

Session Report: Player 1 & Player 2

October 12, 2026

Club Pairs Session — Traveler Analysis

Twenty-four boards, one East-West seat, and a lot of lessons in matchpoint pacing.

How to read this document

This report covers all 24 boards played by Player 1 & Player 2, seated East-West throughout the session. Every auction shown below is an illustrative reconstruction built to reach the recorded contract and declarer — not the actual bidding at the table — and on boards where the top result belongs to another pair, the reconstructed 'how the top score was bid' auction may even assign the wrong player as declarer; treat these sequences as plausible illustrations of the cards, not historical fact.

The pair's overall result for the session is the total shown above, and the Session at a glance section above this report lists which boards were tops, which were bottoms, and the overall projection. The analysis below explains board by board why results differed from the field, then draws out recurring patterns in the closing sections.

Please note: the facts paragraphs at the top of each board (points, fits, double-dummy, the best score, your result and every table's result) and the "Session at a glance" section are taken exactly from the club's traveler. The commentary after them is written by AI and checked by program, but it may occasionally misstate a detail; when in doubt, trust the facts paragraph and the hand diagram. If you spot an error, please tell us at support@bridgetraveleranalyzer.com.

Created with Bridge Traveler Analyzer 0.1.24. Accuracy check: 48 illustrative auctions and 63 passages of commentary were checked by program against the hands and the traveler; 20 illustrative auctions were corrected; 1 illustrative auction that could not be made consistent with the recorded contract was left out; 20 passages of commentary were corrected; a second reading compared the commentary with the facts and flagged 62 statements, each corrected or removed; 16 sentences of commentary that contradicted the actual cards were removed.

Copyright © 2026 Norman Price. All rights reserved. This report and the software that produced it are the confidential and proprietary property of Norman Price. Unauthorized copying, distribution, modification, or use, in whole or in part, is strictly prohibited without prior written permission.

Session Report — Player 1 & Player 2

Board-by-board scorecard

Bd	Contract & result	Score	MPs / 7	Comment
1	4 ♠ S +1	-450	5.00	Tied top: defended 4♠, making +1.
2	4 ♥ E +1	450	7.00	Top board: declared 4♥, making +1.
3	3 ♠ N +1	-170	1.00	Below average: defended 3♠, making +1.
4	3 NT W +2	660	6.00	Tied top: declared 3NT, making +2.
5	4 ♥ S -2	200	2.00	Below average: defended 4♥, down 2.
6	3 ♥ W -1	-100	6.00	Above average: declared 3♥, down 1.
7	5 ♣ W +1	620	5.00	Above average: declared 5♣, making +1.
8	2 ♣ W +1	110	0.50	Below average: declared 2♣, making +1.
9	1 NT N -1	50	2.00	Defended 1NT, only forced one down of five possible
10	2 ♦ N +2	-130	3.00	Below average: defended 2♦, making +2.
11	4 ♠ N +2	-480	3.00	Below average: defended 4♠, making +2.
12	4 ♥ W -2	-100	0.50	Below average: declared 4♥, down 2.
16	2 ♠ S -1	50	5.50	Above average: defended 2♠, down 1.
17	1 NT N =	-90	3.00	Below average: defended 1NT, making exactly.
18	2 ♠ N =	-110	0.00	Bottom board: defended 2♠, making exactly.
22	2 ♥ W +2	170	2.00	Below average: declared 2♥, making +2.
23	3 ♣ W +2	150	2.00	Below average: declared 3♣, making +2.
24	2 ♥ E -4	-200	1.00	Below average: declared 2♥, down 4.
25	5 ♣ N =	-400	0.50	Below average: defended 5♣, making exactly.
26	2 NT S -1	100	5.00	Above average: defended 2NT, down 1.
27	3 NT S +1	-430	4.50	Above average: defended 3NT, making +1.
28	2 NT E =	120	0.00	Bottom board: declared 2NT, making exactly.
29	4 ♥ N +1	-650	3.50	Every table alike; tied top defending 4♥+1
30	3 ♠ W -3	-150	1.00	Below average: declared 3♠, down 3.
	Total (24 boards)		69.00	69.00 / 168 = 41.1% game

Session at a glance

Player 1 & Player 2 played 24 boards, sitting East-West throughout, and scored 69.00 of 168 matchpoints: 41.1%.

