



EUROPEAN WINTER TRANSNATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

— PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC · 10 - 19 FEBRUARY, 2026 —

Daily Bulletin N. 11

Friday, 20 February 2026

Eric Laurant Editor • Mark Horton Coordinator • Francesca Canali Head of Communication, Graphic Designer, Photographer • Arianna Testa Photographer
David Bird, David Burn, Amy Casanova, Marjo Chorus, Mark Horton, Jos Jacobs, Brian Senior, Marc Smith Journalists • Herman De wael Proofreader



DAISY CHAIN BLOOMS TO GOLD

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

Team **Daisy Chain** claimed the title with a total of 116.89 VP.

The silver medal went to Team **Lundberg** (*Peter Bertheau, Simon Hult, Anne-Marie Katarina Lundberg, Christina Lund Madsen*), while the bronze was taken by Team **2 Many Gingers** (*Nikolaj Hammelev, Ella Rosthøj, Julie Marina Sigsgaard, Daniel Tylvad*).

Pictured: EBL President Eric Laurant, Quentin Robert, Anne-Laure Tartarin, Pierre Franceschetti, Hilda Setton, Cedric Lorenzini and Marion Michielsen.

The **Mixed BAM** was won by Team **Blue Note** (*Blandine Delestre, Daniel Delestre, Jerzy Romanowski and Martine Rossard*).

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS


14-year-old **Sophie Zaidenberg Gatt** and 18-year-old **Eitan Gisin** from Israel won with a score of 55.57%, edging out the English pair of **Andrew McIntosh** and **Sara Moran** (55.16%) and the Turkish duo of **Levent İmamoğlu** and **Olgu Şeker** (53.71%).

Both Sophie and Eitan (pictured right) dedicated their gold medal to their grandmothers: Nonna Pnina and Nonna Mazal.



GISIN & ZAIDENBERG GATT: THE FUTURE OF BRIDGE IS NOW

Barbara and **Tomasz Gotard**, from Germany, won the Final B.





EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

2nd place: team **LUNDBERG**



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

3rd place: team **2 MANY GINGERS**

-  **DAISY CHAIN**
Hilda Setton, Pierre Franceschetti, Cedric Lorenzini, Marion Michielsen, Quentin Robert, Anne-Laure Tartarin
-  **LUNDBERG**
Anne-Marie Katarina Lundberg, Peter Bertheau, Simon Hult, Christina Lund Madsen
-  **2 MANY GINGERS**
Nikolaj Hammelev, Ella Rosthøj, Julie Marina Sigsgaard, Daniel Tylvad



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS
2nd place: **Sara Moran** and **Andrew McIntosh**



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS
3rd place: **Levent İmamoğlu** and **Olgu Şeker**



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS, FINAL B
1st place: **Barbara** and **Tomasz Gotard**

FINAL A

-  **Sophie Zaidenberg Gatt** and **Eitan Gisin**
-  **Sara Moran** and **Andrew McIntosh**
-  **Levent İmamoğlu** and **Olgu Şeker**

FINAL B

-  **Barbara Gotard** and **Tomasz Gotard**
-  **Kenan Özkurt** and **İlkay Özkok Kocaman**
-  **Tomasz Lasota** and **Magdalena Podgórczyk**



MIXED BOARD-A-MATCH
1st place: team **BLUE NOTE**



MIXED BOARD-A-MATCH
2nd place: team **VICUNA**



BLUE NOTE

Blandine Delestre, Daniel Delestre, Jerzy Romanowski, Martine Rossard



VICUNA

Maria Sainz de Vicuña, Vicky Chediak, Andrea Nilsson, Antonio Palma, Fernando Piedra



BANANA

Jeffrey Chiang, Daniel Siu Wai Chui, Hor Yung Charmian Koo, Suet Yu Zoe Li, Hoi-Kei Wong, Wai Man Flora Wong



**From all of us at the EBL:
thank you to all participants
for 10 fantastic days in Prague!**

**Safe travels home,
and see you in
Riga, Katowice,
or here again soon!**



Intuitive, intelligent, inexpensive scoring

The screenshot shows the BridgeTab app interface. At the top left, a green button displays '1' under 'Table no.' and 'Names'. To its right is the title 'Select board' and a grey button with a green question mark. Below the title, a row of buttons shows '1' with a green checkmark, 'E', '4' with a red heart, '=', and '-420'. On the left, three buttons labeled '1', '2', and '3' are stacked vertically. At the bottom, there are icons for battery, network, time, and a 'TD' button. A QR code with the text 'Try Android version now' is also present.

Annotations include:

- Button showing table no. round pair nos. names
- Button leading to explanation of the current screen
- Select board to report
- Buttons changing declarer, contract and result
- Battery indicator
- Network indicator. Click for details
- Time indicator. Click for details
- Call TD

Download and try the complete system for free



- Package includes scoring for individual/pair/teams
- Select any language and character set (تبرغفا, 中国人)
- Players can register at the table before, at, or after game start
- Inbuilt bidding (optional)
- Results automatically published on the web
- Everything else that you wanted

www.bridgetab.com

IN CONVERSATION WITH ERIC LAURANT

BRIDGE COMMUNITY WORLDWIDE & FRANCESCA CANALI

PART II

In Part One, Eric Laurant told us about his decision to stand again for the EBL Presidency, the collaboration between EBL and WBF, and the great tablet debate. In Part Two, our readers' questions turn to one of the hottest topics in bridge: cheating.

The fight against cheating has been going on for over ten years now. How is it progressing?

I am convinced that cheating at the top level has come down considerably. Has it disappeared entirely? No. There will always be people tempted by fame or money. But our surveillance is now so well-established that you would have to be quite reckless to think you can get away with it.





We started the EBL Investigation Committee in 2014, right after the big scandals in Opatija. That was the first time we used cameras. A few years later, we realised the scope had to be global, so we integrated with the WBF Investigation Committee after the WBF defined new anti cheating rules. Our target group is the approximately 500 players who have been active internationally in the last five years.

Today, much of the work outside the face to face championships (where we have cameras at every table) focuses on online play. We monitor players around the clock, and when we identify a suspicious pattern. As chairman of the WBF and EBL IC, I personally approach the players involved. I call them, explain what the Committee has found, and offer two options: withdraw from our championships and I forward the case to their NBO, or refuse, and we open an official investigation, which will eventually become public. To date, every single player I have confronted has chosen to withdraw. Our championships are much cleaner and this is our ultimate goal.

We also maintain what I prefer to call a “red alert list” rather than a blacklist, because these players have not necessarily been formally convicted. But we watch them closely, and if they try to enter our competitions, we act.

How do players react when you call them?

At first, they always deny it. “It’s not true,” “I would never do that.” Then I send them some of the evidence.

The excuses follow: “It was a misclick,” “the cat walked on the keyboard.” We don’t accept that if it has happened too many times, of course.

When we present the full extent of our proof, the tone changes. They ask: “You’re sure you won’t tell anyone?” I tell them: “I don’t tell anyone, I simply forward the case to your NBO”. Some NBOs have punished players based on our reports. Others, unfortunately, do nothing.

So far, every single player has chosen to withdraw. They invent excuses and disappear which is ok for us.

Cheating is one thing, but what about unauthorised information at the table?

This is a grey area that I care about deeply. Long-standing partnerships develop non-verbal signals without even

realising it. I experienced it myself with my partner of over twenty years. The way he placed his cards, certain gestures: I could read things I shouldn't have been able to. We were not cheating, but the information was there. Then there is tempo. A defender who plays too fast reveals information. If I lead and declarer instantly plays the Jack from dummy, and I am sitting there with the Queen wondering whether to cover, that is not fair. It is not cheating in the traditional sense, but it falls short of the ethical standards we should aspire to.

One idea we are considering is a mandatory 15-second pause on the first trick. It would slow down play, but it would level the playing field. We are also testing microphones at every table, combined with AI translation. If players know that everything they say is being recorded and translated, certain behaviours will simply stop like unauthorised non-English speaking.

What are the EBL and the WBF doing to help smaller federations grow?

Helping our member federations is one of our most important tasks. The larger ones, like France and the Netherlands, are big enough to manage on their own. But the mid-size and smaller NBOs need our support. That is why we organise seminars, and why we work hands-on with federations that are ready to take the next step. Latvia is a great example. Their president came to us with a vision: growing from 80 members to 1,000 in five to ten years. We helped them write a master plan. The first step was to prove they could organise events well, starting very small: they hosted a TD course, then the Small Federation Games, then the Champions Cup and now, in a few months, they will host the European National Championships in Riga.

They have more than doubled their membership. Going from 80 to 160 is not a huge number in absolute terms, but it has brought them more media attention, government recognition, and Olympic Committee interest. This kind of step-by-step development is the model we offer to any federation willing to invest the effort. But everybody needs to understand: there are no shortcuts. It takes years.

Where will the next European and World championships be held?

For 2026, the European Team Championships are in Riga, which is exciting because it is the result of the development work I just described. On the WBF side, the Youth Championships will be in Hefei, China.



For 2027, we are in discussions to bring the EBL summer championships back to Poznań, and possibly for 2029 and 2031 as well, if we can reach an agreement with the city. The winter transnationals will be in Prague again. For 2028 and 2030 National teams, we have several candidacies under evaluation.

On the WBF side, the 2027 Bermuda Bowl has two final candidates: Barbados and Zagreb.

Finding suitable venues is never easy. For national team championships we need around 2,500 square metres of playing space. For transnationals, up to 5,000. And we need it for free or sponsored, with good hotels nearby. It is a real challenge for our host NBOs, but we are optimistic about the years ahead.

As these Winter Transnational Championships in Prague come to a close, are you satisfied with how they went?

Overall, yes. But there is always room for improvement, and we are honest about that. We had some issues with the format, particularly the overlap between events. This will not happen again next year, as we will have more days available and can spread things out properly.

Players will receive a survey by email shortly after the tournament. I genuinely encourage everyone to fill it in. We read every response and will be transparent on the follow up.

