## 50. 3NT ys 5e choices

## By Ron Klinger

The Alt Invitational, held in April, was organized by bid72, bridge 24 and netbridgeonline, together with BBO (Bridge Base Online). There were eight teams, playing a round-robin, followed by semi-finals and a final. These were the teams:

| Blass | Josef Blass, Sjoert Brink, Bas Drijver, Jacek Kalita, Michael Nowosadski, <br> Jacek Pszczola (Pepsi) |
| :--- | :--- |
| De Botton | Janet de Botton, Thomas Charlsen, Jason Hackett, Thor Erik Hoftaniska, Alexander Hydes, <br> Artur Malinowski |
| Hungary | Miklos Dumbovich, Gal Hegedus, Csaba Szabo, Balasz Szegedi, Gabor Winkler <br> Upmark <br> Peter Bertheau, Per Ola Cullin, Simon Hult, Marion Michielsen, Fredrik Nyström, <br> Mikael Rimstedt, Ola Rimstedt, Johan Upmark |
| Meltzer | Rose Meltzer, Nikolay Demirev, Bartosz Chmurski, Piotr Nawrocki, Piotr Tuczynski, <br> Piotr Wiankowski |
| Milner | Reese Milner, Hemant Lall, Sabine Auken, Roy Welland <br> Street <br> Team NLPaul Street, Kamel Fergani, Nicolas L'Ecuyer, Ron Pachtman, Fred Pollack, Piotr Zatorski <br> Maarten Schollaardt, Merijn Groenenboom, Danny Molenaar, Tim Verbeek, <br> Joris van Lankveld, Berend van den Bos, Bart Nab, Bob Drijver, Guy Mendes de Leon, <br> Zhao$\quad$Thibo Sprinkhuizen <br> Zhao Chen, Liu Jing, Bauke Muller, Ricco van Prooijen, Louk Verhees, Simon de Wijs |

Day 3, Round 6: BLASS beat DE BOTTON 47-36 (12.54-7.46) MELTZER beat TEAM NL by 42-32 (12.337.67) MILNER beat HUNGARY by 50-40 (12.33-7.67) and STREET beat ZHAO 59-32 (15.39-4.61)

## Current Standings after Round 6:

1. BLASS 88.13
2. DE BOTTON 77.53
3. STREET 75.33
4. TEAM NL 58.47
5. MELTZER 56.33
6. ZHAO 47.43
7. HUNGARY 41.06
8. MILNER 37.72

With neither side vulnerable, South opens 1NT (13-15 or 14-17). West shows a 1-suiter (via Double or via an artificial $2 \downarrow$ ). What would you do as North with:

```
^ --
` A98
* KQ1098
& 108743
```

South dealer : Nil vulnerable.
North
^ --

- A98
- KQ1098
- 108743

| West | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| ^ AKJ8632 | - 754 |
| - 32 | $\checkmark$ Q10765 |
| - A | - J762 |
| - Q95 | - 2 |

South

- Q109
$\checkmark$ KJ4
- 543
- AKJ6

The board was flat in BLASS vs DE BOTTON, but not in a way which either North-South pair would have wanted:

BLASS North-South:

| West | North | East | South <br> 1NT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | 3^ ${ }^{(1)}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(1) Stopper ask, spade shortage

West led the 2 . South won and played $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{K}$, West won and continued with $\wedge \mathrm{A}$, the rest of the spades and the $\star$ A to take $3 N T$ four down, East-West +200 .

DE BOTTON North-South:

| West | North | East | South <br> 1NT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \wedge^{(1)}$ | Dble | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

(1) Single suited in a major

West led the $\boldsymbol{\wedge}$ K, asking for count. East played the $\mathbf{7}$, reverse count, showing an odd number of spades. West
 out, South took the K and played a diamond. West won, cashed the spades and the and gave declarer a heart trick at the end, also four down, East-West +200 , no swing.

MELTZER, North-South: 1NT : Double : 3^ (stopper ask) : 3NT, all pass. Lead: $\uparrow$ K. Four down, -200 .
TEAM NL North-South:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 18. |
| 14. | 230 | 24 | $3{ }^{(1)}$ |
| 4 | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 54 | Dble | All Pass |  |

(1) Trial bid, seeking help in diamonds

North led the $\varangle$ K. West won and played the 9 : ten - two - jack!. South returned the $\uparrow 9$. West won with the $\wedge$, ruffed the 5 , ruffed a diamond and ruffed the Q . West had a spade and two hearts to lose, two down. NorthSouth +300 and 11 Imps to TEAM NL. With 5 going down, bidding 5-over-5 proved unsuccessful.

|  | North <br> ค -- <br> $\checkmark$ A98 <br> - KQ1098 <br> - 108743 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West |  | East |
| - AKJ8632 |  | - 754 |
| $\bullet 32$ |  | $\bullet$ Q10765 |
| - A |  | - J762 |
| * Q95 |  | - 2 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ^ Q109 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KJ4 |  |
|  | - 543 |  |
|  | * AKJ6 |  |

