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## $\square \square \square$ <br> 

It is time for the Knock-outs after a close finish to the qualifying stages yesterday. In the Juniors, Singapore defeated France $18-12$ in the morning match to go into the final round I VP ahead of their opponents. In the final round, France defeated Japan 21-9 then had to see if it would be sufficient. It was not. Singapore completed a strong day with a 23-7 win over Canada and Italy beat Australia 20-I0, to join USAI and Poland in the last four. That completed a fine comeback from the Italians, after a slow start to the Championship, and there was no place in the KOs for France.
In the Schools Championship, Israel, Latvia and Australia were safe before the last round. USA Red managed a maximum against Indonesia but were overtaken by Norway, who got a 20-10 win against Thailand. Would that be enough? No, Poland had

## VUGRAPH MATCHES

## Semi-final Segment I- 10.30 <br> Italy v Poland

Semi-final Segment 2 - 14.00
to be announced
Semi-final Segment 3 - 17.00 to be announced

Semi-final Segment 4 - 21.00 to be announced
been fourth going in and their draw with Chinese Taipei took them through to the KOs in fourth place.
Today's semi-finals consist of four 16-board segments, with carry-overs from the round robin matches between the two teams. Good luck to all.


The teams in play
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|  |  |  | $B E E$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| JUNIORS SESSION 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Match |  |  | IMP's |  | VP's |  |
| 1 | AUSTRALIA | JORDAN | 61 | 45 | 18 | 12 |
| 2 | JAPAN | ITALY | 46 | 87 | 7 | 23 |
| 3 | SINGAPORE | FRANCE | 73 | 57 | 18 | 12 |
| 4 | CHILE | CANADA | 54 | 56 | 15 | 15 |
| 5 | POLAND | USA 2 | 62 | 17 | 24 | 6 |
| 6 | EGYPT | USA I | 17 | 65 | 5 | 25 |
| 7 | THAILAND | HUNGARY | 28 | 80 | 5 | 25 |
| 8 | BRAZIL | ISRAEL | 47 | 55 | 14 | 16 |
| 9 | CHINA HG KG | NORWAY | 28 | 61 | 8 | 22 |

## JUNIORS SESSION I7

|  |  | Match |  | IMP's |  | VP's |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| I | JORDAN | CHINA HG KG | 39 | 61 | 10 | 20 |  |
| 2 | NORWAY | BRAZIL | 54 | 54 | 15 | 15 |  |
| 3 | ISRAEL | THAILAND | 85 | 47 | 23 | 7 |  |
| 4 | HUNGARY | EGYPT | 73 | 37 | 22 | 8 |  |
| 5 | USA I | POLAND | 43 | 40 | 16 | 14 |  |
| 6 | USA 2 | CHILE | 38 | 46 | 14 | 16 |  |
| 7 | CANADA | SINGAPORE | 28 | 69 | 7 | 23 |  |
| 8 | FRANCE | JAPAN | 44 | 16 | 21 | 9 |  |
| 9 | ITALY | AUSTRALIA | 70 | 47 | 20 | 10 |  |

## JUNIORS FINAL RANKING

| I | USA I |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | POLAND |
| 3 | ITALY | 3328 309


| SEMAFINALS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 USAI | +15.5 | SINGAPORE | 0 |
| 2 POLAND | +1 | ITALY | 0 |


| SCHOOLS SESSION I 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Match |  | IMP's |  | VP's |  |
| I | AUSTRALIA | INDONESIA | 73 | 27 | 24 | 6 |
| 2 | USA BLUE | ITALY | 63 | 64 | 15 | 15 |
| 3 | CHINA HG KG | SWEDEN | 20 | 66 | 6 | 24 |
| 4 | CHINA | ISRAEL | 30 | 76 | 6 | 24 |
| 5 | CHINESE TAIPEI | LATVIA | 31 | 43 | 13 | 17 |
| 6 | THAILAND | POLAND | 29 | 82 | 5 | 25 |
| 7 | CANADA | NORWAY | 33 | 88 | 4 | 25 |
| 8 | USA RED | PAKISTAN | 57 | 39 | 19 |  |


| SCHOOLS SESSION I5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Match |  | IMP's |  | VP's |  |
| 1 | INDONESIA | USA RED | 42 | 97 | 4 | 25 |
| 2 | PAKISTAN | CANADA | 77 | 55 | 20 | 10 |
| 3 | NORWAY | THAILAND | 72 | 49 | 20 | 10 |
| 4 | POLAND | CHINESE TAIPEI | 51 | 50 | 15 | 15 |
| 5 | LATVIA | CHINA | 63 | 41 | 20 | 10 |
| 6 | ISRAEL | CHINA HG KG | 84 | 38 | 24 | 6 |
| 7 | SWEDEN | USA BLUE | 34 | 45 | 13 | 17 |
| 8 | ITALY | AUSTRALIA | 50 | 87 | 7 | 23 |

## SCHOOLS FINAL RANKING

| I ISRAEL | 320 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 AUSTRALIA | 285 |
| 3 LATVIA | 285 |
| 4 POLAND | 269 |
| 5 NORWAY | 266 |
| 6 USA RED | 261 |
| 7 SWEDEN | 245 |
| 8 USA BLUE | 243 |
| 9 CHINESE TAIPEI | 232 |
| 10 PAKISTAN | 204 |
| 11 CHINA HONG KONG | 203 |
| 12 ITALY | 186 |
| 13 CANADA | 181 |
| 14 CHINA | 133 |
| 15 INDONESIA | 114 |
| 16 THAILAND | 111 |

SEMI-FINALS

| 3 AUSTRALIA | 0 | ISRAEL | +16 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4 LATVIA | 0 | POLAND | +8 |

## The Only Card

It is well-known to those of us who come from the land of the weak no trump (The True Faith!), that one never goes for a big penalty when one opens INT with a disgusting II-count with no intermediates and a queen-jack doubleton in some suit. Oh no, it is the I4-point hands with three tens that go for 1100 .This is a law of nature.
In the same way, it is the I8-point INT overcalls that go for a number, never the 'good' 14 -counts. There was such a hand in the Round 12 Juniors match between France and Poland.