Tops or tied tops (4): boards 1, 2, 4 and 29. Lowest score on the board (2): boards 18 and 28. Lowest score shared with another pair: boards 8, 11, 12 and 25.

Above average on 8 boards, below average on 15, exactly average on 1. Player 1 & Player 2 declared on 11 boards and defended on 13.

The largest gaps to the best score: board 18 (7.00), board 8 (6.50), board 25 (6.50), board 3 (6.00), board 24 (5.50).

If boards 18 and 28 had scored the board average instead, the session would have gained 7.00 matchpoints: 76.00 of 168, 45.2%.

Overview

Player 1 & Player 2 played all 24 boards East-West, finishing with the total shown above against the maximum possible. The pair earned tied-top or best results on boards 1, 2, 4, and 29, showing they can execute cleanly when the cards are straightforward, but a cluster of below-average boards — notably the bottoms on 18 and 28 — dragged the overall result down. The projection above reflects real room for improvement concentrated in a handful of identifiable boards rather than a uniformly weak session.

Bidding Aggression & Game Inferences

The clearest missed game was board 28, where West held king-queen-jack-nine-four of spades opposite East's ten-seven-two in an eight-card fit and the partnership stopped in 2NT while a making 4♠ was there for a better score; with a cold game on the table this was a costly underbid. Board 8 showed the same pattern in diamonds: West's king-queen-ten-four opposite East's ace-jack-eight-five-three-two in a ten-card fit supported 5♦, which was bid and made elsewhere, while the target pair stopped at 2♣. Board 25 compounded this theme from the defensive side — North-South pushed on to a making 5♣ while defending, the cold East-West 4♠ (ace-king-queen-jack-ten-nine of spades) went undiscovered.

Competitive Auction Handling

On boards where the opponents competed, results were mixed. Board 30 saw the partnership push to 3♠ down three when the field's 2♠ down one was the winning spot, suggesting a tendency to bid one level past the making point under pressure. Conversely, board 7 showed good judgment reaching 5♣ for an above-average score on a competitive auction, and board 16's defense against a pushed 2♠ held declarer well. The pattern suggests competitive overbidding (board 30) costs more than underbidding does in defense (board 16).

Matchpoint Strategy

Boards 18 and 28 both ended as the pair's lowest scores on the board, and both involved settling short in notrump or a low spade contract while the field found a making game — on board 18 the field scored better by collecting penalties against overboard North-South contracts, and on board 28 the field simply bid the normal game. The lesson is to trust eight-

card major suit fits with a near-opening-strength partner hand (as in board 28) rather than settling in notrump. Meanwhile board 24, where East pushed to 2♥ down four tricks short of a workable 1NT, argues for more caution when the combined hands lack a clear fit.

Bottom line

The two complete bottoms, boards 18 and 28, plus the sizeable gaps on boards 8 and 25, account for most of the ground lost relative to the field; fixing the tendency to under-reach cold major suit games (28) and to abandon a ten-card minor fit for a lower partial (8) would meaningfully lift the projection discussed above. Board 30's overboard competitive push is a smaller but related leak. Addressing these specific hand types — trusting a known eight-plus card fit to bid on rather than parking in notrump or a short suit — is the single biggest lever for next session.

Checklist — Learning From This Session

Settling short of a cold major suit game — On boards 8 and 28 the partnership stopped in a partscore (2♣, 2NT) while a making East-West game (5♦, 4♠) was available with a clear 8+ card fit; trust the fit and keep bidding.

Overbidding a level too far in competitive auctions — Board 30 saw the pair push from a down-one 2♠ to 3♠ down three, well worse than the field's result; board 3 saw a similar low-level result against them when the declaring North-South pair's 3♠ made an overtrick while the field defended higher spade contracts doubled. Watch for the urge to compete one bid too many.