European Spring Online Transnational Senior Team Championship

16 - 19 March and 23 - 26 March, 2026
Online on RealBridge

www.eurobridge.org

- ♠ Everybody can play – Team up across the world!
- ♠ Win EBL Medals, Master Points and entry fees to the European Winter Transnational Championships!
- ♠ Need a partner or team mates? Check the Partnership Desk!

SAVE THE DATE

European Online Transnational Mixed Teams Championships
14 - 17 May, 2026 – online on RealBridge

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIP

TOP TWENTY

MARK HORTON

In contests leading up to the chance of playing a match for the title, the former World Chess Champion Tigran Petrosian was only interested in securing qualification. Whilst winning is always a pleasurable experience, the most important thing was to reach the next stage of the competition. When a long qualification event is reaching its conclusion, I always look at the situation surrounding the last place on offer. In the case of the Mixed Teams, the leading 20 teams would advance to the final. As the final round got under way, Germany was occupying the last place on offer, and they would meet one of the teams just above them French Connection. Meanwhile, the teams that were hoping results went their way included Creazone, Milanbridge.com, Colorado, Sallys Aces and Bahnici. You can gauge the strength of the competition by noting that the aforementioned squads numbered several World Champions amongst their ranks.

It proved to be a quiet set of deals. The early exchanges saw Germany lead 12-11.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

♠ K Q 6 3		♠ 2
♥ 9 7 4 3		♥ A 5
♦ 9 6 2		♦ A J 10 8 4
♣ 10 9		♣ A 8 6 5 2
♠ 9 8		♠ 2
♥ K Q 8		♥ A 5
♦ K Q 5		♦ A J 10 8 4
♣ K Q J 4 3		♣ A 8 6 5 2
		♠ A J 10 7 5 4
		♥ J 10 6 2
		♦ 7 3
		♣ 7

French Connection v Germany

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Gladiator</i>	<i>Saporta</i>	<i>Janson</i>	<i>Saporta-T.</i>
—	Pass	1♦	2♠
3♣	5♠	6♣	All Pass

Once West has bid 3♣ it is long odds that East will look for a slam. North's obstructive 5♠ took away space, but did not deter East.

North led the ♠K, +1370.

Although it would probably have made little difference here, this is a situation that arises quite often. Tony Forrester told me that before deciding how high to raise partner you should ask yourself at what level would you like your opponents to play. If North thinks the answer to that on this deal is the five-level, then 4♠ is the way to go. It probably won't work on this deal, but you have the option of saving in 6♠ later. Several players did choose 4♠ and three of them were rewarded when East's 5♣ ended the auction. Where NS still reached 6♣ some of the 4♠ bidders took the save and gained 7 IMPs.





Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Wnuk</i>	<i>Nehmert</i>	<i>Kreglewska-Wnuk</i>	<i>Froehner</i>
—	Pass	1♦	2♠
3♣	4♠	5NT*	Pass
6♣	All Pass		

5NT Pick a slam

Lako v Lundberg

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lundberg</i>	<i>O Herbst</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	2♥*	3♦	4♠
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

2♥ Weak, both majors

A defensive lapse saw declarer emerge with eight tricks, -300.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>Retter</i>	<i>Bertheau</i>
—	Pass	1♦	3♠
Dble	5♠	Pass*	Pass
5NT*	Pass	6♣	Pass
7♣	All Pass		

Pass Forcing

5NT Pick a slam

South led the ♠A and collected 9 IMPs.

I must show you my favourite auction which comes from the match between Gold Bars and Colorado:

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Punch</i>	<i>Abragi</i>	<i>Rees</i>	<i>K Bertheau</i>
—	Pass	1♦	3♠
Dble*	4♣	Dble	Pass
Pass	4♥	Dble	Pass
Pass	4♠	Dble	Pass
6♦	6♠	Dble	All Pass

One good thing about bidding with tablets is that you never run out of red or green cards.

That was -1100, but worth 7 IMPs when teammates were allowed to play 6♣ in the other room.

Germany added an overtrick on the antepenultimate deal.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

♠ J 9 8 5		♠ Q 10 7 2
♥ 10 9 7 5		♥ K J
♦ A 8 4		♦ 10 9 6
♣ Q 8		♣ A 9 3 2
♠ A K 6		
♥ 6 3		
♦ Q 7 5 3 2		
♣ 10 7 4		
♠ 4 3		
♥ A Q 8 4 2		
♦ K J		
♣ K J 6 5		

French Connection v Germany

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Gladiator</i>	<i>Saporta</i>	<i>Janson</i>	<i>Saporta-T.</i>
—	—	—	1♥
Pass	2♥	Dble	3♥
All Pass			

Should South make a try for game?

Once hearts have been supported, your fifth heart becomes valuable, roughly the equivalent of an additional king.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Wnuk</i>	<i>Nehmert</i>	<i>Kreglewska-Wnuk</i>	<i>Froehner</i>
—	—	—	1♥
Pass	2♥*	Pass	3♣*
Pass	4♥	All Pass	

2♥ 8-10
3♣ Game try

With two golden cards and four trumps Pony Nehmert raised to the game that delivered 6 IMPs to Germany.

Only seven pairs bid 4♥, all gaining 6/7 IMPs.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

	♠ 9 6 5 4 3		♠ K Q 2
	♥ K Q 3		♥ 10 9 8 7 6
	♦ 10 5 4		♦ Q 7
	♣ 6 5		♣ K 10 4
♠ A J 10 8		♠ K Q 2	
♥ J		♥ 10 9 8 7 6	
♦ 9 8 3 2		♦ Q 7	
♣ A Q J 9		♣ K 10 4	
	♠ 7		
	♥ A 5 4 2		
	♦ A K J 6		
	♣ 8 7 3 2		

South led the ♣7 and declarer cashed out for +120.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Wnuk</i>	<i>Nehmert</i>	<i>Kreglewska-Wnuk</i>	<i>Froehner</i>
1♣*	Pass	1♥	Pass
1♠*	Pass	3♣	All Pass

North led the ♦5 and the defenders could not be denied five tricks, -50 and another 4 IMPs for Germany that saw them win 24-11, 13.72-6.28 VP, securing their place in the final. Milanbridge.com, Creazone and Bahnici also got through.

French Connection v Germany

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Gladiator</i>	<i>Saporta</i>	<i>Janson</i>	<i>Saporta-T.</i>
1♦	Pass	1♥	Pass
1♠*	Pass	1NT	All Pass



PROGRAM

12.08.2026	18:00	OlyBet Sports Bar Invitational pairs tournament
13.08.2026	11:00	Open Teams tournament (1-3 rounds)
13.08.2026	17:00	Open Teams tournament (4-6 rounds)
14.08.2026	11:00	Open Teams tournament (7-9 rounds)
14.08.2026	17:00	Open Teams tournament (10-12 rounds)
14.08.2026	17:00	Get-Together & Banquet for all participants (pairs and teams) - OlyBet Sports Bar, Radisson.
15.08.2026	10:00	Open Teams tournament (semi-final)
15.08.2026	11:00	Open Pairs tournament, Qualification session 1
15.08.2026	12:30	Open Teams tournament (final)
15.08.2026	17:00	Open Pairs tournament, Qualification session 2
16.08.2026	10:00	Open Pairs tournament, Final A
16.08.2026	11:00	Open Pairs tournament, Final B

PRIZES

First 3 places in the Invitational tournament receive cups and souvenirs. First 3 places in the Teams tournament receive cups and cash prizes. In the Pairs tournament first 6 places in Final A and first 3 places in Final B receive cash prizes. Special prizes for best Latvian pair; best woman pair; best mixt pair and best junior pair.

Prize fund - 10000 EUR
 Team tournament - 5000 EUR
 Pair A tournament - 4000 EUR
 Pair B tournament - 1000 EUR

VENUE

Radisson Blu SAS Daugava, Riga, Latvia

Special prices with code BRIDGE
 Room for two 105 EUR
 Room for one 95 EUR
 For the room reservation reservation.riga@radisson.com

ENTRY FEES

300 EUR per Team for Teams tournament
 200 EUR per Pair for Pairs tournament



www.rigainvites.lv
 12. - 16. August, 2026



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINAL A, ROUND 2 GOLDBERG V LAKO LUNDBERG V DAISY CHAIN

MARJO CHORUS

Goldberg:

B. and U. Efraimsson, L. Goldberg, A. Zack-Goldberg

Lako:

Asulin, O. Herbst, Petelko, Retter

Lundberg:

Hult-A. Lundberg; P. Bertheau-Lund Madsen

Daisy Chain:

Franceschetti-Setton; Robert-Tartarin

In the Goldberg v. Lako match, this board was a push in 5♣. In our other match, something happened...

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

	♠ 9 8 7 5 4		
	♥ Q		
	♦ K 7		
	♣ A K Q 4 3		
♠ A K		♠ Q 10 6 3	
♥ K 6 4 2		♥ J 10 5	
♦ Q 10 9 5 3 2		♦ J 8 6 4	
♣ 2		♣ 7 5	
	♠ J 2		
	♥ A 9 8 7 3		
	♦ A		
	♣ J 10 9 8 6		

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lundberg</i>	<i>Michielsen</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Lorenzini</i>
—	—	—	1♥
2♦	Dble	Pass	3♣
Pass	3♦	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♣	Pass	4♦
Pass	4♥	Pass	5♣
All Pass			

West was on lead and cashed her two spade tricks. Daisy Chain +400.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Setton</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>Franceschetti</i>	<i>Bertheau</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♦	2♣	Pass	3♦
Dble	3♠	Pass	4♦
Dble	4♠	Pass	6♣
All Pass			

For East, it was by no means obvious to lead a spade. When he tried a low diamond instead, one of the spade losers went on the ♦K and that was +920 and 11 IMPs to Lundberg.