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AJ } 1043 \\
& \text { Q } \\
& \text { J } 103 \\
& \text { A } 1098
\end{aligned}
$$

| - 9852 | N | - K 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 1092 |  | - AK 83 |
| - 54 | W E | -K92 |
| -7654 | S | - KQ 3 |
|  | Q Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 7654 |  |
|  | - A Q 876 |  |
|  | - 12 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Bessis | Kalita | Gaviard | Kotorowicz |
|  | IS | INT | Dble |

## All Pass

Nobody could reasonably criticise the INT bid on a full 18 HCP , but a sharp double from Krzysztof Kotorowicz left the French pair with nowhere to go.
Kotorowicz led a low heart to the queen and ace and Julian Gaviard returned a low heart, Kotorowicz going in with the jack and continuing the suit. Gaviard won in dummy and took the opportunity to lead up to the king of clubs, then cashed the king of hearts. On the hearts, Kalita had thrown one diamond and two spades. This was the position after the last heart:

|  | - AJ 10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark-$ |  |
|  | - J 10 |  |
|  | - A 109 |  |
| - 9852 | N | - K 76 |
| $\checkmark$ - | W E | $\checkmark$ - |
| - 54 |  | -K 92 |
| -76 | S | - Q 3 |
|  | Q Q |  |
|  | $\checkmark 7$ |  |
|  | - A Q 876 |  |
|  |  |  |

Gaviard exited with the nine of diamonds, but he did not come to another trick. Kalita won the diamond and returned the suit. By the time Kotorowicz had finished cashing red winners, he had just two cards left to go on North's

## PLAY SCHEDULE

10.30-I2.50
II.00-12.00
12.15-13.15
14.00-16.20
15.00-16.00
16.15-I7.15
17.00-19.20
17.30-18.30
18.45-I 9.45
$21.00-23.20$

Semi-finals, Segment I
Swiss Pairs, Round I
Swiss Pairs, Round 2
Semi-finals, Segment 2
Swiss Pairs, Round 3
Swiss Pairs, Round 4
Semi-finals, Segment 3
Swiss Pairs, Round 5
Swiss Pairs, Round 6
Semi-finals, Segment 4

## The Swiss Pairs

The Swiss Pairs will be held Today and Monday, starting at II-00 am each day, with six rounds and five on Monday, and ending in time for dinner each day.
It is a Transnational event and is open to anyone playing in the Junior or Schools Championship, plus anyone else who was born on or after January Ist 1981.

Registration is in the playing area 30 minutes before the start of play, i.e. 10-30 this morning.

## Victory Banquet

Everyone should have had a form left in their room, asking which main course they would like at Tuesday's Victory Banquet. Could you please hand these in as the hotel requires advance notice to aid the smooth running of the dinner.
black aces; down three for -800 .
That was a flat board as, at the other table, the Polish East/West pair wriggled their way into $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ doubled, also going for 800.
In the diagrammed position, there is only one card with which declarer can exit and come to another trick to win the board.
A low spade is no good - the queen wins and South cashes the heart, squeezing East in three suits.
A low club is no good - South wins and cashes the heart, crosses to the $\Phi \mathrm{A}$ and the club winners now squeeze East.
If East exits with the e Q , North cashes the clubs then plays a diamond. Declarer can block the diamonds by covering, but he has had to throw a spade on the fourth club and now the long heart squeezes him once again.
The only winning play is the king of diamonds. That leaves the diamonds blocked and there is no way for the defence to unravel them, so declarer must make either the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ or $\stackrel{2}{2}$ to get out for two down.

# WORLD JUNIOR CHAMPIONSHIP 8 <br> (2001) 

Seventeen teams gathered in Mangaratiba, near Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for the 2001 World Junior Championship. USAI won the round robin reasonably comfortably, with the shock of the tournament being Thailand, in its first appearance at a World Junior Championship, qualifying in second place.
I. USAI 324
2. Thailand 290
3. Denmark 282.5
4. Israel 282
5. China 275
6. Norway 271

7=. Canada 270
7=. Netherlands 270
9. Argentina 266
10. France 256.8
II. Australia 256
12. Brazil 251.5

13 USA2 235.2
14 Egypt 223
15. Chinese Taipei 208
16. CAC 190
17. New Zealand 159

Despite its second-place in the round robin, Thailand found that it was the opponent of choice for USAI at the semi-final stage, where Thailand had a 2.7 -IMP carry-over advantage. That left Denmark to start the other semi-final against Israel with a single-IMP advantage. Neither semifinal was close.Thailand ran out of steam and were crushed by a strong American team, 284-94.7, while Israel also had a comfortable win by 217-108.
Denmark defeated Thailand by 191-123.5 in the bronzemedal play-off while USAI soon added to their 6-IMP carry-over advantage in the final and won by 262 -I57. As with Italy two years earlier, USAI had looked to be the class team all the way through the tournament, and were worthy winners.
Canada's Vincent Demuy found a neat play to earn his side a game swing on this deal against Denmark:

| Dealer South. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - J 3 |  |  |
| - A9432 |  |  |
| - 73 |  |  |
| - AKQ 5 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& AK } 9876 \\ & \vee K J I O \end{aligned}$ | N | - 2 |
|  |  | $\checkmark 8765$ |
| - W E - 10985 |  |  |
| +196 | S | -10873 |
|  | - Q 1054 |  |
|  | - Q |  |
|  | - AKJ642 |  |
|  | * 42 |  |


| West | North <br> Heller | East | South <br> Demuy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{1 Q}$ | - | - | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{u}$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | PNT |  |  |

