## Improvers' Bidding Challenge

8 - July 2017

Russell Frame

We have input from a panel of 11 bridge teachers for our latest challenge. The questions for Challenge 9 appear elsewhere in this magazine and will also be posted on the SBU website - if you are a Bronze category player, please have a go and submit an entry. Let's see what our panel of teachers has to say:

Problem 1 Pairs Game All

|  | N | E | S | W |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AK963 | - | - | - | P |
| Q | 1 | P | 2 | P |
| Q972 | $?$ |  |  |  |
| AQ6 |  |  |  |  |

The panel all felt that game was on but the majority wanted to explore further through the use of a trial bid - for those not aware of how this works, it allows for more input from partner to help determine the final level (in this case 3 or 4 Spades), the trump suit already having been agreed:

Sanders (many others similarly): 3 4 : A traditional trial bid asking partner to bid game with a maximum or with less values and help in D.

The remainder decided to bid game themselves, some because they were confident it would make...

Tudor (similarly Edmond): 4 $\boldsymbol{4}$ : I can construct several minimal hands for my partner where there'd be a good play for game so I leave partner out of the decision!
...or because they weren't sure if Checkback was part of their system:

Campbell: 44: The more advanced would use a trial bid but most Improvers have not been taught that.

| Problem 1 | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 8 | 10 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | 0 | 9 |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | 0 | 7 |
| $4 \boldsymbol{}$ | 3 | 5 |
| Pass | 0 | 2 |

Partner actually held T872, $\uparrow$ K43, AT4, e953, so the spade game would be bid and made comfortably.

Problem 2 Pairs Love All

|  | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K | - | - | - | P |
| - Q9532 | P | P | 14 | P |
| - J864 | 1NT | P | 2 | P |
| * KT7 | ? |  |  |  |

The panel was unanimous in passing:
Merriman (all others similarly): Pass: Partner should have 6+ spades and I have nothing better to offer.

| Problem 2 | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 11 | 10 |
| 3^ | 0 | 7 |
| 2NT | 0 | 5 |
| 3ゅ | 0 | 3 |
| 3NT | 0 | 2 |

Partner actually held $\uparrow A Q 9762, ~ \wedge J$, -AT32, 4 and, although computer analysis made the spade game, this was only by "pinning" the 9 , a line that would be beyond most players!

Problem 3 Pairs NS Vul

|  | N | E | S | W |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - T5 | P | P | $1 *$ | P |
| - AJ976 | 1V | P | 1NT* | P |
| - J763 | ? |  |  |  |
| * AT |  |  |  |  |

*15-17 HCP

This was the question that caused the greatest diversity of answers, three from the panel and nine in all from participants let's see what the teachers have to say:

Pigott (similarly Hamilton, Male,
McGowan \& Merriman): 2: This gives us better chances than 5 D , so 3 D is a dangerous choice - 4H might be better if partner has 3card support so I would use Checkback if it is in our system as 3 N might be difficult on a C lead.

The others felt that the Checkback convention would not be available but chose different ways of dealing with this constraint (Note: after a NT re-bid by opener, a club bid can be agreed by partnerships as the Checkback, convention, asking for details of opener's major suit holdings):

Benson (similarly Lees, Sanders \& Tudor):
3४: Forcing - if partner has 3H they will bid 3H but, if not, 3NT.

Edmond (similarly Campbell): 3NT: It would be nice to use Checkback but, if you do not have that convention available, this seems the best option, despite the potentially devastating spade lead!

| Problem 3 | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | 5 | 10 |
| 3 | 4 | 9 |
| 3NT | 2 | 8 |
| 5 | 0 | 6 |
| 2 NT | 0 | 5 |
| 3 | 0 | 4 |
| 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Pass | 0 | 1 |

In reality, partner had $\uparrow$ K93, $\uparrow K 4, ~ A K T 94$, \&KJ8 and there were actually 12 tricks available in NT due to a favourable lie of the diamond \& heart suits.

Problem 4 Pairs Game all

|  | N | E | S | W |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \multirow{2}T8{} | P | P | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \downarrow$ |
| J62 | 3 | P | $3 \uparrow$ | 4 |
| K6 | ? |  |  |  |
| \multirow{3}AT8763{} |  |  |  |  |

Most of the panel elected to take no further action:

Campbell (many others similarly): Pass: 3C is already an overbid as a new suit at the 2level generally shows $10+$ HCP - partner has not shown a strong hand so don't encourage him any further, especially as he does have another chance to bid.

Despite disagreeing with the initial bid, however,Steve felt that bidding game was better than defending:

Male: 4a: I would not bid 3C to start with, however KD \& AC for partner look to be working.

Two, on the other hand, felt that defending was best and doubled for penalties:

Sanders (similarly Pigott): Double: I have two certain tricks and partner has opened the bidding - there is no chance that this will make!

| Problem 4 | Votes | Marks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 8 | 10 |
| 4@ | 1 | 9 |
| 3NT | 0 | 5 |
| Dbl | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 |

Partner held $\uparrow A K J 7543, ~$ A4, $\uparrow$, $\mathbf{~ J 9 5}$, perhaps more than we might have expected. While doubling would gather +200 , 11 tricks could be made in NT and, with a favourable lie in spades \& clubs, slam was actually available in spades!

Congratulations to the following top scorers in the various Master Point categories, particularly Ken on his perfect score:

| $\mathbf{2}^{*}$ <br> Master | Ann Kerr | Dundee | 38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}^{*}$ <br> Master | Bettina <br> Debon | St Andrews | 34 |
| District <br> Master | John <br> Scrimgeour | Aberdeen | 38 |
|  | Roy Heanes | Falcon | 37 |
| Local <br> Master | Ken <br> Latham | Carlton | 38 |
|  | Eoin Rutter <br> David <br> Olive | Carlton | 38 |
| Club <br> Master | Ken Brown | Pentland | 40 |
|  | Jean <br> Cousins | Buchanan | 35 |
| Novice | Donald <br> Bain | Comiston | 36 |
|  | Cecilia <br> McRitchie | New St. <br> Andrew | 36 |
|  |  |  |  |