On board 14 Flannery struck:

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

	♠ K Q J		
	♥ 7		
	♦ 10 8 7 6		
	♣ A J 8 7 4		
♠ 8 6 3		♠ A 10 9 5	
♥ 10 9 5 4		♥ A J 8 6 3	
♦ K Q 5 3		♦ A 9 4	
♣ K Q		♣ 10	
	♠ 7 4 2		
	♥ K Q 2		
	♦ J 2		
	♣ 9 6 5 3 2		

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Efraimsson</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Zack E</i>
—	—	2♦*	Pass
2♥	All Pass		
2♦ Flannery:	5-4 majors, 10+p		

Now West bid 2♥ and played there. Retter managed an overtrick. Lako +140.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>U Goldberg</i>	<i>O Herbst</i>	<i>L Goldberg</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	—	1♥	Pass
3♦*	Pass	4♥	All Pass

3♦ Bergen raise

In the Closed room L. Goldberg began with 1♥, U. Goldberg showed four hearts and 9-10 points and East leaped to 4♥.

No chance at all. Two down. Lako +100 and 6 IMPs

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

	♠ J 7 5 3	
	♥ 10 7 4	
	♦ Q J 10	
	♣ A 10 4	
♠ A K 8		♠ Q 10
♥ A K 8 6		♥ Q J 5 2
♦ K 6 4 2		♦ 8 7 3
♣ 6 5		♣ J 9 3 2
	♠ 9 6 4 2	
	♥ 9 3	
	♦ A 9 5	
	♣ K Q 8 7	

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Efrainsson</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Zack E</i>
—	—	—	1♣*
Dble	Pass	1♥	Pass*
2♣*	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♥	All Pass		

- 1♣ Balanced 8-10 or any 16+
- Pass 8-10
- 2♣ One round force, usually with a heart fit



South led ♣K and continued the suit to North's Ace. Back came a diamond to the ace and another diamond. Retter took his king, played three rounds of hearts and then ♣J. Down came the ten! A diamond in East disappeared on ♠K and that was it. Lako +420.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>U Goldberg</i>	<i>O Herbst</i>	<i>L Goldberg</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1NT	All Pass		

In the Closed Room, South did not find an opening bid. West opened a normal 1NT and East had an equally normal pass. One overtrick was made but Goldberg had scored another 7 IMPs.

Thereafter nothing much happened, except an extra over- or undertrick here or there, Goldberg won 19-3 IMP, 15.5-4.5 VP. In our other match, Daisy Chain beat Lundberg 13-11 or 10.86-9.14 VP.

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

SEMIFINAL – SESSION 3

DAVID BURN

The top match in the Mixed Teams semi-final featured Lako against the splendidly named 2 Many Gingers – I am afraid I do not know whether this reflects the number of redheads in the squad or a propensity for drinking what they call ingerfaerol. The first board was nearly a slam:

Board 1. Dealer North. Love all.

♠ 9 3 ♥ A 6 ♦ A K Q 6 3 ♣ A 9 6 3		♠ Q J 10 4 ♥ Q J 10 8 2 ♦ 9 8 5 ♣ 4	♠ A 6 2 ♥ 9 7 5 ♦ 10 2 ♣ 10 8 7 5 2
♠ K 8 7 5 ♥ K 6 3 ♦ J 7 4 ♣ K Q J			

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Rosthøj</i>	<i>Herbst</i>	<i>Hammelev</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	1♦	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♣	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♦	All pass	

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Sigsgaard</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Tylvad</i>
—	1♦	1♥	Dble
2♥	3♣	3♥	3♠
Pass	4♣	Pass	5♦
All Pass			

Both pairs nearly bid a slam – the Closed Room auction showed that the Gingers had come to bid, and there may not have been perfect understanding about the meaning of 3♠, but

no harm was done in the end. Technically this isn't a 50% slam because it won't make on 5-0 diamonds wherever the ace of spades is located, but I'd expected more of the field to bid it than the unlucky half-dozen pairs who actually did.

Board 2 was not nearly a slam, as two pairs found out to their cost. Our protagonists had well-controlled auctions to stop in game, and the scoreboard had yet to move. That was soon to be rectified:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

♠ 10 8 6 4 ♥ A 10 6 ♦ 8 5 ♣ K Q 10 8		♠ 2 ♥ K 8 5 3 2 ♦ A 10 9 7 6 ♣ 5 2	♠ J 5 3 ♥ Q J 9 7 ♦ K J 3 ♣ 9 7 4
♠ A K Q 9 7 ♥ 4 ♦ Q 4 2 ♣ A J 6 3			

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Rosthøj</i>	<i>Herbst</i>	<i>Hammelev</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	—	—	1♠
Pass	3♦	Pass	3NT
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Sigsgaard</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Tylvad</i>
—	—	—	1♠
Pass	2NT	Pass	3♥
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♥
Pass	4NT	Pass	5♦
Pass	5♥	Pass	6♠
All Pass			

The Open Room auction was without alarms or excursions – North showed a mixed spade raise, South proffered a not-all-that-serious slam try and North rejected it. In the Closed Room North showed a limit raise or stronger with 2NT, South showed whatever 3♥ showed (shortage would be my guess), North showed a limit raise, and South bid a rather mysterious 4♥. North may have reasoned that if South lacked a minor-suit control he would bid the other minor, so 4♥ might be a kind of all-round slam try with everything controlled but no great source of tricks. In that case she had a pretty useful hand – the right holding in hearts facing a singleton and a club suit that could easily provide enough winners. So she bid Blackwood, then asked for the queen of spades, then watched her partner fail to make his slam, and 11 IMPs opened the scoring for Lako. I should say that I am writing this piece in London, not Prague, so I don't have a way to ask what really happened. But do you know, I'm not sure I would if I could?

Board 4 was a messy game for the West players:

Board 4. Dealer West. Game all.

♠ 10 4 ♥ J 8 6 ♦ Q J 8 7 6 ♣ K Q 9		♠ Q J 5 ♥ K Q 5 ♦ K 9 5 3 2 ♣ 10 8	♠ A K 9 6 2 ♥ A 10 3 2 ♦ A ♣ 6 4 3
---	---	---	---

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Rosthøj</i>	<i>Herbst</i>	<i>Hammelev</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
Pass	1♦	1♠	Pass
1NT	Pass	2♦	Pass
2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Sigsgaard</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Tylvad</i>
Pass	Pass	1♠	Pass
1NT	Pass	2♥	Pass
2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass

Facing an overcall in the Open Room West's 1NT promised fair values, so East simply drove to game. Facing an opening bid West didn't need to have so much, and Petelko contented herself with a 2♥ rebid over which Retter scraped up 2NT and Petelko raised to game. Herbst for Lako led a heart honour, taken by the ace. With little communication between the hands Rosthøj was not willing to rely on taking five spade tricks – she cashed dummy's ♠A and led a low spade to her ten. Herbst played a diamond to the bare ace, and it was now or never for the spades – but the run of those was going to subject West to some awkward discards. She threw a diamond on ♠K, a club on ♠6, and another diamond on the last spade. But South had to make a couple of discards also, and the second of those was a seemingly innocuous but actually fatal heart.

Now declarer played a heart to her jack, ducked by Herbst, and continued with another heart which Herbst took perforce. Declarer who had seven tricks in was down to ♦QJ ♣KQ, and there was nothing to stop her from making one trick in each suit – either defender could set up a long minor, but neither could cash it.

What was so fatal about that heart discard by South? Well, look at the position if she had discarded a club instead (and North had kept 0=2=2=2 shape):

♠ — ♥ Q 5 ♦ K 9 ♣ 10 8		♠ — ♥ 10 3 2 ♦ — ♣ 6 4 3	♠ — ♥ 9 7 ♦ 10 ♣ A J 7
---------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------



Declarer, who needs three tricks, leads a heart to the jack (a club is no better) and North wins it to play another round of the suit. Dummy can win and cash the last heart, but that will squeeze West in the minors, and she will make no more tricks. However, if South doesn't have ♥9 in the above ending declarer can run the third round of the suit to her ♥8 and reach the same four-card end position as in actual play. Tough game, bridge.

At the other table, a diamond was led, and declarer played a low spade to the ten without cashing the ace. North continued diamonds and West won to run spades. He played a club to the king, ♥J to the queen and ace, and another club. There wasn't anything the defenders could do about that, so they didn't, and there was no swing on the board.

On board 5 East-West had 11 opposite 11 in high-card points and nothing better than a seven-card fit. So of course almost the whole field was in game – that's where you're supposed to be with an opening bid facing an opening bid, after all. Game was hopeless – so hopeless in fact that some of the outlying partscores didn't make either and 2 Many Gingers could write the first part of their name in the IMPs column for two down against three down.



Ella Rosthøj

On board 6 West had ♠7643 ♥953 ♦AJ8 ♣A108 and bid 1♠ after her partner had opened 1♣ and her RHO had doubled it. Nothing much in that, you may think, but the bid was actually a transfer to no trumps and in principle denied a major. This kept her side out of a 4-4 spade fit that made nine tricks at the other table, but they extracted 100 from a 4-3 heart fit that made only six tricks at her table, so the cost was a mere 1 IMP. The next swing was larger:

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

♠ A K 5		♠ J 8 4
♥ J 6		♥ Q 5
♦ J 3 2		♦ A 9 6 4
♣ Q 8 7 3 2		♣ A K J 5
♠ Q 3 2		♠ J 8 4
♥ A 3 2		♥ Q 5
♦ K Q 10 8 7 5		♦ A 9 6 4
♣ 9		♣ A K J 5
♠ 10 9 7 6		
♥ K 10 9 8 7 4		
♦ —		
♣ 10 6 4		

In the Closed Room South opened a Multi 2♦ and West passed. East doubled North's pass-or-correct response for takeout, and West bid 3NT which made four. So what? you may ask. So this is what happened in the Open Room:

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Rosthøj</i>	<i>Herbst</i>	<i>Hammelev</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	—	—	2♦
3♦	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Dble	All Pass	

2♦ was a Multi here also and West's direct overcall put East in a bit of a quandary. South would be on lead and would presumably know what her own suit was, so if she led it and West was short in it the consequences could be dire. Eventually East decided that he had so much in the minors that West had to have something in the majors, so 3NT it was. I don't know whether North, who was on the same side of the screen as East, had sensed anything of inner anguish emanating from the player on his left, but Ophir Herbst was prepared to double Nikolaj

Hammelev to see if he blinked. The young Dane, an under-21 World Champion, placed a Pass card on the tray without turning a hair and was able to write 1150 on his scorecard moments later. 11 IMPs to the Gingers, who led in the match by one.