## All Pass

The Danish declarer, also in 3NT, won the spade lead in hand, crossed to dummy with a club, and led a diamond to the jack and queen. West tried a top spade to find how they divided then switched to the king of hearts; down three.
Demuy won the spade lead with his ten and realized that he only needed four diamond tricks for his contract. With entries to hand in short supply, he ducked a diamond and, when the queen appeared, had ten tricks whatever the defence did next.
Had the queen of diamonds not appeared, Demuy expected to have a count on both black suits before he came to the critical decision in diamonds, and some clue about the hearts after seeing what East discarded on the top spades, so had high hopes of 'guessing' correctly whether the suit had started out three-two or four-one.
Pablo Ravenna of Argentina was partnering Agustin Madala in his team's match against the Netherlands. Ravenna played this next one nicely to bring home his game.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- Q 93
- KJ643
- 7
\& K 1098

| - 104 <br> - A 108 <br> -K Q 10542 <br> \& 4 | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ S A 762 Q Q 72 AJ 8 A65 | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North <br> Madala | East | South <br> Ravenna |
| - | - | Pass | INT |
| 24(i) | 3 (ii) | Pass | 3NT |

(i) Diamonds or both majors
(ii) Hearts

Ravenna liked his diamond holding so judged to play 3NT rather than the doomed heart game. The Dutch West led the king of diamonds, catching a discouraging nine from East, and Ravenna ducked. West now tried the $\vee 10$, imagining that declarer would be weak in the suit because he had chosen to play 3NT rather than $4 \vee$. Dummy's king won the heart and second round went to the queen and
ace. Now West found the spade switch, the ten being covered by the queen and king. Ravenna did well by ducking and East switched to a diamond to the jack and queen. With no entry, West switched back to spades, the eight forcing the ace. But Ravenna had lost his four tricks, rectifying the count for a squeeze against East. He crossed to the king of clubs and cashed the heart winners, and East had to concede the ninth trick.
The surprise team of the tournament was Thailand. Near the end of their Round 7 match with Norway they appeared to be on their way to a heavy defeat, but this next deal pulled them back into the match.

| Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 75 |  |  |  |
| - KJ2 |  |  |  |
| - AK 1052 |  |  |  |
| \& 192 |  |  |  |
| - Q 1083 | N | - 64 |  |
| $\checkmark 5$ |  | - Q 109863- Q 43 |  |
| - 86 |  |  |  |
| \& AKQ64 | 43 S | * 105 |  |
| (AKJ92 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 74 |  |  |  |
| - J 97 |  |  |  |
| \& 87 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Chitngamkusol K | Kvangraven | Trimankha | Harr |
| - | - | - | 14 |
| 20 | 2 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 31 | Pass | $4{ }^{1}$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The Norwegians did well to reach a game that had at least some play on the two hands, but he needed a friendly lie and one was not forthcoming. In the circumstances, two down was no great disaster; -200.

| West <br> Ellestad | North <br> Sasibut | East <br> Charlsen | South <br> Limsinsopon |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $-\overline{2 a}$ | - | $\overline{-}$ | $1 \mathbf{1}$ |

Olav Ellestad was desperately unlucky to find himself conceding a penalty in his very sound overcall. Jaturong Sasibut's had a penalty double available and chose to use it to do so on a hand of this type being an old-fashioned style that used to be promoted by such players as the late Terence Reese.
Sasibut led the ace of diamonds and, though at first glance it appears that declarer will come to seven tricks, the defence was spot on and left Ellestad with only six. Sasibut and Kirawat Limsinsopon simply cashed their three top red tricks and one spade, then exited with a trump, and Ellestad had to lose three more spade tricks for down two and 500 to Thailand, who picked up 12 IMPs from nowhere.
The first board of the final produced a big swing to USAI but Israel had an opportunity to win the board.

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

- A 652
- J 9754
-K 83
- 7


I am not sure if North/South were entirely on the same wavelength regarding the 5 NT bid, as it looks as though South might have been willing to shoot out the grand if facing the ace of trumps, while North clearly did not believe that he had what was required. Anyway, John Kranyak wasted no time on the play, winning the diamond lead with the king, playing ace then ruffing a club, drawing trumps and conceding a club for a quick +980 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cambell | Roll | Wooldridge | Schneider |
| - | $2 *$ (i) | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 5NT |
| Pass | 6 | Pass | 79 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

(i) Both majors, 5-10 HCP

When Yossi Roll showed a weak hand with both majors, Ranny Schneider made a couple of enquiries then asked about trump honours and, on discovering that the ace was present, bid the grand.
Joel Wooldridge led the ace of hearts and Roll ruffed. Of course, the club suit is the key to the fate of the grand slam. Declarer should cash the ace of trumps at trick two, just in case East has all the missing cards. When both defenders follow, the decision is whether to draw a second trump or to set about the clubs immediately. It looks correct to cash a second trump as the contract will be almost home if the suit splits evenly. On the actual lay-out, declarer next cashes the top clubs and, when an honour falls from East, it is with the odds to draw a third round of trumps then follow the theory of restricted choice and take the ruffing club finesse, making the slam. If no club honour appears, declarer will have to ruff a club without drawing the third trump and hope that East has three or four cards in the suit, when he can still succeed. It follows that East should drop a club honour on the second round
when holding $\mathrm{QJ} \times x$, encouraging declarer to draw the third trump and go down in a contract that he would make by playing to take two ruffs in the North hand.
Well, Roll ruffed a small club at trick three, cashed two rounds of trumps and tried to ruff another club. When that was over-ruffed he was one down and USAI had picked up 14 IMPs when it could have been II to Israel.
I.USAI (Brad Campbell, Joe Grue, John Hurd, John Kranyak, Kent Mignocchi, Joel Wooldridge, NPC Bob Rosen, Coach Dennis McGarry)
2.Israel (Asaf Amit, Yaniv Vax, Aran Warzawsky, Inon Liran, Ranny Schneider, Yossi Roll, NPC Michael Barel)
3.Denmark (Martin Schaltz, Andreas Marquardsen, Gregers Bjarnarson, Michael Askgaard, Kare Gjaldbaek, Jonas Houmoller, NPC Hans Kristian Sorensen, Coach Bettina Kalkerup)

## USA2 Junior Team

## Noble Shore

Noble is a 25 -year old software developer from the Washington DC area. He would like to say 'Hi' to his fiancee, Sarah, and their dog, Charlie. Sarah and Noble will be married next August.