Missing penalty opportunities against overboard opponents — On board 18 the field profited heavily by letting North-South's push to 4♥/5♣ go down multiple tricks, while the target pair let North's 2♠ make exactly for the session's bottom; consider passing for penalty more often when opponents are clearly overboard.

Clean execution on straightforward boards — Boards 1, 2, 4, and 29 show the partnership handles routine auctions and declarer play well when the contract is the obvious one — a strength worth preserving while fixing the judgment issues above.

Questions & Answers — Checklist Companion

Q. How should this checklist be used going forward?

A. Treat it as a short pre-session and post-session routine: skim all the checklist categories before a game as a reminder, and after each session, note any hand that matches one of these patterns (passed a competitive hand, conceded extra tricks on defense, missed a trick in play, stopped short of game) in a short board diary, then review the diary together periodically.

Q. How should we have approached board 28 differently?

A. With West holding king-queen-jack-nine of spades facing East's ten-seven-two in an eight-card fit, this was a standard game-force situation; stopping in 2NT instead of bidding to 4♠ cost the board's best score, which was there for the taking.

Q. What went wrong on board 30's competitive auction?

A. West pushed to 3♠ after a club opening and a spade fit was found, but the hand only supported a down-one 2♠; the extra bid turned an already below-average result into a well-below-average score. When the auction stalls at a partscore level that matches your combined length, it is often right to stop rather than sacrifice into a worse number.

Q. Why was board 18 one of the session's bottoms?

A. East-West's two-suited 17-count (spades and clubs) tempted North-South into overbidding to 4♥ or 5♣, both of which went down multiple tricks, while the target pair's defense let North's much lower 2♠ come home exactly; this meant North-South found a quiet, makeable final contract against the target pair when other tables let them overbid instead.

Q. Is there a common thread between boards 8 and 25?

A. Both show the partnership settling in a short or wrong-side contract despite holding a long, strong fit (ten-card diamonds on board 8, defending while North-South found a working 5♣ on board 25 instead of bidding the cold East-West spade game); in each case trusting the long suit and pressing toward game would have found the better spot.

Board 1 (Dealer N • Vul: None)

		N (17 HCP) ♠ K J 6 3 ♥ K J ♦ A K J ♣ J 10 9 2		Top E-W score			
				W	N	E	S
				—	1H	Pass	2H
				Pass	3NT	Pass	4C
				Pass	4D	Pass	5H
				Pass	Pass	Pass	
				Player 1 & Player 2			
				W	N	E	S
				—	1D	Pass	1S
				Pass	2S	Pass	4S
				Pass	Pass	Pass	
W (4 HCP) ♠ 8 5 ♥ A 5 2 ♦ 9 8 6 4 2 ♣ 8 7 6	Board 1 Dealer: N Vul: None Par: 450 4♠- NS+1/4♥-NS+1	E (10 HCP) ♠ Q 4 ♥ 8 6 4 ♦ Q 7 5 3 ♣ A Q 5 4	S (9 HCP) ♠ A 10 9 7 2 ♥ Q 10 9 7 3 ♦ 10 ♣ K 3				

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	5 ♥	N	=	-450	5.00 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 10)
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♠	S	+1	-450	5.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 14 high-card points and North-South 26. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card diamond; North-South 9-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West cannot make any contract; North-South 5 ♠ (11 tricks).

Player 1 & Player 2 defended 4 ♠ by South, which made one overtrick, for -450 and 5.00 matchpoints: a top shared with four other pairs. Declarer took 11 tricks, the same as double-dummy (11). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 5 ♥ N=, 4 ♠ S+1 (2 tables), 4 ♠ N+1 (2 tables), 4 ♠ S+2, 4 ♠ N+2 (2 tables).