North made 1NT in one room on board 8. West made 1NT in the other room on board 8. Both of those players were on Lako's side, and their team added 5 IMPs to give them a slender advantage. East-West had a 5-3 heart fit and a combined 24 high-card points on board 9, but chose to play in 3NT from – as it happened – the wrong side. Adi Asulin had to find a lead, and her partner had opened 1♣ which didn't show much, but she led the suit anyway (from ♠10865) and that beat the contract. At the other table North opened a weak (possibly very weak) no trump although this one was actually a 13 count, and someone doubled her. The reason more and more pairs are starting to use these methods, not vulnerable at least, is that the opponents always seem to have the Devil's own job dealing with them. The above-mentioned 24-count with an eight-card heart fit fuffed around for a couple of rounds of bidding and ended in 2♦, a 4-3 fit that made ten tricks and sent 6 more IMPs to Lako.

Board 10 undid the damage with interest.

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.

♠ K 5 3 ♥ A J 10 9 5 4 2 ♦ — ♣ Q 5 2		♠ A 10 8 4 ♥ 7 ♦ Q 8 4 2 ♣ J 10 9 4	♠ 9 6 2 ♥ Q 6 ♦ J 10 9 7 6 5 ♣ A 8
---	---	--	---

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Rosthøj</i>	<i>Herbst</i>	<i>Hammelev</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
—	—	Pass	Pass
1NT	2♦	Pass	2♥
Pass	Pass	Dble	Pass
2♠	3♥	Dble	All Pass

East's second double was "more of the same" after his balancing double of 2♥, but Rosthøj had bid a three-card suit once and was not anxious to do it again. She passed and led a high diamond, ruffed in dummy by Asulin who played a club to the ace and another club. But Rosthøj went in with the king and shifted to a spade; three rounds of those and a diamond left declarer unable to get to her hand for the heart finesse without ruffing ♣Q, after which she could not pick up West's ♥K. Down one. Sweat wiped from Danish brows.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Sigsgaard</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Tylvad</i>
—	—	Pass	Pass
1NT	2♥	Dble	Pass
2NT	Pass	3♣	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Dble
All Pass			

From the fact that East alerted West's 2NT one may infer that she didn't think it was natural. West, who had so intended it, was buoyed by what he hoped was a long club suit opposite and bid game. South expressed the view that this was a mistake, and North led ♥J. Declarer won that with the king (good move) and crossed to dummy with ♦Q to run ♣J (bad move). Taking no chances South plonked ♣A on the table and played his remaining heart – a necessary defence if, for example, North had ♣K and hearts headed by the jack. Down three, 14 IMPs to Gingers.

Board 11 featured an oddity at one table – South opened with a one-bid and West overcalled a natural 1NT, brushed aside by his opponents who ended in 3NT themselves. They didn't make it, and a less expansive effort at the other table brought in a small plus and 4 IMPs to Gingers. Nothing much happened for the next couple of boards, and on the last Lako repeated the dose, reaching a failing (and hopeless) game down at one table, conceding a small minus at the other, As far as they were concerned, their opponents had scored 2 Many IMPs – the final tally was Lako 23, Gingers 36.

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINAL A, ROUND 1

JOS JACOBS

Early on Thursday morning 20 teams gathered to contest yet another round of Swiss movement bridge: the Mixed Teams A Final. Already on the opening board, E/W had their chances to deal a heavy blow on their opponents.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

♠ 10 8 7 3 2	♠ 6	♠ 5 4
♥ A J 10 7	♥ 9 4	♥ K 8 6 3 2
♦ 5 4 3	♦ A 8 7 6	♦ K Q 10
♣ 2	♣ A Q 10 8 5 3	♣ K J 7

♠ A K Q J 9	♠ 6	♠ 5 4
♥ Q 5	♥ 9 4	♥ K 8 6 3 2
♦ J 9 2	♦ A 8 7 6	♦ K Q 10
♣ 9 6 4	♣ A Q 10 8 5 3	♣ K J 7

♠ 10 8 7 3 2	♠ 6	♠ 5 4
♥ A J 10 7	♥ 9 4	♥ K 8 6 3 2
♦ 5 4 3	♦ A 8 7 6	♦ K Q 10
♣ 2	♣ A Q 10 8 5 3	♣ K J 7

This is what happened in the Bernal v. Zhang match:

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>S Zhang</i>	<i>Dessi</i>	<i>Korbel</i>	<i>Cima</i>
—	1♣	1♥*	Dble
3♥	Pass	Pass	Dble
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♠
Pass	5♣	Dble	All Pass

1♥ Spades

Though West refrained from doubling 4♠, East, who was looking at two possible trump tricks, had no hesitation in throwing the axe at 5♣. This proved a good idea, even more so when he simply led the suit E/W had bid and raised. Only a few moments later, three undertricks were in

the pocket. Zhang +500. From South's double of 3♥, North knew there would be some club fit as well so when given the chance, she showed preference though this turned out to be to little avail.

In the other room, South was looking at the same problem as they had been next door.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Özbay</i>	<i>WF Wang</i>	<i>Bernal</i>	<i>Hampson</i>
—	1♣	1♥	1♠
3♣	Dble	Pass	3♥
Dble	Pass	Pass	4♠
All Pass			

When nobody took any action over Hampson's 4♠, he had to play there. With the pretty awful trump break, 4♠ was not a very pretty place to be (on the actual layout) but at least, he was not doubled and quietly went three off. Bernal +150 but 8 IMPs to Zhang.

These mixed results at just one table gave me the idea to look a little further. I found out a few interesting other details. At many tables, South bid 4♠ at some moment but only two Wests doubled this. One West then enjoyed the pleasure of collecting four undertricks for +800 and a 13 IMP gain for the Lundberg team. The other West saw North show preference for clubs, which enabled partner East to express an opinion on that contract as well. Down three and +500, good for 7 IMPs, to team 2 Many Gingers.

Two boards later, no game was on but nevertheless many E/W pairs tried to score one:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

♠ 9 8 5 4 ♥ A 8 7 4 ♦ 10 9 6 ♣ A 8		♠ 6 3 ♥ Q 3 ♦ J 7 ♣ K Q 9 7 5 4 2	♠ A K Q 10 7 ♥ J 9 ♦ A Q 5 3 2 ♣ J
♠ J 2 ♥ K 10 6 5 2 ♦ K 8 4 ♣ 10 6 3			

In our featured match (Bernal v. Zhang) these were the auctions:

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>S Zhang</i>	<i>Dessi</i>	<i>Korbel</i>	<i>Cima</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
2NT	Pass	3NT	All Pass

Unplayable, even more so on a heart lead. Down three, Bernal +300.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Ozbay</i>	<i>W Wang</i>	<i>Bernal</i>	<i>Hampson</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
3♦	Pass	4♣	Pass
4♦	Pass	5♣	All Pass

With the ♦K well placed for declarer, it looks as if 4♣ can be made but there is a snag: declarer cannot come to his hand for the diamond finesse in time. So Bernal went down two after all and his team had won 3 IMPs back.

These two contracts were not on, as should be obvious. At seven tables, 4♠ was reached. The play was not recorded but we know that at three of those tables, 4♠ was even made for a double-figure swing.

Two boards later, 4♥ was reached at all but two tables.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

♠ 6 4 3 ♥ A 10 ♦ J ♣ Q 9 7 6 5 3 2		♠ Q 10 8 7 ♥ K 8 6 5 ♦ K Q 9 7 ♣ J	♠ K ♥ Q 7 4 3 ♦ A 6 4 3 ♣ A K 10 4
♠ A J 9 5 2 ♥ J 9 2 ♦ 10 8 5 2 ♣ 8			

It was made 11 times and went down 7 times. When West was the declarer, North would lead the ♦J. South should now follow suit with e.g. the ♦8 to show partner that his possible entry is in spades and not in clubs. If declarer wins the ♦K in dummy and leads a trump to his queen and North's ace, he will go down when North returns a spade to South's ace. North will then get his diamond ruff, and South will still make another trump trick.

If declarer tackles trumps by first leading low from the West hand, there is nothing the defence can do North can go up with the ♥A, cross to partner's ♠A and get his ruff but that will be it. .

When East is the declarer, an interesting variation might occur, as we saw at a few tables. South led his singleton club and declarer, not aware of any danger ahead, won in dummy and first led the ♠K. South took his ace and returned a diamond. Now, North can go up with his ♥A immediately when trumps are led, give partner his club ruff and gets his own diamond ruff in return for an elegant down two.

In the Bernal v Zhang match, Hampson and Wang were among those who found this defence. At the other table in this match, South did not play the ♦8 to trick one after partner's diamond lead so the contract was made with an overtrick when declarer led the first round of trumps through North. That was worth 11 IMPs to Zhang.



On the next board, the Italians were among the five pairs who reached thin game in hearts.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

♠ Q 2
 ♥ K 10 8 3
 ♦ A 9 6 3
 ♣ A 8 2

♠ A 9 6
 ♥ A Q 5
 ♦ 8 5
 ♣ 10 9 7 4 3

♠ J 7 5 4 3
 ♥ 9 6
 ♦ 10 7 4
 ♣ K Q J

♠ K 10 8
 ♥ J 7 4 2
 ♦ K Q J 2
 ♣ 6 5

After ducking the club lead from West, declarer could ruff himself to his hand and lead trumps. With the ♥AQ in West, that was about all he needed for his +420.