## Mike Gill

Mike is a 24 -year old grad. student in astronomy at the University of Maryland. He feels honoured and lucky to be here in Thailand, and says that he is happy to have accomplished his primary goal of not having caused any internationals incidents (so far).

## Michael and Jon Rice

The Rice brothers are both 24 -years old. Michael graduated from Georgia Tech. with a bachelor's degree in computer engineering, while Jon is at N . C. State. The Rice brothers in Thailand means Twin Towers, they love bridge and little else, but have said that the hospitality here is excellent.

## Mike Develin and John Barth

Mike and John both hail from the great state of California. John, the wild one, works as a product analyst and, if you know what his job description is, he would love to hear it. He is greatly enjoying the hospitality of the Thai people, and leads all teams in late registration fees. Mike, the straight man, doubles as a mathematician and pretentious indie hipster. He is also a resident blogger for www.bridgeiscool.com. Astonishingly, Mike and John have only played in one three-three fit so far this tournament.

## Elimination and Endplay

## by Sandra Kulovic-Probst

Noble Shore of USA2 Juniors found a nice play to make this slam from Round 15.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 104
- K 1082
- 1054
- A 92


All Pass
(i) Strong
(ii) Minors
(iii) GF
(iv) One key card

West duly led a club to dummy's ace. Shore ruffed a club, crossed to dummy with a trump and ruffed the last club, cashed the ace of spades and led his heart. West had to take the ace of hearts but was now endplayed. He could not lead a minor, for obvious reasons but, equally, either heart return would also be fatal to the defence.
West actually chose to return the $\vee 4$. Shore put in the eight, ruffing out East's jack, crossed to dummy with a trump and cashed the $\vee K$, throwing a diamond. When the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ fell, he had a second discard for the jack of diamonds and twelve tricks. Nicely played.
Had West exited with the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, declarer would have won the king and had a guess on the next round of hearts - which he would almost certainly have got right.


## JUNIORS

## Round I 5

Going into their Round 15 encounter in the Junior Championship, USAI were in the lead and, while not yet secure, looking good for a place in the semi-finals, while Israel were in the thick of the battle for one of the remaining qualification spots.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- 10953
-     - 
- A Q 8
- J76532

```
- AK Q 84
- 3
-K 52
\& Q 1094
```



- J 2
- K QJIO 9652

76

- A874
- 9743
- AK 8

| West <br> Reshef | North <br> Grue | East <br> Ginossar | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Dble | $4 \vee$ <br> All Pass | Pass |

What is the weakest hand with which you have ever seen a $4 \vee$ opening doubled for take-out? This example must be pretty close, I would have thought. No doubt John Kranyak was delighted to hear the double and envisaged collecting a substantial penalty. It was not to be. Kranyak led a top club, ruffed, and Eldad Ginossar played the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, ducked, then the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, also ducked, and a third heart, which Kranyak won. Joe Grue had pitched two low clubs, but the switch was clear without any help from partner. Kranyak led the


Eldad GINOSSAR, Israel
nine of diamonds and the defence took its tricks; +790 .
At the other table, Ron Hoffman did not find the double, but neither did Gilad Ofir find the diamond switch, so there were twelve tricks for +680 but 3 IMPs to Israel.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | ¢ 7 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - J 63 |  |  |
|  | -K642 |  |  |
|  | * AKQ9 5 |  |  |
| - Q 983 | N |  | 102 |
| - Q 7 | W E |  |  |
| - Q 753 | $S$ |  | 108 |
| * J 42 |  |  |  |
|  | - J 654 |  |  |
|  | - A 10854 |  |  |
|  | - 9 |  |  |
|  | 2063 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Reshef | Grue | Ginossar | Kranyak |
| Pass | 1 | INT | 2\% |
| Dble | Pass | 2. | Pass |
| 3. | Pass | $3 \vee$ | Pass |
| 4 * | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

At the other table Ari Greenberg and Justin Lall played 24 on the East/West cards, making ten tricks for +170 to USAI. I include this deal because it was the subject of an appeal and thought that it might be of interest to see how an appeals committee might think. Of course, you may not agree with the decision, and a different committee might even come to a different conclusion though, of course, we hope not.
One Diamond was Precision and was described at both sides of the screen as being a negative double. Both East and West asked for further clarification.
East was told by North that would usually deliver at least four-three in the majors with a four-card or longer minor. With South only promising four-three in the majors, East was confident that his partnership agreement was that the double of was Stayman, and that the 3 continuation was natural and game-forcing. This was supported by the partnership's system file.
West was told by South, both majors. For him, his double now showed an interest in penalising his opponents in a major. This also was supported by the system file, so East and West were playing two different systems due to the slightly different secondary explanations given by North and South.
While East was in a game-forcing auction the moment
that his partner bid $3 *$, West was not. He interpreted $2 \uparrow$ as showing a maximum with spade values, i.e. stopper showing, and bid 3 as an attempt to play in the only suit not shown by his opponents - North's pass of the double showed clubs, of course. West interpreted 3 b as a halfstopper and attempted again to sign-off in diamonds but, of course, East went on to game. The contract was down two doubled for -300.
The TD ruled that the result should stand as the two explanations were basically identical. East/West appealed.
The appeals committee decided that the two explanations were not identical. Indeed, the fact that East and West could be on different pages systemically, having received the two explanations, strongly suggests that for some people there was a difference.Accordingly, there was misinformation, although both North and South were doing their best to give a proper explanation.
Did the misinformation contribute to the table result? The committee believed that it did, as had East and West received identical information they would presumably have then been playing the same methods and would not have had the misunderstanding. It followed that an adjusted score had to be considered.
Were the different explanations the sole cause of the bad East/West result, or did they contribute to their own downfall? The committee could not see how East could have avoided the result as his methods forced him to game. However, the committee felt that West might have bid differently and that his actions had contributed to the result. East's removal of the double of $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ denied a penalty double of that contract. West believed that East had a maximum with spade strength, but it followed that East lacked a heart stopper, and there was no guarantee that he would have a diamond suit. Accordingly, he would usually hold three or more spades and a pass of 24 was a sensible option - indeed, one committee member was confident that he would have passed 24 had he held the hand. West might also have tried 34 over $3 \vee$, and would then have been able to pass a 4* rebid by East.
The committee decided that there had been damage but that East/West had also contributed to their bad result. Accordingly, the result was adjusted to $50 \%$ of the time 5 doubled -300 and $50 \%$ of the time 2 making +170 . Effectively, the IO-IMP swing to USAI was halved to 5 IMPs.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- J 432
- 107
- 54
- J 10752
- K 76
- A842
- J 976
\& K 6