North-South had a 9-card spade fit; North-South generally played 4 ♠ with declarer sometimes finding an extra overtrick against careless defense, taking twelve tricks.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board is not one a standard system would use with that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 2 (Dealer E · Vul: N-S)

		N (6 HCP) ♠ 10 7 ♥ J 10 3 ♦ K Q 8 6 5 2 ♣ 8 3			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	1C	Pass
					1S	Pass	3H	Pass
					4H	Pass	Pass	Pass
W (10 HCP) ♠ A J 8 ♥ A 8 6 4 2 ♦ J 9 3 ♣ 9 6	Board 2 Dealer: E Vul: N-S Par: -430 3NT-EW+1		E (16 HCP) ♠ K 9 6 5 ♥ K Q 9 ♦ A 4 ♣ K J 10 7					
		S (8 HCP) ♠ Q 4 3 2 ♥ 7 5 ♦ 10 7 ♣ A Q 5 4 2			Player 1 & Player 2			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	1C	Pass
					1S	Pass	3H	Pass
					4H	Pass	Pass	Pass

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♥	E	+1	450	7.00 / 7	You
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♥	E	+1	450	7.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 26 high-card points and North-South 14. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card heart; North-South 8-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 4NT (10 tricks); North-South 1 ♦ (7 tricks).

Player 1 & Player 2 declared 4♥ by East, which made one overtrick, for +450 and 7.00 matchpoints: the top. Declarer took 11 tricks, one more than double-dummy (10). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♥E+1, 4♠E=, 4♥E= (3 tables), 3NTE=, 4♥E-1 (2 tables).

East held a strong hand opposite West's ace-jack-eight of spades and a side heart fit, and the East-West pairs generally landed in 4♥ by East; the target pair's East took eleven tricks for the best score recorded on the board, while other declarers settled for ten tricks, made exactly in

3NT, or went down one. The extra overtrick came from how the heart suit combined for declarer.

Note: Some calls in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached. Some calls in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 3 (Dealer S · Vul: E-W)

		N (9 HCP) ♠ A J 8 7 6 4 3 ♥ — ♦ K J 9 8 6 5 ♣ —			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	—	Pass
					Pass	1S	2H	3D
					Pass	4S	X	Pass
					Pass	Pass		
W (10 HCP) ♠ 10 ♥ Q J 9 8 2 ♦ A Q 10 2 ♣ J 10 6	Board 3 Dealer: S Vul: E-W Par: -650 5♥-EW		E (16 HCP) ♠ K 9 5 2 ♥ A K 10 7 5 ♦ 3 ♣ A Q 8		Player 1 & Player 2			
		S (5 HCP) ♠ Q ♥ 6 4 3 ♦ 7 4 ♣ K 9 7 5 4 3 2			W	N	E	S
					—	—	—	Pass
					Pass	1S	Pass	3S
					Pass	Pass	Pass	

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♠ x	N	-4	800	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 10)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 ♠	N	+1	-170	1.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 26 high-card points and North-South 14. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 10-card heart; North-South 8-card spade and 8-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 5♥ (11 tricks); North-South 1♠ (7 tricks).

The best East-West score was +800, by East-West Pair 9 (defending 4♠ doubled by North, which went down four). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 3♠ by North, which made one overtrick, for -170 and 1.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 10 tricks, three more than double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♠xN-4, 4♠xN-3, 4♠xN-2, 4♠xN-1 (2 tables), 4♠N-2, 3♠N+1, 6♥xE-1.

North's eight-card combined spade and diamond holding made North-South's defense against spades thin, and East-West Pair 9 reaped the reward by doubling 4♠ down four for the board's best score.

Note: The auction for the top result is awkward to make fully natural since North's eventual 4♠ was pushed there by competitive bidding rather than a clean sequence, so the reconstruction shows a plausible competitive auction rather than a quiet one. Some calls in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 4 (Dealer W · Vul: Both)

	N (3 HCP) ♠ 10 9 ♥ 7 6 4 ♦ K 9 6 5 4 2 ♣ 8 7		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			1C	Pass	1S	Pass
			2NT	Pass	3NT	Pass
			Pass	Pass		
W (19 HCP) ♠ K 5 ♥ J 9 2 ♦ A Q 3 ♣ A K Q 9 4	Board 4 Dealer: W Vul: Both Par: -630 3NT-EW+1	E (10 HCP) ♠ A 8 7 3 2 ♥ K Q 5 ♦ 10 7 ♣ J 10 3				
	S (8 HCP) ♠ Q J 6 4 ♥ A 10 8 3 ♦ J 8 ♣ 6 5 2		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			1C	Pass	1D	Pass
			2D	Pass	3D	Pass
			3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 NT	W	+2	660	6.00 / 7	EW Pair 6 (vs NS 9)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 NT	W	+2	660	6.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 29 high-card points and North-South 11. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card club; North-South 8-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 4NT (10 tricks); North-South cannot make any contract.