A less ambitious auction at the other table:

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Özbay	W F Wang	Bernal	Hampson
—	—	Pass	Pass
Pass	1♦	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♥	All Pass	

The same 10 tricks, of course, but 6 IMPs back to Bernal.

Open Room

West	North	East	South
S Zhang	Dessi	Korbel	Cima
—	—	Pass	Pass
Pass	1♦	Pass	1♥
Pass	2♥	Pass	3♦
Pass	4♥	All Pass	



3rd WBF Online WOMEN'S TEAMS

Online on RealBridge, 27 - 29 March, 2026



TRANSNATIONAL EVENT

OPEN TO PLAYERS FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD



UP TO 8 PLAYERS PER TEAM



FLEXIBLE SCHEDULE

TEAMS CHOOSE WHEN THEY CAN PLAY



NO TRAVEL OR ACCOMMODATION COSTS

PLAY ONLINE FROM THE COMFORT OF YOUR HOME



LOW ENTRY FEES

INFO & REGISTRATION: WWW.WORLDBRIDGE.ORG



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED PAIRS

FINAL MATCH POINT MANIA

MARK HORTON

On a day when it is very cold and depressing outside, what better way to keep warm than by playing for matchpoints. Here are a couple of dramatic deals from the first session of the Mixed Pairs Final:

Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.

♠ 8 ♥ Q J 10 5 4 ♦ 4 2 ♣ Q 10 7 6 5		♠ A K Q 10 4 2 ♥ 7 6 ♦ K Q 9 7 6 ♣ —	♠ J 9 7 ♥ — ♦ A J 10 8 5 ♣ 9 8 4 3 2
--	--	---	---

West	North	East	South
<i>Krasa</i>	<i>McIntosh</i>	<i>Slovakova</i>	<i>Moran</i>
—	1♠	Pass	2♥*
Pass	3♦	Dble	3♠
Pass	4♣*	Pass	4NT*
Pass	5NT*	Pass	6♠
All Pass			

- 2♥ Game forcing
- 4♣ Control
- 4NT RKCB

North's 5NT is consistent with an even number of keycards and a void somewhere.

The opening lead was the ♦J, a terrific attempt to put partner in to lead a heart, but now declarer took all the tricks.

In order to do that he must have won the diamond lead, ruffed a diamond, come to hand with a spade, ruffed a diamond, pitched two

diamonds on the top clubs, ruffed a club and drawn the outstanding trump. +1460 was 100%. Six pairs bid 6♠, three going down. After a club lead declarer needs to set up a diamond trick and ruff a diamond in dummy.

This was an unusual auction:

West	North	East	South
<i>Gisin</i>	<i>G Mihai</i>	<i>Gatt</i>	<i>R Mihai</i>
—	3♥*	Pass	4♣*
Pass	4♦	Pass	4♥*
Pass	5♣*	Pass	5♥*
Pass	5NT*	Pass	6♠
Pass	Pass	Dble*	Pass
Pass	6NT	Dble	All Pass

- 3♥ Preempt in spades or 5/6 spades and another suit, maximum four losers
- 4♣ Natural or control, forcing
- 4♥ Control
- 5♣ Control
- 5♥ Control
- 5NT Pick a slam
- Dble Lightner

How unlucky that South became the declarer in 6♠.

North hoped there would be 12 tricks in no trumps but after the lead of the ♣9 there were only eleven.





Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

♠ Q
 ♥ A 9 6 3
 ♦ A Q J 6 4
 ♣ K J 9

♠ 6 5 4 3 2
 ♥ 8 7 4 2
 ♦ 8 5
 ♣ Q 2

♠ K
 ♥ K Q J 10 5
 ♦ K 10 7
 ♣ 8 7 5 3

♠ A J 10 9 8 7
 ♥ —
 ♦ 9 3 2
 ♣ A 10 6 4

West	North	East	South
Gorska	Ivanov	Tuczynski	Pavlushko
—	—	—	1♠
Pass	2♣*	2♥	2♠
3♥	Pass*	Pass	4♣
Pass	4♦*	Pass	4♥*
Pass	4NT*	Pass	5NT*
Pass	6♠	All Pass	

- 2♣ Artificial game force
- 4♦ Control
- 4♥ Control
- 4NT RKCB
- 5NT 2 keycards and a void

West led the ♥2 and I imagine declarer won, drew trumps and played a diamond to the queen, losing at some point to the ♦K. +1430 was 100% - no one else got past game.

World Bridge Series 2026

KATOWICE
MCK INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS CENTRE
POLAND

20 AUGUST - 3 SEPTEMBER 2026

8 WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

TEAMS	PAIRS
Open Teams	Open Pairs
Women's Teams	Women's Pairs
Senior Teams	Senior Pairs
Mixed Teams	Mixed Pairs

ALL INFORMATION AT:
[CHAMPIONSHIPS.WORLDBRIDGE.ORG/2026WBS](https://championships.worldbridge.org/2026wbs)

OPEN TO PLAYERS FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD

The Partnership Desk: Majella McDonald's Prague Adventure

When Majella McDonald from Ireland was looking for a partner to play in Prague, she turned to the EBL Partnership Desk. She found one, booked her trip, and the adventure began!

But it didn't stop there: once in Prague, Majella was also picked up by a team looking for a fourth player in the Swiss Cup, giving her even more time at the table.

Majella's story is the perfect example of what the Partnership Desk is all about: connecting players and creating opportunities. Without it, she might never have made the trip. With it, she played two events and had a fantastic experience.



Majella and Nezer Jacob Zaidenberg

Travelling solo? Don't let that stop you. Check the Partnership Desk and let the bridge find you!

BREAKING OR NOT BREAKING (TEMPO)?

MAURIZIO DI SACCO

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

	♠ J 4		
	♥ A Q 8 4		
	♦ K J 9 3 2		
	♣ 9 4		
♠ A K 10 8 7 5 2		♠ Q	
♥ -		♥ K J 10 7 6 5 2	
♦ 8 7 4		♦ 6	
♣ 10 6 5		♣ Q 8 7 2	
	♠ 9 6 3		
	♥ 9 3		
	♦ A Q 10 5		
	♣ A K J 3		

Last time we saw a board which proved to be decisive to win a KO match, but even less dramatic ones can offer the possibility of teaching lessons. Here we have one – that also came to me written on a review form – that shows a peculiar case of how TDs deal with potential UI when playing with screens.

West	North	East	South
-	1♦	3♥	3♠*
Pass	3NT	All pass	

*3♠ (0-3 spades, puppet to 3NT) and Pass together took 4'02" before appearing on the N/S side (e.g. playing without tablets, we could have said "the tray came back after 4'02"").

East led the ♠Q, so hitting the jackpot: down three and 15 IMPs when it compared with 4♥x-4 in the other room.

At the end, N/S called the TD complaining about the lead, alleging it had been influenced by the Break-in-tempo (BIT).

The TDs investigated the facts, looking at the

tablet's recording of each bid, and going through the video footage. This is what they found:

- South took 1'58" before bidding 3S, uncertain as it was about the partnership's agreement.
- West took 2'04" for his pass, yet, the video shows that most of that time was spent asking questions and receiving answers, south contributing further to the delay volunteering twice extra information. The total time used by west for his call was 24".

It is time to have a look at one of the most famous Law, 16:

LAW 16 - AUTHORIZED AND UNAUTHORIZED INFORMATION

1. [-]

B. Extraneous Information from Partner

Any extraneous information from partner that might suggest a call or play is unauthorized. This includes remarks, questions, replies to questions, unexpected alerts or failures to alert, unmistakable hesitation, unwonted speed, special emphasis, tone, gesture, movement or mannerism.

See it? It deals with UI caused by partner (C and D deal with some other source, but, trust me, obviously none of them is about opponents'), because you cannot be blamed if your opponents are the cause of the problem.

I wrote a lecture on the subject of "UI playing with screens", which is used ever since (2005) to educate TDs around the world: if you google my name and the title you should be able to find it, in the different versions used through the years (you'll find some power point presentation as well). What is its main argument? Whenever the tray (if the case) comes back after a delay,

you just ignore it. You do not know whether you have ethical obligation to not use a UI, because you cannot know whether was your partner who caused the delay or not. Quite often, the opponent was the source, and/or explanations, a TD call, a coffee spilled and so forth.

Here we have a very good example: once south took almost two minutes for his bid, there was nothing west could do to avoid a delay, so east was not subjected to any restrictions as for 16B. Is this the end? Actually not, because though rare, there are cases where the length of the delay matters (there's a famous case from Chennai's semifinal of the Bermuda Bowl (I dealt with that too in some lecture), so you can sometimes charge a pairs of a UI even if the opponents contributed to a delay. Not the

case here: west took 24", which is a more than reasonable time after a complicate bid (30" is what is generally accepted), so there's no reason to worry about the delay's length and start polling about that.

Bottom line, east was free to choose whatever lead and/play she wished.

Had not been for a reason, this is a case where the reviewer would have kept the deposit and awarded a further penalty to the appellants, since the request for a review was completely lacking ground, yet, the TD who communicated the decision had failed to explain what I just wrote in this article, and the appellants did not know they could not win the case at all. Money back then, but be careful for the future.



European Spring Online Transnational Senior Team Championship



16 - 19 March and 23 - 26 March, 2026
Online on RealBridge

www.eurobridge.org

- ♠ Everybody can play - Team up across the world!
- ♠ Win EBL Medals, Master Points and entry fees to the European Winter Transnational Championships!
- ♠ Need a partner or team mates? Check the Partnership Desk!