| West <br> Reshef | North <br> Grue | East <br> Ginossar | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 3母 | Pass | 3 |  |
| $3 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Three Clubs started a Puppet Stayman sequence. Though dummy had shown four hearts, Kranyak judged that his best chance was to find partner with some help in that suit - with two aces, he might even be able to afford giving declarer a trick on the lead. The low heart lead ran around to Ginossar's queen and he attacked diamonds. Kranyak cleared the hearts but Ginossar had nine tricks for +600 .
In the other room, a different auction saw Ofir lead a low club to defeat the same contract;-100 and I2 IMPs to Israel.
The Israelis led by 20-7 at this point, but now came a major shift in the momentum of the match.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 104
- K 1082
- 1054
- A 92


| West <br> Reshef | North Grue | East <br> Ginossar | South Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 13 |
| Pass | $1 \vee$ | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 24. |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | 64 |

All Pass
The modified Precision auction saw the Americans get to the reasonable small slam and Ophir Reshef led a low club to the ace and jack. Kranyak crossed to hand with a trump and led a heart up. When Reshef played low, Kranyak put up the king and had twelve tricks for +1430 .
On a similar line,Ari Greenberg took his ace to defeat the slam at the other table so USAI gained a massive 17 IMPs to take the lead in the match.


There was no helpful East/West bidding here, but read a separate article in this issue to see how the slam can be made legitimately.

(i) First-round control

Facing a simple but sound raise, Ginossar tried and tried again for slam but eventually had to call it a day. As the cards lie, this was the correct thing to do, because after a trump lead there were two tricks to be lost; +650 .
Alas for Israel Lall/Greenberg bid the slam at the other table and Ofir cashed the ace of diamonds at trick one, after which Lall had no problem in coming to twelve tricks for +1430 and 13 IMPs to USAI.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- Q 1085
$\checkmark 76$
- J 4
- AJ965


| West <br> Reshef | North <br> Grue | East <br> Ginossar | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT |  |  |  |
| Pass | 20 | Dble | $2 \downarrow$ |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Having opened INT with a singleton club, Kranyak was not inclined to play 3NT after Ginossar had doubled to show clubs. He raised to the four-three fit spade game and Ginossar led the king of clubs to the ten and ace. Grue led the $\downarrow 4$ at trick two, the king losing to the ace. Back came a club to the jack, queen and ruff, and now Grue played ace and another trump, misguessing by putting up the queen and losing to the king. It didn't matter, as there was no effective defence open to Ginossar. In practice, he tried a heart, but Grue finessed the queen and crossed to the jack of diamonds to play a trump; +620 .
The same contract failed by a trick at the other table so that was another 12 IMPs to USAI. They ran out winners by $67-26 \mathrm{IMPs}, 23-7 \mathrm{VPs}$, and had all but ensured their place in the semi-finals. Meanwhile, Israel had some serious work to do in their last two matches if they were to join them.

## China Schools Team

The China school team comes from the Northwest Sci-tech University of Agriculture and Forestry. This is the first international bridge match they have played.

## Wei YUAN \& Siao-Kun WU

Both partners are students, majoring in Enology. Wu began to play bridge from middle school. They use a quite complicated bidding system with many conventions. The only problem for them is that often one partner forgets their convention though the other partner still remembers while bidding.

## Kai CAO \& Hui WANG

Cao is also studying Enology, and Wang majors at Forestry. Their partnership is quite short, just starting before this championship. Their bidding is often quite brave. The only problem for them is that it is often hard for them to find the proper way to go home.

## Bao-zhen HUA, npc

He is a professor of Entomology, teaching bridge for 20 years. His colleague found that in his students, the declarer did not allow the defenders to see the dummy's cards.
An-lao HU, coach
He is the head of the Department of Physical Education. He knows that 3NT needs 9 tricks, and grand slam can win the highest score.


Round 16 was going to be exciting in the Junior championship. USAI (leaders with 288 VPs ) played Egypt, who were eighth, but only I3 VPs short of a qualifying spot.
After four boards USAI were leading by I IMP. On Board 5, Joe Grue gave an example of his excellent bidding judgment to extend the lead.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

(i) Two plus diamonds
(ii) Majors, 6-10 or 14+ HCP
(iii) Splinter
(iv) First-round control

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | 2 (i) | 3 (ii) |
| 34 | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 54, | Pass | Pass | Dble |

All Pass
(i) Majors
(ii) Splinter

After John Kranyak's splinter, Grue wanted to bid towards grand slam. Most juniors would have been more than happy to bid their grand, but Grue saw another problem - vulnerability. E/W could save in Seven Spades, as they are not vulnerable, and all the good judgment in the world would not get him many IMPs on the board. To avoid this happening, he bid Six Diamonds first and, after West saved as expected, he bid Seven Diamonds. E/W weren't so sure
about saving now and passed. Grue claimed his 2140 after the lead. In the Open Room N/S doubled Five Spades only and lost 16 IMPs .
Board 6 was also a test of high-level bidding as E/W can make Six Clubs or Six Hearts, but N/S can save in spades.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/WVul.