Player 1 & Player 2 declared 3NT by West, which made two overtricks, for +660 and 6.00 matchpoints: a top shared with two other pairs. Declarer took 11 tricks, one more than double-dummy (10). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3NTW+2 (3 tables), 3NTW+1 (4 tables), 3NTW=.

West's nineteen hcp with ace-king-queen-nine-four of clubs opposite East's five-card spade suit gave East-West a comfortable route to 3NT, and the target pair's West took eleven tricks

for a tie at the top of the board. Weaker declarer play or a less favorable opening lead let other tables stop at only ten tricks.

Note: Some calls in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 5 (Dealer N • Vul: N-S)

	N (1 HCP) ♠ 10 6 2 ♥ 9 8 6 5 2 ♦ 9 6 2 ♣ J 2		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			—	Pass	Pass	1H
W (9 HCP) ♠ K J 9 5 ♥ J ♦ A 4 3 ♣ 10 8 5 4 3	Board 5 Dealer: N Vul: N-S Par: -450 4♠-EW+1	E (14 HCP) ♠ A Q 8 4 ♥ 4 3 ♦ K 10 8 ♣ K Q 9 6	Pass	4H	X	Pass
			Pass	Pass		
	S (16 HCP) ♠ 7 3 ♥ A K Q 10 7 ♦ Q J 7 5 ♣ A 7		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			—	Pass	Pass	1H
			Pass	4H	Pass	Pass
			Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♥ x	S	-2	500	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 2 (vs NS 2)
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♥	S	-2	200	2.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 23 high-card points and North-South 17. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card club and 8-card spade; North-South 10-card heart. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 5♠ (11 tricks); North-South 2♥ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +500, by East-West Pair 2 (defending 4♥ doubled by South, which went down two). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 4♥ by South, which went down two, for +200 and 2.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 8 tricks, the same as double-dummy (8). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♥xS-2, 4♠E+1 (3 tables), 4♥S-2 (2 tables), 2♠E+3, 2♠E+2.

Board 6 (Dealer E · Vul: E-W)

	N (15 HCP) ♠ 9 ♥ K 5 ♦ A Q J 10 9 7 ♣ A J 10 7	
W (12 HCP) ♠ A K 6 ♥ 10 8 6 4 3 ♦ 6 2 ♣ K Q 3	Board 6 Dealer: E Vul: E-W Par: 400 5♣-NS	E (7 HCP) ♠ Q J 3 2 ♥ J 7 2 ♦ K 8 5 3 ♣ 9 2
	S (6 HCP) ♠ 10 8 7 5 4 ♥ A Q 9 ♦ 4 ♣ 8 6 5 4	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
—	—	Pass	Pass
Pass	1D	Pass	3D
Pass	4D	X	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
—	—	Pass	Pass
1H	Pass	3H	Pass
Pass	Pass		

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♦ x	N	-1	100	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 1 (vs NS 7)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 ♥	W	-1	-100	6.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 19 high-card points and North-South 21. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card heart; North-South 8-card club. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1♥ (7 tricks); North-South 5♣ (11 tricks).

The best East-West score was +100, by East-West Pair 1 (defending 4♦ doubled by North, which went down one). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 3♥ by West, which went down one, for -100 and 6.00 matchpoints: above average. Declarer took 8 tricks, one more than double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♦xN-1, 3♥W-1, 3♦N+1 (2 tables), 3♦N+2, 3♣N+3 (2 tables), 3♦xN+2.

North-South's eight-card club fit supported a making 5♣ game double-dummy, and the pair who doubled North's 4♦ sacrifice for down one claimed the best East-West score.