SAVE THE DATE

European Online Transnational Mixed Teams Championships

14 - 17 May, 2026 - online on RealBridge

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINAL A, ROUND 3

ASHE vs LUNDBERG

MARJO CHORUS

A wonderful declarer play by Peter Bertheau made my day on board 19:

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

	♠ 10 9 4 3		
	♥ K 6		
	♦ 7 3		
	♣ K 8 4 3 2		
♠ K Q 8 7		♠ 6 2	
♥ J 7 3		♥ Q 8 5 2	
♦ J 9		♦ Q 10 6 5 2	
♣ 10 9 7 6		♣ Q J	
	♠ A J 5		
	♥ A 10 9 4		
	♦ A K 8 4		
	♣ A 5		

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lundberg</i>	<i>Ashe</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Maricic</i>
—	—	—	2NT
Pass	3♣*	Pass	3♦*
Pass	3♥*	Pass	3NT*
All Pass			

- 3♣ Muppet Stayman
- 3♦ At least one four-card major
- 3♥ Spades
- 3NT No fit

Lundberg chose the lead of ♣7 and that proved killing, especially when South put her hopes on the club suit. Club ace, club king and no chance of making. Lundberg +100.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>J Duursma</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>M Schaltz</i>	<i>P Bertheau</i>
—	—	—	2♣
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥
Pass	2♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♣	Pass	3♥
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

Bertheau got the lead of ♠10 and that put the defence behind. He took the ace and put down the ♠J. Duursma won and continued with the ♣10 to the ♣K and South played spades. West, in with ♠K, couldn't afford to collect the ♣9. She played another spade, East throwing a diamond. It seemed East had four hearts.

Now Bertheau thought for a while. Looking at all the cards I saw possibilities if South played the ♥10 now but could he find that? Yes! The ♥10 went to the ♥Q. A diamond to the king and with the ♥J coming down, nine tricks were in the pocket. Very well played. +400 and Lundberg 11 IMPs.

In the Daisy Chain v Lako match, both Wests led the ♣10 against South's 3NT. Asulin won dummy's king and led a spade to the jack. West won and played another club to declarer's ace. Next came ♠A and another. West won the king and returned...a heart to the queen and declarer's ace. Now there was time to cash a top diamond, cross to the ♥K, cash the last spade, go back to the ♥A and establish the ♥10 by conceding a trick to West's ♥J. West could only cash one top club. Bernal +400.

At the other table, play was mainly the same, but when West was in with the second high spade, he returned a spade. This left declarer two tricks short in the end, good for 11 IMPs to Lako.





Bertheau made another good decision on board 20:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

♠ K J 9 6 5 ♥ Q 9 6 ♦ A 7 6 ♣ 4 2		♠ 10 2 ♥ K J 10 8 7 ♦ J 10 9 ♣ A 7 5	♠ A 8 ♥ 3 ♦ K Q 8 2 ♣ K Q J 8 6 3
--	--	---	--

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lundberg</i>	<i>Ashe</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Maricic</i>
Pass	Pass	1♥	2♣
2♥	2♠	Pass	3♥
Pass	4♠	All Pass	

The 3♥ bid by South didn't bring in any useful information so it ended in 4♠. But **Ashe** could make no more than nine tricks. Lundberg +100.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>J Duursma</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>M Schaltz</i>	<i>P Bertheau</i>
Pass	Pass	2♥	3♣
3♥	3♠	Pass	5♣
All Pass			

Bertheau simply bid 5♣ after North's 3♠. He had a lot of chances: diamonds 3-3, ♠Q falling or with West, and a squeeze on West if she had 4-3-4-2. Bertheau tried this and that and eventually took his four diamond tricks. Lundberg + 600 and 12 IMP.

In our other featured match, there were problems:

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Retter</i>	<i>Tartarin</i>	<i>Petelko</i>	<i>Robert</i>
Pass	Pass	1♥	2♣
3♥	Dble	Pass	4NT
Pass	5♣	All Pass	

This was just made, Daisy Chain +600.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lorenzini</i>	<i>O Herbst</i>	<i>Michielsen</i>	<i>Asulin</i>
Pass	Pass	1♥	2♣
3♥	3♠	Pass	4♦
All Pass			

This was not made (down two), Daisy Chain another +200 and 13 IMPs.

Ashe managed 10 IMPs more on board 22:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W

♠ J 3 ♥ 9 5 ♦ A K 10 9 2 ♣ 9 7 6 4		♠ A 9 8 4 ♥ A 8 6 3 ♦ Q 8 4 ♣ A K	♠ Q 7 6 2 ♥ J 10 7 4 2 ♦ 6 ♣ Q 10 5
---	--	--	--

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lundberg</i>	<i>Ashe</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Maricic</i>
—	—	1NT	All Pass

In my opinion Lundberg gave up too soon. Not even an invite? It cost her dearly. Lundberg +150.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>J Duursma</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>M Schaltz</i>	<i>P Bertheau</i>
—	—	1NT	Pass
3NT	All Pass		

Duursma liked her cards with the nice diamond suit. That was +600 to Ashe and 10 IMPs.

The final results:

Ashe v Lundberg: 28-2 or 17.69-2.31 VP.
 Daisy Chain v Lako: 31-13 or 16-4 VP.

A QUESTION FROM OUR READERS

MAURIZIO DI SACCO

Gladly, our bulletins and so my poor articles, are read well beyond the boundaries of Prague. This is proven by the email that I received from a kind correspondent from far away, which gives me the possibility of putting some more dots on top the "I" I already used. Here it is, with my comments in between (red). For privacy reasons I'm hiding the sender:

Hi Maurizio,

I'm xxx and have represented xxx open in many world championships.

I read the bulletin 9 this morning. After learning the case "Tie-breaking", I believe that this case was obviously handled very properly. But as a player who loves to study rules, I have some other deep thoughts, especially from the perspective of a player. Please allow me to discuss it with you and look forward to your professional reply.

My main issue is "what is the CORRECT/PROPER question when TD polls players at the same level?" Let's assume the bidding was:

West	North	East	South
			1NT
Pass	2♥	Pass	2♠
Pass	3♣*	Pass	3NT
All pass			

The difference is that EAST passed over 3♣. Still 3♣ is explained to EAST as transfer to diamonds, but to WEST as natural.

Suppose WEST is holding ♥ QJ10x and ♣ QJ10x. WEST leads ♥Q but ♣Q would be winning lead.

We have sufficient evidence and there is no doubt that SOUTH gives the wrong information, the agreement by NS should be 3♣ shows

diamonds. We are not going to argue if it's mistaken explanation or mistaken call.

The original case in the bulletin is so clear and too easy because it led to a completely opposite understanding of the meaning of DOUBLE.

Ok, now the mistaken explanation doesn't affect the bidding but only the opening lead.

How would you award an adjusted score and how would you poll players? Which the following question is proper in this scenario?

Show players who are polled the auction. Then ask:

(1) 3♣ shows diamonds, what would you lead?

OR

(2) 3♣ is explained as natural by your screenmate but according to their agreement 3♣ should show diamonds, what would you lead?





Unfortunately you got wrong a main principle of the entire Laws: a player is entitled to know, at all times, only the partnership agreements of the opponents, and nothing else. Without going through all Law 40 (Partnership understanding), suffice is to quote 40A1b:

(b) Each partnership has a duty to make its partnership understandings available to its opponents. The Regulating Authority specifies the manner in which this is done.

You can trust me if I say that nowhere is written that they also have to make the opponents aware they had had a misunderstanding. Therefore a player, non-offender or not, has the only right to know what the opponents bids and/or carding mean according to their agreement (and this includes much more than explicit ones: we are talking here of also explicit ones, inferences, partnership's experience and so forth), and no more, which makes question 2 illegal.

Why does it matter?

Because for top level players, they may derive extra information from subtle differences.

If you ask question 1, I think it's a pure guess between hearts and clubs. In theory, you may get 50% heart leader and 50% club leader. Eventually TD can award the adjustment point according to this weight.

But if you ask question 2, as the opening leader, I know SOUTH bid 3NT based on 3♣=natural. So we can derive that SOUTH COULDN'T have good clubs support or even the weakest suit might be club. Then the weight may be deviated. For example, you get another result that 20% leads hearts and 80% leads clubs.

"3C is explained as natural by SOUTH" is the FACT that happened at the table.

To summarize, when TD polls players, if the FACT should be concealed to the polled players. Sometimes if you only provide the auction and the agreement, the bidding looks in chaos and unreasonable. You don't really put them in opening leader's shoes. Can this restore fairness?

Let's go to LAW75, we are going to investigate that "What is the true spirit of the bridge laws?"

As you offered in the bulletin,

LAW75

D) Director's Determination

3. When there is an infraction (as per B1 or D2) and sufficient evidence exists as to the agreed meaning of the call, the Director awards an adjusted score based upon the likely outcome had the opponents received the correct explanation in a timely manner. If the Director determines that the call has no agreed meaning, he awards an adjusted score based upon the likely outcome had the opponents been so informed.

The 1st key word is "likely outcome". What's "likely"?

In Cambridge Dictionary, it's explained as: "If something is likely, it will probably happen or is expected."

In the spirit of bridge laws – the word likely occurs a few times there – "likely" means anything above 50% (so stated, unanimously, by many English mother tongue: there are some in the WBF Laws Committee). However, as I explained in the article, the real reference is to Law 12.

The 2nd key word is "in a timely manner". What's "timely"?

"happening at the best possible moment." in Cambridge Dictionary.

Once again, you cannot use a word out of context: in bridge Laws interpretation, "timely", referred to an action, means "whenever is necessary to not cause an infraction".

So is it the likely outcome if you ask question1? Will it probably happen in real life that the opening leader gets the correct explanation but doesn't know SOUTH's biddings are all based on what he actually explained at the table? If the auction is totally illogical without knowing the explanation given at the table actually, it will create a human bias or seems

like a multi-options questions with no useful information.