- AJ 10
$\checkmark 32$
- J 10852
- 1084

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19 | 19 |
| $2 v$ | 2. | $4 \checkmark$ | 4. |
| $5 \vee$ | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pas |



Joe GRUE, USA

Open Room

| West <br> Feldman | North <br> Nabil | East <br> Donn | South <br> Hammad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 19 | $3 \Phi$ |
| Dble | $4 \Phi$ | Pass | Pass |
| $5 \Omega$ | Pass | $5 \varphi$ | Pass |
| $5 N T$ (i) | Pass | $6 \varphi$ | Pass |
| Pass | 69 | Dble | All Pass |

(i) Pick a slam

Again Egypt didn't judge the hand right and Five Spades made eight tricks. In the Open Room, E/W found their slam and N/S made the higher sacrifice and found only seven tricks for 1100 ; another 12 IMPs to the leaders.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 105
- 9862
- J 5

KQJ65

- 2
- K 43
- Q 9872
\& A 87

- AK 864
- QJ5
- A 43
- 104

Q Q 973

- A 107
-K 106
- 92

Closed Room

| West <br> Abdel Fattah | North <br> Grue | East <br> Mehilba | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| INT | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |



John KRANYAK, USA

Open Room

| West <br> Feldman | North <br> Nabil | East <br> Donn | South <br> Hammad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | IS | Pass |
| INT | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Dble | Pass |
| $3 *$ | All Pass |  |  |

Grue led the against 3NT. Mahmoud Abdel Fattah took the A and played a diamond to the $\forall$. Next he played another diamond, on which Kranyak played the ten, and declarer the queen, dropping the jack. The $\uparrow 9$ was led to the king, Grue discarding the $\downarrow$. Kranyak now returned the Q and declarer took it and played a club. After Grue cashed the he played the 10 . Declarer took the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$, but ended up with only seven tricks to lose 7 IMPs.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

```
& J 107 32
* AJ96
-9
& 872
```

| ¢ K 64 | N | ¢ A Q 985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 1074 | W | $\checkmark 52$ |
| - J1085 | W E | -642 |
| ¢ K 9 | S | \& Q 105 |
|  | 9- |  |
|  | -K83 |  |
|  | - AKQ 73 |  |
|  | \& AJ 643 |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Abdel Fattah | North <br> Grue | East <br> Mehilba | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I\& (ii) | Dble | Pass | $1 \mathbf{1 Q}$ (i) |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{3 0}$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

(i) $16+\mathrm{HCP}$
(ii) Two-suiter, red suits or black suits

Open Room

| West <br> Feldman | North <br> Nabil | East <br> Donn | South <br> Hammad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | ANT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the Open Room the auction went nicely for the Egyptian pair as they found the cold club game. In the Closed Room, the auction went differently after West decided to describe his hand as a red or black two-suiter. 3-4-4-2 is probably not the shape he should have for this bid, but on this auction it worked very well. N/S have difficulties finding Five Clubs as they are expecting suits to break badly and 3 NT should make only eight tricks.
East led the $\vee 5$. Grue enquired about the One Spade bid and was told it was not pass or correct, but simply natur-
al. He now knew West held the red suits and probably Q10xx in hearts. The contract has a legitimate play if West holds 5-4-3-I, as declarer can afford to lose three spade tricks but not four, meaning West becomes the dangerous hand which should not be allowed into the lead. Grue took the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and played a small club. When East played small he put up the ace expecting to drop an honour. When he saw West play small, he suspected the 3-4-42 shape. If this is the case, 3NT is just one light, but Grue wasn't going to give up that easily. He quickly played a diamond from dummy and West won his 10 . If West now plays a spade the contract is one off, but West could not see what was happening and passively returned a diamond. Declarer now cashed his diamonds and finessed in hearts for nine tricks and an exciting push.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

|  | - A 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 9543$ |  |
|  | -KQ 732 |  |
|  | \& A 8 |  |
| - KQ 987 |  | - 652 |
| $\checkmark$ J 8 | N | - K 2 |
| -1084 | W E | - A 9 |
| ¢ J 42 | S | \& K 97653 |
|  | - J 104 |  |
|  | - A Q 1076 |  |
|  | - J65 |  |
|  | Q Q 10 |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Abdel Fattah | North <br> Grue | East <br> Mehilba | South <br> Kranyak |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | Pass | $1 \vee$ |
| Is | $2 \downarrow$ | $2 \varphi$ | $4 \vee$ |
| $4 \infty$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Feldman | North <br> Nabil | East <br> Donn | South <br> Hammad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1 | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Dble |
| $3 \%$ | $3 v$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ |

All Pass
Neither N/S pair had any problem finding Four Hearts. In the Closed Room E/W found their spade fit and the vulnerability seduced them into saving. Grue led $\vee Q$. Declarer didn't read the hands well and made only six tricks for 800 and 4 IMPs to USAI.
USAI won the match by 65-I7 IMPs, 25-5 VPs.

