96		
	♦ KT9		
	♣ AJ854		

W	N	E	S
2♦	2♥	3♦	3NT
All pass			

2♦ is multi, 3♦ was explained by West to South as showing a long major, by East as diamonds. The contract went one off. Then N/S discovered the different explanations and asked for a ruling.

E/W could not prove the agreement they had, so South was considered to be misinformed. The TD organised a poll, and a majority chose double instead of 3NT, so the TD adjusted the score to 5♣ made, N/S +400. E/W asked for a review since they thought that knowing East had diamonds, South still might bid 3NT.

The reviewer asked the TD to give weight to 3NT, and the final decision was two-thirds of 5♣ just made and one-third to 3NT - 1. The deposit was returned.

BB /SF

E - all

	♠ KT542	
	♥ Q	
	♦ AKQT82	
	♣ K	
♠ J983		♠ AQ7
♥ 8754		♥ K96
♦ --		♦ J763
♣ AQT82		♣ 743
	♠ 6	
	♥ AJT32	
	♦ 954	
	♣ J965	

W	N	E	S
		pass	pass
1♣	1♦	1♠	X
2♠	X	3NT	X
4♣	4♠	pass	5♦
pass	pass	X	all pass

East alerted 1♠ and explained it as fewer than 4 spades; West did not alert it.

South's double was intended to show hearts with diamond tolerance, but North explained it as spades. West showed his spades with 2♠, but East interpreted the call as a cuebid. North's double showed spades also. When the tray returned with 3NT, West realised his mistake and gave the correct explanation, but the auction became weird and N/S asked for a ruling. South explained that he would have bid 2♦ instead of his first double with the correct information.

North took 10 tricks in 5♦x .

A complicated poll was held with several calls to consider and a couple of assumptions to make. The outcome was a weighted score of 70% of 5♣X by West -3 and 30% of 5♦X by North -1.

E/W asked for a review because they thought that some aspects were not sufficiently covered. The reviewer agreed and asked the TDs to make a new poll, starting with North's bid after 2♠ (3♦ and 3♣), questioning East's call thereafter (it remained 3NT). Then South's call (mostly pass, but also 4♦ and a double), and West's call thereafter (mostly pass and a 4♣). It all resulted in at least 20 pollees and a weighted score of 60% of 3NT by East -3, and small portions for 5♦X-1, 4♦ made, and 4♣X -2. Calculation showed that E/W lost a net of 2 imps on the board, the result at the other table being 4♦ +1. The deposit was returned.

BB /Final

N - N/S

♠ K8		
♥ KT8743		
♦ 743		
♣ AJ		
♠ J75		♠ 94
♥ AJ5		♥ Q962
♦ AQT2		♦ 985
♣ K42		♣ T986
	♠ AQT632	
	♥ --	
	♦ KJ6	
	♣ Q753	

W	N	E	S
	2♥	pass	3♠
X	pass	pass	pass

North had explained 3S as a splinter, South as invitational for spades. When the auction seemed over, the players realised that something was wrong and eventually summoned the TD. The TD discovered that East had been misinformed and allowed him to change his call (L21b1A). East refused, and a dispute arose. E/W claimed the board was unplayable, and, though the TD instructed East repeatedly, the player seemed unwilling to listen. Only after a long interval did East reluctantly pass again (or did not want to change his call). So 3♠X was played, and declarer scored 11 tricks. E/W protested immediately. The TDs analysed what had happened and, for unclear reasons, decided to adjust the score to 4♣X with different numbers of tricks, a weighted score with 4 imps less for N/S.

Both teams asked for a review.

E/W argued that the TDs should have considered many more possibilities, up to even bidding a slam with the N/S hands. Furthermore, they considered it impossible that N/S obtained a favourable result when it caused this problem with an incorrect explanation.

N/S pointed to L21B1a, indicating that the table result was the only legal one. With East being correctly informed that 3♠ was invitational, the bidding was back to normal.

The reviewer agreed with N/S and advised the TD to change the result back to the table result. He found the request for a review by E/W without merit, forfeited their deposit, and assessed an additional penalty of 3 imps. Further, he advised the TD to give East a 'yellow card' for misbehaviour.

d'Orsi Trophy /SF Almost a review

S - N/S	♠ Q ♥ J84 ♦ AT65432 ♣ AQ		
♠ T842 ♥ KQ3 ♦ KJ8 ♣ KJ7	♠ AKJ5 ♥ 62 ♦ Q7 ♣ T9863	♠ 9763 ♥ AT975 ♦ 9 ♣ 542	

W	N	E	S
1♣	1♦	1♥	Pass
Pass	3♦	Pass	X
All pass			3NT

West could have given a support redouble but chose to refrain.

South ended in 3NT and West led the ♥K. After 15 seconds, South played the 4, East the 7 (low encouraging) and South thought for another 10 seconds before playing the 6. He held his hands under the table and had taken the 6 when playing from dummy. West did not return a heart, and after less than impeccable defence, declarer emerged with 9 tricks.

E/W called the TD and told what had happened in the first trick. South said he had felt unwell for the whole day, struggling to play and unaware of slow play in the first trick.

The TD ruled that deception had occurred and applied L73E2, awarding an adjusted score. E/W's play and the unclear signal with the 7 made the TD believe that the play might have gone similarly without the hesitation. It led to a weighted score: 1/3 for the table result and 2/3 for 3NT-2. E/W considered requesting a review, but the match's final result was known, and even with a full weight for 3NT, they would lose. No review.

Had South been assessed a penalty for his behaviour, the E/W team could have won the match, but the TD accepted South's explanation and decided that the deception was not intentional.