## Reportonaruling

Team NS<br>Begijntje 1<br>N Tom Cornelis<br>S Dirk Logghe

Team EW
UAE 1
E Philippe Caputo
W Wouter van den Hove

Honour Division, round 16; November 26, 2023; l'Oree, Brussels


Board: 8 Dealer: W Vuln: -

## Bidding

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pass | 1 | $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| pass | 2 NT | pass | 3 NT |
| pass | pass | pass | $/ /$ |

$1 *$ is ambiguous ( $1 \%$ strong)
$2 \boldsymbol{A}$ is explained by North to East as transfer to 2 NT .
Correct is ( $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{W}$ ) transfer to clubs.
Table result: $3 \mathrm{NT}+2(\boldsymbol{A} \mathrm{Q})$
Other table: 3NT-1 (Ax)

## Facts, decision:

At the end of play, East called the TD and told that he probably had received wrong information about the meaning of the bidding, as it was different from what South told West. North explained $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ as transfer to 2NT as South told West it showed a club suit. The explanation by South is correct, according to the system notes.

I asked several players (two Belgian that sat out this round, two Latvian internationals and two Dutch playing in the Premier League) what they would lead in this sequence with the other explanation.
Three choose a small spade, two would lead a heart, one would lead a diamond. The three players not leading a heart were then asked what their choice would be if they would (or had to) lead a spade: one $\mathbb{A} Q$, two $\mathbb{A} \times$.

As the result of the poll clearly indicates the lead would have been different with correct explanation, but not always a small spade leading to defeat, I decided to award a weighted adjusted score, as follows:
$3 / 4$ small spade: $\quad 3 \mathrm{NT}-1$
$1 / 4$ no small spade: $3 \mathrm{NT}+2$ (or +1 )
This results in +3 imp to Begijntje 1 (instead of +11 imp )
Marc van Beijsterveldt, November 26, 2023