## Nice Lead

The France v Poland match in the Junior Championship has proved to be a rich source of interesting hands, and here is one more, which salvaged valuable VPs for Poland at the end of the match.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- J 42
- Q 94
- A 2
- K 10932

| - A 5 <br> - 10752 <br> - Q 65 <br> - 7654 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& K } 76 \\ & \vee 63 \\ & \text { J } 109874 \\ & \text { Q } 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| T. Bessis | Kalita | Gaviard | Kotorowicz |
| Pass | Pass | 12 | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| 4v | All Pass |  |  |

A diamond is the easy lead from the South hand but Krzysztof Kotorowicz was concerned that everything appeared to be breaking well for declarer and that most of his finesses would be working. It followed that a more dynamic approach was required, so Kotorowicz tried the effect of leading the queen of clubs.
Julian Gaviard did the best he could when he ducked the opening lead but, of course, Kotorowicz continued with a second club to the ace. Gaviard played a spade to the ace and a spade back, misguessing by putting up the queen, though that in itself was not fatal.
Kotorowicz switched to a diamond to Kalita's ace and back came a club. Gaviard could have survived by ruffing with the eight, but that required two cards onside, whereas his actual choice of ruffing with the jack just required queen doubleton in the North hand, surely more likely.
The contract was one down, all due to the attacking opening lead which put declarer under pressure. In the other room $4 \checkmark$ made after a diamond lead.

## A Helping Hand

It is nice that we help each other in this beautiful game of ours. After watching his team play against Australia in the Schools competition, the Israeli captain pointed out that one of the Australian players exposed his hand to his screen-mate far too much and should be more careful in future.
Is is a good lesson for a young player to learn.


France was just ahead of Singapore going into this match so both teams were fighting for a place in the next phase.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
-KJ62

- AJ 87
- 932
- A 9


Godefroy De TESSIERES, France

This hand was interesting because of the different bidding styles in the Open and Closed Rooms. In the Closed Room, Choon Chou.Loo was able to give partner a lead by showing his two-suiter. Poon led the 5 and Tessieres hopped up with the ace and played the 2 from dummy to his ace. Next came the $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, ducked around to Easts king. East then cashed the $k$ and played the 10 for two down.
The Open Room didn't have the critical information and started with the A lead which now gave declarer the tempo to make his contract; II IMPs to Singapore

Board 5. Dealer North.Vul.N/S.


In the Closed Room, Godefroy de Tessieres took a long time deliberating over the Seven Diamond bid and Poon also took his time to pass. The A was led and Olivier Bessis trumped in hand, drew trumps and claimed for
+2|40 to France.
The sacrifice of 74 doubled in the Open Room only cost I400, a substantial save that was worthl2 IMPs to France

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
\& Q 7632

- J 62
- J 8
\& Q J 10
© J 5
-AK743
- AKQ 3
\& 72

\& K
- Q 10985
- 1064
\& AK 98
- A 10984
$\checkmark$
- 9752

26543
Closed Room

| West <br> Poon | North <br> O.Bessis | East <br> Loo | South de Tessieres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 v$ | Pass | 2NT(i) | Pass |
| 3\%(ii) | Pass | $3 \diamond$ (iii) | Pass |
| $3 v$ (iv) | Pass | 3NT(v) | Pass |
| 4NT(vi) | Pass | 5 (vii) | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |
| (i) 4+ hearts, GF | 4+ hearts, GF |  |  |
| (ii) Slam try |  |  |  |
| (iii) Slam interest |  |  |  |
| (iv) No singleton |  |  |  |
| (v) Spade singleto |  |  |  |
| (vi) Key Card |  |  |  |
| (vii) I | key cards |  |  |



Olivier BESSIS, France

Open Room

| West <br> T.Bessis | North <br> $N g$ | East <br> Gaviard | South <br> L.Tan |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| $2 \vee$ | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass |
|  | All Pass |  |  |

In the Closed Room, after Poon opened One Heart, Loo showed his game-going hand and they followed a good auction to easily find the slam. The 2 Q was led to the king, five and two. Poon now started on trumps by playing the $\vee 5$, South discarding the four of spades, to the ace and two. Next came the $\checkmark K$ to the five and eight, South throwing a small diamond. The $\vee 3$ was led to the jack and queen, South throwing another diamond. Poon played a small diamond from dummy to his ace, then the $\bullet K, Q$ and claimed for +1460 .
The French East/West never got excited about their hands and settled in Four Hearts for 13 IMPs to Singapore.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J 10732
$\checkmark$ AJ 96
- 9
\& 872

```
. K64
v Q 1074
- JIO }8
&K}
```



- A Q 985
- 52
- 642
\& Q 105
9
-K 83
-AKQ73
\& AJ643
Closed Room

| West <br> Poon | North <br> O.Bessis | East <br> Loo | South <br> de Tessieres |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ (i) | Pass | $2 N T$ (ii) |
| Pass | 3 (iii) | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
(i) Weak, at least five-five in the majors
(ii) Relay
(iii) Minimum or semi-natural

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T.Bessis | Ng | Gaviard | L.Tan |
|  |  | Pass | 1 |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | $3 \&$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

In the Closed Room, the $\vee 4$ was led to the six, five and won in hand with the eight. Declarer led a small diamond toward the nine in dummy and West won with the ten of diamonds. West led another heart and now Tessieres had his nine tricks: four hearts, four diamonds and the ace of clubs. The Closed Room played 3NT from the North hand on the 48 lead and eventually went down two for 13 IMPs to France.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.
\& Q 8764
-A97

- Q 72
$\% 84$
- AKJ 52
$\bullet$ Q 10
- 543

2 1076

$\pm 1093$
$\checkmark 542$
-KJ 1086

- J 2
$\Phi$
- KJ 863
- A 9
\& AKQ953
Closed Room


Julien GAVIARD, France

The French pair never looked like being interested in slam. West led the \$A to the four, ten and ruffed by de Tessieres. Declarer played the ace of clubs, king of clubs, then six of hearts to the queen and the ace in dummy. Declarer called for the seven of hearts from dummy then thought for a while, finessed the jack and claimed II tricks for +450 .
In slam, Kelvin Ng received the $\$ 2$ lead to the four, three and ruffed with the $\vee 3$. He played the six of hearts to the ace and a heart back to his king, dropping West's queen of hearts. He now played the $\stackrel{\mu}{\mathrm{m}}, \mathrm{m} \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{e}$, East ruffing with the last trump, and declarer claimed 12 tricks for +980 and II IMPS to Singapore.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- 194
- 95
- 10953
* KJ92

