



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

Summary of the reviews in Orlando

At the World Bridge Series, contested in Orlando, Florida in September and October 2018, a total of ten cases were submitted for review.

The Reviewer was Ata Aydin, assisted by Herman De wael.

The Reviews were usually treated by both persons together, although the final judgment was always handed out by "the Reviewer".

In all cases, the players or captain of the side asking for the review were heard.

All reviews were written up by the assistant (Herman De wael), but the write-ups are for internal use only.

The cases:

In one case, a total of 12 players had been consulted. Although the problem had been complex and the appellants had a decent case, the polls had been conclusive. The Reviewer returned the deposit because of the difficulty of the case. Since one of the tasks of the Reviewer is to decide if the consulted players are of the right calibre, and only the Reviewer can do this, there should be some leniency towards the players that ask for a review if the result of the poll seems at odds with their judgment.

In another case, a player had explained a convention with just one word. The opponent knew that convention and had not asked further. After he had taken a wrong decision during play, it was discovered that the version of the convention that was played was radically different from the version that the opponent knew. The Director ruled in the opponent's favour, but the offending side wanted to know whether the player had not failed to protect himself by asking further. Since the Director had only relied on his colleagues' knowledge of the convention, the Reviewer asked the Director to conduct another poll, wanting to know if players in general knew about the alternate versions. It turned out they did not, so the original ruling was confirmed.

In a third case, the Director had ruled that a player had failed to protect himself by asking for the meaning of a bid. The players wanted this to be reviewed, since the Director had not polled any players on this. The Reviewer affirmed that such a decision was up to the Director and the procedures do not mandate a poll in this case, so the review was denied.



Headquarters: Maison du Sport International – 54 av. de Rhodanie – 1007 Lausanne – Switzerland

Tel.: +41 21 544 7218 – Fax: +41 21 601 2315

President's Address: Via Moscova 46/5 – 20121 Milano – Italy

Tel.: +39 02 367 04 987 – Fax: +39 02 367 05 962



The fourth case centred around misinformation. A bid of 2♠ had been explained as "M+m". This explanation, is non-sensical (using spades to show hearts or spades?) and even a brown convention. The Reviewer agreed with the Director that such considerations are not necessarily to be taken and that it had been so easy for the offending player to have written an S rather than an M.

Another reason for reviewing was that the offending player had not been certain of his own system, which meant he finally chose an alternative (the one suggested by the UI) that catered to both possibilities for the meaning his partner's bid. The Director had not mentioned this uncertainty to the experts, but he explained that omission by saying that it may well have been his partner's hesitation which caused the doubt in the player's mind. As a side issue, the players now questioned the break in tempo itself. The Director stated that he had watched the video of the table, and that the tray had returned after 1 minute and 42 seconds!

In the next case, third hand had hesitated for some time at trick one, and had then played a card which was contrary to their basic system. Nevertheless, the opening leader made the correct play. The Director had conducted a correct poll, but the offenders wanted to know if the Director had mentioned their particular reasoning for the switch to the experts. The Director had not done so, believing the bidding was enough to have the experts draw the same conclusion. The review was refused.

Then, an opponent, who thought he had seen an alert (denied but considered unimportant by the Director), had looked at the system card, which held incorrect information. The offenders believed the player ought to have asked anyway, but the Director ruled that this was not needed. Since there is no procedure for this, the Reviewer could see nothing wrong with the Director's decision, which was within his discretion.

The next case centred around Rusinow leads. A player had led the Jack from king-queen-jack, and had explained at the table he promised the Queen. Declarer had then not imagined that the King was also there. While the System card was mildly deficient (the possibility of J from KQJ had not been mentioned), the experts consulted had stated that this was common, and Declarer ought to have known this. Since the procedures had been followed, no reason for the Reviewer to intervene.

Then one case in which the Reviewer did ask for the poll to be conducted again. The players had done some polling of their own, also looking at the actual results in the room, and found the result of the poll surprising. The Director could only mention three experts (of suitable level) so the Reviewer asked for some extra polling. This did indeed confirm that there had been a Logical Alternative, so the Director changed his initial ruling.

In the final case, the Reviewer listened to the Director's story, which included a poll of ten players, and asked the players to withdraw their request for a review, which they did.

This meant that not a single deposit was kept.

There was one extra request for a review, but this was withdrawn when the pair noticed they had in fact already qualified.

Herman De wael
Assistant Reviewer