 99: four! - two - jack. South switched to the ace. West was two down, North-South +300 . With 5 . makeable without too much trouble, bidding 5 -over- 5 was a good idea. You just have to pick your moments. STREET North-South:

| West | North | East | South <br> 1NT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{~}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{~}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

With $5 \boldsymbol{*}$ on for North-South, it would be a good result to be one off in $4 \boldsymbol{d}$. West achieved a better result. He made 4 . West won the $\downarrow$ K lead and exited with the 9 : seven! - two - jack. South switched to the $\boldsymbol{\$}$. Given South’s 1 NT opening, West placed South with the $\mathbf{Q}$ rather than North having the $\mathbf{Q}$ singleton. West covered with the $\uparrow \mathrm{J}$ winning. Then came club ruff, diamond ruff, club ruff, diamond ruff, $\uparrow A, \stackrel{\wedge}{ }$, ten tricks, +420 and 12 Imps to STREET.
 MILNER North-South:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1NT |
| Dble | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{(1)}$ | Pass | 32 |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | Dble ${ }^{(2)}$ | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | 5 | All |  |

(1) Takeout, usually minors
(2) For takeout

West led the A, ruffed. After 4 to the South played the 4 . West won and, endplayed, exited with the 3 . South won with the $\uparrow$ J, ruffed a spade and played the 8 to the $\$$. South had 11 tricks, +400 and 12 Imps to MILNER.

South dealer North-South vulnerable

| West North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $?$ |  |  |

What would you do as West with:

```
& A2
\bullet KQJ64
-103
*9765
```


## Round 6 : Board 15

South dealer : North-South vulnerable.

|  | North |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $109$ |  |
|  | - 93 |  |
|  | - A74 |  |
|  | - AKQJ43 |  |
| West |  | East |
| - A2 |  | - KJ54 |
| - KQJ64 |  | $\checkmark 10872$ |
| - 103 |  | - 9862 |
| - 9765 |  | -8 |
|  | South |  |
|  | ^ Q8763 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A5 |  |
|  | - KQJ5 |  |
|  | -102 |  |

While 5 is available, the spot you would like to reach is $3 N T$ with 11 tricks unassailable. With a free run, that should not be too difficult. However, West might well overcall $2 \vee$, especially at this vulnerability. Two Wests passed over 1 $\boldsymbol{A}$ and North-South had no trouble finding 3NT, making 11 tricks, +660 . One passed $1 \boldsymbol{\perp}$, but came in later with $2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$. That proved ineffective:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 14. |
| Pass | 2es ${ }^{(1)}$ | Pass | 2* |
| 2 | 38 | $3 \times$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \mathbf{1}^{(2)}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

(1) Forcing to game
(2) Doubleton spade support

Lead: $\uparrow K,+660$, for a flat board with $3 N T$ reached without interference at the other table.
The board was also flat in HUNGARY vs MILNER, but not in 3NT. MILNER North-South had an artificial auction to 5\%. HUNGARY North-South:

| West | North | East | South <br>  <br> $2 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | $4 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | Dble |
|  | 5 | All Pass |  |

Both Norths made 11 tricks, +600 .
So, how can you reach $3 N T$ if the opponents bid $2 \downarrow$ and raise to $3 \vee$ ? This was yesterday's second problem:
South dealer : North-South vulnerable

| West | North | East | South <br>  <br> $2 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ | Pass |
|  | $?$ |  |  |

What would you do as North with:

```
& $09
```

- 83
- A74
- AKQJ43

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $109$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 93$ |  |  |
|  | - A74 |  |  |
|  | * AKQJ43 |  |  |
| West |  |  | East |
| - A2 |  |  | - KJ54 |
| - KQJ64 |  |  | $\checkmark 10872$ |
| - 103 |  |  | - 9862 |
| - 9765 |  |  | \& 8 |
|  | South |  |  |
|  | - Q8763 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A5 |  |  |
|  | - KQJ5 |  |  |
|  | - 102 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  |  | 14. |
| 2V | 32 | $3 *$ | Pass |
| Pass | ? |  |  |

One North bid 4\&, all pass, +150 . Nope, that wasn't the right answer. That was -11 Imps vs $3 N T+660$.
Another North doubled, all pass. The result was one down, North-South +100 . Nope, that didn't work either. At the other table, North also doubled $3 \vee$, but here that was not for penalties or for takeout, but an ask for a stopper in hearts. Now that's a good idea. South bid 3NT, all pass, North-South +660 and +11 Imps.

## Problems for Tomorrow:

1. South dealer : North-South vulnerable

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $?$ |  |  |

What would you do as North with:

```
@ --
* AQJ3
- AKJ102
* AQ92
```

2. East dealer : North-South vulnerable

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Pass | 1 『 |
| Pass | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{(1)}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ | $?$ |

(1) Game-force, 4+ hearts

What would you do as South with:

```
@ K964
` KQ843
* AKQ7
& --
```

Why not phone or email your bridge partners and compare your answers and your reasoning?
Why do 'fat chance' and 'slim chance' mean the same thing?