4 K 8532

- KJ 3
-K 4
- A 107

- Q 7
- Q 8
- A Q J 86
-6543
- A 106
- A 107542
- 72
* Q 8

Closed Room

| West <br> Poon | North <br> O.Bessis | East <br> Loo | South de Tessieres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | INT | $2 \vee$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| T.Bessis | Ng | Gaviard | L.Tan |
|  |  | Pass | 2\%(i) |
| Pass | 2 | All pass |  |

(i) Multi

In the Closed Room, Poon led the $\$ 2$ to the four, queen and ace. Declarer laid down the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, all following and then led the $\vee 2$ to the jack, nine and queen. Loo returned the $\$ 7$ to his partner's king and Poon put declarer in dummy with the $\varphi$. De Tessieres played the 2 to the four, queen and ace and had to concede down two.
In the Open Room, Li Yu Tan started with a multi, Ng bid Two Hearts and all passed. Thomas Bessis started with the $\% 5$ to the queen, ace and two. West now played the $K$ and Julian Gaviard overtook with the ace and returned the $\checkmark$ Q. East switched to the $\Phi 7$ to declarer's ace and now declarer played on clubs and claimed eight tricks for another 7 IMPs to Singapore.
Singapore came out on top by 73-57 IMPs for an I8-I2 VP win.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ran | Pair |  | Team | Boards | IMPs/Board |
|  | LOO Choon Chou | POON Hua | SIN | 320 | 1.14 |
| 1 | SANGIORGIO Alberto | FERRARI Francesco | ITA | 180 | 1.04 |
| 2 | GRUE Joe | KRANYAK John | USA | 339 | 0.87 |
| 3 | CHAUVELOT Nicolas | MALARME Thibault | FRA | 140 | 0.87 |
| 4 | RINGSETH Joern Arild | BERG Erik | NOR | 237 | 0.60 |
| 5 | BARBOSA Roberto Oliveira | LA ROVERE Marcello | BRA | 140 | 0.56 |
| 6 | KOTOROWICZ Krzysztof | KALITA Jacek | POL | 280 | 0.51 |
| 7 | BESSIS Thomas | GAVIARD Julien | FRA | 300 | 0.50 |
| 8 | HAMMAD Mohamed | NABIL Karim | EGY | 239 | 0.49 |
| 9 | ARASZKIEWICZ Konrad | BURAS Krzysztof | POL | 280 | 0.43 |
| 10 | GINOSSAR EIdad | RESHEF Ophir | ISR | 317 | 0.42 |
| 11 | LO PRESTI Fabio | DI BELLO Stelio | ITA | 320 | 0.38 |
| 12 | HOFFMAN Ron | OFIR Gilad | ISR | 319 | 0.38 |
| 13 | GREENBERG Ari | LALL Justin | USA | 220 | 0.36 |
| 14 | YOUSRY Ahmed | LEWIS Michel Mounir | EGY | 237 | 0.33 |
| 15 | EIDE Petter | LIVGARD Allan | NOR | 198 | 0.27 |
| 16 | MINARIK Gabor | MARJAI Peter | HUN | 258 | 0.25 |
| 17 | KORBEL Susan | KORBEL Daniel | CAN | 300 | 0.20 |
| 18 | SBARIGIA Matteo | BOLDRINI Andrea | ITA | 180 | 0.19 |
| 19 | SHORE Noble | GILL Michael | USA | 200 | 0.15 |
| 20 | IP Yu-Cheung | MO Yee Sum | CHK | 220 | 0.14 |
| 21 | NG Chi-Cheung | LEUNG Cheuk-Hin | CHK | 240 | 0.12 |
| 22 | BRUM Jose Roberto Barros | ROSSI Eduardo | BRA | 320 | 0.12 |
| 23 | BESSIS Olivier | TESSIERES Godefroy De | FRA | 240 | 0.12 |
| 24 | RICE Jon | RICE Mike | USA | 260 | 0.10 |
| 25 | BARTH John | DEVELIN Mike | USA | 220 | 0.08 |
| 26 | ROBLES Benjamin | PACAREU Joaquin | CHL | 340 | 0.08 |
| 27 | EIDE Erik A | LINDQVIST Espen | NOR | 239 | 0.02 |
| 28 | ANDERSON Erin | HALASI Charles | CAN | 220 | -0.09 |
| 29 | NYSTROM Samantha | MASON Matthew | CAN | 160 | -0.15 |
| 30 | SZABO Csaba | HONYEK Andres | HUN | 278 | -0.25 |
| 31 | IKEMOTO Yuichi | YOKOI Hiroki | JAP | 300 | -0.28 |
| 32 | NG Kelvin | TAN LiYu | SIN | 300 | -0.33 |
| 33 | SMITH Jack | BORGONO Rodrigo | CHL | 340 | -0.39 |
| 34 | NYARADI Gabriella | NYARADI Zsolt | HUN | 140 | -0.41 |
| 35 | YIU Wai-Sing | LEUNG Chung-Man | CHK | 219 | -0.42 |
| 36 | FEILER Gabby | WILLIAMS Justin | AUS | 260 | -0.47 |
| 37 | BARBOSA Roberto Oliveira | DAVID Paula | BRA | 199 | -0.51 |
| 38 | DOECKE Mike | GRIFFITHS Nye | AUS | 200 | -0.66 |
| 39 | THOTONGKAM Chirawut | SOOKASEM Rawit | THA | 238 | -0.77 |
| 40 | TUNYASET Tanaporn | PANICHKAJANG Kasamon | THA | 240 | -0.94 |
| 41 | TUNYASET Nuttakul | ANUGOONPRASERT Prateep | THA | 178 | -1.12 |
| 42 | HADDADIN Raed | SWEIDAN Fadi | JOR | 220 | -1.21 |
| 43 | HALLASA Jawan | MALKAWI Sakher | JOR | 220 | -1.36 |