Then from another perspective, if TD ask question 2, will it probably happen in real life? Maybe yes! Before WEST makes the opening lead, SOUTH suddenly wakes up and becomes aware that he gave the wrong explanation then tries to correct it. This scenario is also mentioned in LAW75 B) (2). I think it often occurs when we play without screen as long as there is no UI during the bidding. Like in NABC, declarer/dummy may realize they have some misunderstanding after the auction ends, definitely they should try to give the correct explanation before the opening lead is faced up. At the same time, the opening leader receives the explanation that was made at the table and the correct explanation by the agreement, BOTH. I think it also meets “probably happen” and “at the best possible moment”. BTW, if the correct information may affect the bidding, “the best possible moment” should NOT be BEFORE THE OPENING LEAD IS FACED UP. Why did I think about the above scenarios? Simply because I find different TD may hold

different opinion in reality and many TDs ask question1 without any thinking.

As I explained, they are very right, though there may be other questions to be asked.

This makes me wonder what the original intention of the law/regulation is and how the fairness can be restored after an infraction has occurred.

I hope to have answered your wonders.

I also asked and discussed similar scenarios with some Chinese TDs, unfortunately they can not answer my question.

I appreciate you so much if you can clear up my doubts. Thank you.

Sorry to disturb you and wish you all the best in the remaining days in Prague.

Kind regards,
Signed



European Spring Online Transnational Senior Team Championship



16 - 19 March and 23 - 26 March, 2026
Online on RealBridge

www.eurobridge.org

- ♠ Everybody can play – Team up across the world!
- ♠ Win EBL Medals, Master Points and entry fees to the European Winter Transnational Championships!
- ♠ Need a partner or team mates? Check the Partnership Desk!

SAVE THE DATE

European Online Transnational Mixed Teams Championships

14 - 17 May, 2026 – online on RealBridge

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED BAM

MATCHPOINTS WITH A VENGEANCE

MARK HORTON

Board a Match scoring makes for a tough game. Here's an innocent looking deal from Round 10 of the Mixed BAM:

Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul.

	♠ K 7 6 2		
	♥ J		
	♦ Q 9 8 7		
	♣ Q 5 4 2		
♠ 8 4 3		♠ A Q J 10 5	
♥ 9 3		♥ A Q 10 8 7 4	
♦ 6 5 3 2		♦ —	
♣ 10 9 8 7		♣ 6 3	
	♠ 9		
	♥ K 6 5 2		
	♦ A K J 10 4		
	♣ A K J		

Sallys Aces v Colorado

Open Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♥	Dble
Pass	1♠	Pass	1NT
Pass	3NT	All Pass	

West led the ♥9 and declarer took 10 tricks for +630.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♥	Dble
Pass	1♠	Pass	2♦
Pass	3♥	Pass	5♦
All Pass			

West led a heart and declarer took 11 tricks, but lost the board.

I don't know how the play went, but if East returns a club at trick two declarer can win, ruff a heart, come to hand with a diamond, ruff a heart, unblock the clubs, cross to dummy with a

diamond, pitch a spade on the ♠Q and score an overtrick – which would still be a zero.

BC Muenchen v Banana

Open Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♠	Dble
Pass	2♦	4♥	5♦
5♠	Dble	All Pass	

That little adventure cost -1100.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♥	Dble
Pass	1♠	2♥	Dble
All Pass			

That was only -300.

Dronka v Nambajuan

Open Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♥	Dble
Pass	1♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3NT	Dble	Rdbl
All Pass			

West led the ♠8 (a pity the ♠8 and ♠9 had not changed places, but East would not be able to duck a second round of the suit) and declarer was +1000.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
—	—	1♥	Dble
Pass	2♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Dble	All Pass

No redouble, no trouble as they say.

EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED BAM

MILTON AT WORK AT THE STAFF PARTY

MAURIZIO DI SACCO

You don't need the scenario of the final of the Bermuda Bowl, nor a dramatic board which moves tons of IMPs to appreciate the simple beauty of our game. In Italy we say "you can find a diamond even in manure".

That was the case of a hand played at the staff party (I was originally seating West, but I rotated the hand for reading convenience):

<p>♠ 2 ♥ J 6 3 ♦ J 8 6 5 4 ♣ J 9 3 2</p>	<p>♠ J 6 3 ♥ K 9 8 7 4 ♦ A 2 ♣ K 8 5</p>	<p>♠ A 10 8 5 4 ♥ Q 10 ♦ Q 3 ♣ A 10 7 6</p>	<p>♠ K Q 9 7 ♥ A 5 2 ♦ K 10 9 7 ♣ Q 4</p>
--	--	---	---

West	North	East	South
-	1♥	1♠	2♠
pass	3♥	pass	3NT
all pass			

The first good decision was to bid 3NT instead of 4♥; the latter contract goes down on two aces and two ruffs before declarer can get the lead ♠A (it happened at some other table), yet, some made it when south did not lead the SA, so scoring ten tricks in NT was essential to achieve a top score. I receive the lead of the S4, ducked my queen (I hide the 9). The ♥A and a heart ducked to east's queen followed, then a second spade won in hand. After a third heart cleared the suit, here came the key move: a club toward the queen scored a trick before south could make good his fifth spade, and, in fact, my opponent was powerless. That was the coup famous under the name of Milton Work coup, named after a famous American Whist expert: thanks Mr Milton Cooper Work!



Championship specials

The new **dealing machines** used to duplicate the boards for the European Winter Transnational Championships are sold for **€2650**. The **cards** played at last year's world championship are sold for **€80/100 decks**.

These offers are on so long as supply lasts, but no longer than February 19. Shipping from Sweden. (Machine can be picked up at the end.) Email anna@jannersten.com to order.



EUROPEAN WINTER MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINAL A, ROUND 4

JOS JACOBS

For this round, I will have a close look at the Lundberg v Goldberg and the Daisy Chain v Bernal matches. At the start of the round, Lundberg was just 0.06 VP ahead of Daisy Chain. This had the effect that Lundberg's opponent for this round would come from lower ranked teams whereas Daisy Chain would have to face 3rd placed Bernal. With three more rounds to come after this, however, it might well not matter too much – that's the way Swiss movements are run.

Board 3 was a question of agreements, I think.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

♠ 6 2			
♥ K 8			
♦ A Q J 5 4 2			
♣ A 8 5			
♠ A K J 4 3		♠ 8 5	
♥ 7 5 2		♥ A Q J 4 3	
♦ 3		♦ 10 8	
♣ K 6 4 2		♣ Q J 10 9	
♠ Q 10 9 7			
♥ 10 9 6			
♦ K 9 7 6			
♣ 7 3			

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Zack Efraimsson</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Efraimsson</i>	<i>Lundberg</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠*	2♦	Dble	Pass
3♣	All Pass		

1♠ 10-15, 4+♠

Two overtricks, Goldberg +150.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>P Bertheau</i>	<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>U Goldberg</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	2♦	2♥	4♦
4♥	All Pass		

Once East could show five hearts, game in that suit was never in doubt. Lundberg +650 and 11 IMPs to them

In the Daisy Chain v Bernal match, E/W for Bernal did not reach game either; This was their auction:

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Cima</i>	<i>Tartarin</i>	<i>Dessi</i>	<i>Robert</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠*	2♦	Dble	3♦
Pass	Pass	Dble	Pass
4♣	All Pass		

Bernal +150 as well.

In the Closed Room, they bid game:

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Lorenzini</i>	<i>Alpert</i>	<i>Michielsen</i>	<i>Versace</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	2♦	2♥	4♦
4♥	5♦	Dble	All Pass

Three off, Daisy Chain +500 and 9 IMPs.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

♠ K Q J 8		♠ 9 3 2
♥ A 9 7 6 4		♥ 5
♦ —		♦ A K Q 9 7 6 3
♣ K Q 10 2		♣ J 6

♠ A 5		♠ 10 7 6 4
♥ Q 10 8		♥ K J 3 2
♦ 10 8 5 2		♦ J 4
♣ A 9 8 7		♣ 5 4 3

N/S were left in peace and thus got to score a quiet +620.

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
<i>P Bertheau</i>	<i>Goldberg</i>	<i>Lund Madsen</i>	<i>U Goldberg</i>
Pass	1♥	2♦	2♥
3♥	4♥	5♦	Pass
Pass	Dble	All Pass	

In the replay, the sacrifice was duly taken for just one down and a 9 IMP gain for Lundberg.

In this round, the scorers were hardly troubled. The final scores in our matches read:

Lundberg v Goldberg: 28-2.
Daisy Chain v Bernal: 22-2.

Open Room

West	North	East	South
<i>Zack Efraimsson</i>	<i>Hult</i>	<i>Efraimsson</i>	<i>Lundberg</i>
1♣*	1♥	3♦*	Pass
Pass*	Dble*	Pass	3♥
4♦	4♥	All Pass	

- 1♣ 8-10 balanced or any 16+
- 3♦ Invitational
- Pass 8-10
- Dble Takeout



BRIDGE FOR ALL
LEVEL OF PLAYERS
09.00 - 22.30
DAILY

JUL 24 - AUG 2
2026



SUMMER & SUN | FUN
FRIENDS | GOOD FOOD
CONVENTUM ARENA
ÖREBRO, SWEDEN

MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINALS A & B

FINAL RANKING

FINAL A

1	DAISY CHAIN	116.89
2	LUNDBERG	110.72
3	2 MANY GINGERS	91.27
4	CROATIA	89.68
5	LAKO	89.68
6	ASHE	89.05
7	BERNAL	87.46
8	GOLDBERG	83.66
9	EMI	83.54
10	ZHANG	83.43
11	CARE	81.68
12	GROUP ONE TEAM	79.52
13	MILANBRIDGE.COM	77.05
14	WAPO	73.44
15	BAHNICI	68.17
16	DE BOTTON	65.60
17	GERMANY	60.40
18	DAUGAVA	60.02
19	TEAM LLAMA	54.91
20	CREAZONE	51.03

FINAL B - MIXED BAM

1	BLUE NOTE	40.00
2	VICUNA	35.00
3	BANANA	34.00
4	COLORADO	33.00
5	NORDIC FOURS	30.00
	BUNIO	30.00
7	NAMBAJUAN	29.00
	BEKKER	29.00
	DRONKA	29.00
10	NETTLETON	28.00
	SALLYS ACES	28.00
	BC MUENCHEN	28.00
13	TUTTI FRUTTI	23.00
	ELER	23.00

MIXED TEAMS CHAMPIONSHIP

BUTLER RANKING

BERTHEAU Peter - MADSEN Christina Lund	1.64	SWE-DEN	56
ROBERT Quentin - TARTARIN Anne-Laure	1.21	FRA-FRA	48
FRANCESCHETTI Pierre - SETTON Hilda	1.00	FRA-SUI	8
AUKEN Sabine - WELLAND Roy	0.88	DEN-DEN	32
WANG Wen Fei - HAMPSON Geoff	0.79	HKG-USA	56
KAZMUCHA Danuta - GAWEL Wojciech	0.73	POL-POL	40
ZORIC Vedran - SVER Nikica	0.73	CRO-CRO	40
LORENZINI Cedric - MICHELSEN Marion	0.57	FRA-SWE	56
PAOLUZI Simonetta - MONTANARI Matteo	0.54	ITA-ITA	56
VERSACE Alfredo - ALPERT Claire	0.50	ITA-USA	32
HULT Simon - LUNDBERG Anne-Marie Katarina	0.46	SWE-SWE	56
BUSSE Piotr - BUSSE Grazyna	0.41	POL-POL	56
JANSONS Ugis - VEKSA Natalija	0.41	LAT-LAT	56
BRKLJACIC Tihana - MESTRIC Mate	0.41	CRO-CRO	32
TYLVAD Daniel - SIGSGAARD Julie Marina	0.39	DEN-DEN	56
HERBST Ophir - ASULIN Adi	0.39	ISR-ISR	56
MALINOWSKI Artur - SENIOR Nevena	0.38	ENG-ENG	32
STEPINSKI Jeremi - ZALEWSKA Joanna	0.35	POL-POL	40
ZMUDA Justyna - MARCINOWSKI Piotr	0.29	POL-POL	48
DELLE CAVE Giuseppe - CARE Livia	0.29	ITA-ITA	24
SCHALTZ Martin - DUURSMA Judith	0.25	DEN-NED	56
EFRAIMSSON Bengt-Erik - ZACK EFRAIMSSON Anna	0.25	SWE-SWE	56
JAGNIEWSKI Rafal - LUCKA Dominika	0.23	POL-POL	40
BAHNIK Ondrej - KOHUTOVA Lucie	0.14	CZE-CZE	56
BILDE Dorte Cilleborg - BILDE Morten	0.10	DEN-DEN	40
ROSTHOEJ Ella - HAMMELEV Nikolaj	0.02	DEN-DEN	56
MENGU Kenan - SEN Nuray	-0.04	TUR-TUR	56
PILIPOVIC Marina - MARINOVSKI Kiril	-0.05	CRO-CRO	40
ASHE Steven - MARICIC Jovana	-0.09	USA-SER	56
NEHMERT Pony Beate - FROEHNER Christian	-0.09	GER-GER	56
BERNAL Francisco - OZBAY Irem	-0.16	COL-TUR	32
BAHNIKOVA Eva - BAHNIK Petr	-0.27	CZE-CZE	56
PETELKO Lia - RETTER Koren	-0.29	ISR-ISR	56
CECERE Amedeo - MARCELLI Cristina	-0.31	ITA-ITA	32
CIMA Leonardo - DESSI Barbara	-0.33	ITA-ITA	48
GOLDBERG Lars - GOLDBERG Ulla-Britt	-0.43	SWE-SWE	56
MISZEWSKA Ewa - ZAWISLAK Slawek	-0.43	POL-POL	56
GLADIATOR Anne - JANSON Bjorn	-0.48	GER-GER	56
KORBEL Daniel - ZHANG Susan	-0.48	USA-USA	56
HOFTANISKA Thor Erik - VIST Gunn Tove	-0.50	NOR-NOR	40
PREDDY Kay - SELWAY Norman	-0.52	ENG-ENG	56
MACURA Milan - MACUROVA Michaela	-0.63	CZE-CZE	40
BREWIAK Grazyna - HUTYRA Maciej	-0.75	POL-POL	32
WROBEL Michal - KALISORAS Justyna	-0.88	POL-POL	24
WEISS SELWAY Florian - WEISS SELWAY Louise	-1.05	AUT-AUT	56
NEIMANIS Janis - ANDERSONE Ilze	-1.43	LAT-LAT	56
CHARLSEN Thomas - DE BOTTON Janet	-1.45	NOR-ENG	40
ERDOGDU Helin - TORUN Bulent Ozgur	-1.75	TUR-TUR	56

MIXED PAIRS CHAMPIONSHIP

FINALS A & B

FINAL RANKING

FINAL A

1	ZAIDENBERG GATT Sophie	GISIN Eitan	ISR - ISR	55.57
2	McINTOSH Andrew	MORAN Sara	ENG - ENG	55.16
3	IMAMOGLU Levent	SEKER Olgu	TUR - TUR	53.71
4	SMEDEREVAC Jovanka	ADELSBERGER Heimo	FRA - DEN	53.40
5	MANNO Andrea	TERSCH Federica	ITA - ITA	53.38
6	LANGER Darina	GOKCE Hakan	SUI - SUI	52.75
7	GORSKA Aleksandra	TUCZYNSKI Piotr	POL - POL	51.46
8	LENZ Vera	VITTERS Ralph	GER - GER	50.56
9	PAVLUSHKO Olga	IVANOV Anatoly	ESP - ESP	50.40
10	MARINONI Pier Andrea	ROMANO Elisa	ITA - ITA	49.52
11	SUNGET Senol	CIMEN Tan	TUR - TUR	49.48
12	MROZ Blazej	BANAS Gabriela	POL - POL	48.82
13	PEYRET Hakan	GUREL Zeynep Damla	TUR - TUR	47.63
14	KRASA Mikulas	SLOVAKOVA Pavla	CZE - CZE	47.63
15	MIHAI Geta	MIHAI Radu	ROM - ROM	47.15
16	KANDEMIR Ismail	NUHOGLU Sevil	TUR - TUR	46.18
17	ERENGIL Yasemin	KAYA Emre	TUR - TUR	45.24
18	ZABICKA BAJON Katarzyna	DZIECIATKOWSKI Piotr	POL - POL	40.02

FINAL B

1	GOTARD Barbara	GOTARD Tomasz	GER - GER	63.15
2	OZKURT Kenan	OZKOK KOCAMAN Ilkay	TUR - TUR	59.93
3	LASOTA Tomasz	PODGORCZYK Magdalena	POL - POL	55.88
4	VAN HOOIJDONK Marcel	NGUYEN Ahn	NED - NED	55.81
5	ZAIDENBERG Nezer Jacob	MCDONALD Majella	BUL - IRL	55.33
6	PISANI Rosanna	MARINO Leonardo	ITA - ITA	55.32
7	WAKSMAN Sophie	MILASZEWSKI Mirosław	FRA - POL	54.55
8	KANLIKILIC Ferda	OZER Ahmet Murat	TUR - TUR	54.44
9	PROBST Sandra	MIJIC Ante	CRO - CRO	54.25
10	AGA Ezgi Ece	DOGAN Fikret	GER - TUR	53.43
11	GOLDBERG Jerry	SEAMAN Eleanor	USA - USA	53.04
12	HALEFOGLU Oksan Veda	AYTEMUR Cengiz	TUR - TUR	53.03
13	LYSEK Matyas	KONSTACKA Emma	CZE - CZE	51.50
14	KLUPS Aleksandra	FOLTYN Adrian	POL - POL	50.20
15	JESENICNIK Aleksandra	ORAC Tolja	SLO - SLO	49.34
16	THORPE Stefan	ADELSBERGER Renate	NED - AUT	49.31
17	HOLOWACZ Michal	CHMIELEWSKA Antonina	POL - POL	49.12
18	PIGULSKI Adam	PUCYK Martyna	POL - POL	48.33
19	PYSZKOVA Valerie	DANEK Petr	CZE - CZE	48.00
20	GOBEKLI Altug	OZAYDIN TANRIOVER Zerrin	TUR - TUR	47.77
21	KNOTTENBELT Maggie	HANDLEY-PRITCHARD Ben	ENG - ENG	47.35
22	HOLOWACZ Krzysztof	CHMIELEWSKA Magdalena	POL - POL	47.09
23	NIKLAUS Maria	LORKOWSKI Jan	POL - POL	46.38
24	OLMER Adam	BABICKOVA Anna	CZE - CZE	44.80
25	ZYCHLINSKA Malgorzata	KANDULA Pawel	POL - POL	44.63
26	SORESINI Antonella	GUGLIELMI Enrico	ITA - ITA	43.34
27	ZIETARA Jolanta	GREWLING Jozef	POL - POL	43.16
28	GALUBINSKI Krzysztof	BORUTA Barbara	POL - POL	42.47
29	BUCHLEV Nedju	DUEHRIG Eike	GER - GER	41.12
30	KIEPURA Marek	GRUSZECZKA Joanna	POL - POL	38.25



Biggest junior bridge
tournament in the Baltics



TARTU ÄRTU 2026

TARTU,
ESTONIA

MAY
08 - 10

The place to meet new friends, play in a competition with different level juniors (at least 40 pairs) from all over Europe - Tartu awaits all you amazing juniors!

FOR MORE
INFORMATION



- ✓ Friday pairs **5x12 boards**
- ✓ Saturday teams qualification **8x8 boards**
- ✓ Sunday teams finals **3x12 boards**

- ✓ Participation fee includes accomodation, tournaments, all meals
Fri-Sun **170€**

*Extra night(s) +40€
w/breakfast only*

- ✓ Extra activities including board games, crazybridge, goulash and much more
- ✓ At least 2000€ in prizes for more than just TOP3

Venue:

Raadimõisa hotell, Tartu, Estonia

More information from Riko
Piirisild riko.piirisild@gmail.com

Register at:

thinking.ee/tartu2026
to secure your spot!