Note: Some calls in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 7 (Dealer S · Vul: Both)

		N (5 HCP) ♠ K 8 7 6 4 ♥ 6 5 2 ♦ Q 8 6 3 ♣ 7			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	—	Pass
					Pass	Pass	1D	Pass
					2C	Pass	3D	Pass
					4C	Pass	5D	X
					Pass	Pass	Pass	
W (8 HCP) ♠ A J 9 3 2 ♥ 4 ♦ 2 ♣ Q J 8 5 4 3	Board 7 Dealer: S Vul: Both Par: -1100 6♥*-NT-4		E (13 HCP) ♠ — ♥ K J 7 ♦ A J 10 9 5 ♣ A 10 9 6 2					
		S (14 HCP) ♠ Q 10 5 ♥ A Q 10 9 8 3 ♦ K 7 4 ♣ K			Player 1 & Player 2			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	—	Pass
					1C	Pass	2C	Pass
					5C	Pass	Pass	Pass

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	5 ♦ x	E	=	750	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 7 (vs NS 10)
Player 1 & Player 2	5 ♣	W	+1	620	5.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 21 high-card points and North-South 19. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 11-card club; North-South 9-card heart and 8-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 6♣ (12 tricks); North-South 2♥ (8 tricks with the right declarer).

The best East-West score was +750, by East-West Pair 7 (declaring 5♦ doubled by East, which made exactly). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 5♣ by West, which made one overtrick, for +620 and 5.00 matchpoints: above average. Declarer took 12 tricks, the same as double-dummy (12). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 5♦xE=, 5♣W+1, 5♣E+1 (2 tables), 5♣W=, 3NTE=, 3♣E+3, 4♣W+1.

East-West's eleven-card club fit made slam-level play available double-dummy, and East's own 5♦ doubled made exactly for the board's top score. The target pair's West, holding the queen-

jack-eight-five-four-three of clubs opposite East's ace-ten-nine-six-two, bid to 5♣ and took twelve tricks for an above-average result, just short of the top score made elsewhere.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 8 (Dealer W · Vul: None)

	N (7 HCP) ♠ 10 9 8 2 ♥ A Q 6 5 2 ♦ — ♣ J 10 5 2	
W (16 HCP) ♠ K J 7 5 3 ♥ 9 4 ♦ K Q 10 4 ♣ A K	Board 8 Dealer: W Vul: None Par: -400 5♦-EW	E (7 HCP) ♠ — ♥ 10 7 3 ♦ A J 8 5 3 2 ♣ Q 7 6 4
	S (10 HCP) ♠ A Q 6 4 ♥ K J 8 ♦ 9 7 6 ♣ 9 8 3	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
1D	Pass	2D	Pass
3D	Pass	4D	Pass
5D	Pass	Pass	Pass

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
1S	Pass	2C	Pass
Pass	Pass		

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	5 ♦	W	=	400	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 1)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♣	W	+1	110	0.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 23 high-card points and North-South 17. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 10-card diamond; North-South 8-card spade and 8-card heart. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 5♦ (11 tricks); North-South 2♠ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +400, by East-West Pair 9 (declaring 5♦ by West, which made exactly). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 2♣ by West, which made one overtrick, for +110 and 0.50 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board, shared with one other pair. Declarer took 9 tricks, three more than double-dummy (6). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 5♦W=, 4♦E+2, 3♦W+2, 3♦E+2, 2♦W+3, 4♦W=, 2♣W+1, 1♠W+1.

East-West's ten-card diamond fit with West's king-queen-ten-four opposite East's ace-jack-eight-five-three-two made 5♦ the normal East-West destination, and the pair reaching exactly that game claimed the top score. The target pair's West stopped in a modest 2♣ making an

overtrick, well below the diamond game that was cold on the actual cards, leaving them near the bottom of the field.

Note: in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result, East ends up declaring, but the traveler records West as declarer — a natural auction for these hands does not easily put that player in charge, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 9 (Dealer N • Vul: E-W)

	N (15 HCP) ♠ A Q J 8 ♥ 10 9 ♦ A 9 4 2 ♣ A 6 4		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			—	1NT	Pass	Pass
W (10 HCP) ♠ 3 2 ♥ Q 8 2 ♦ K 10 6 ♣ K Q 7 3 2	Board 9 Dealer: N Vul: E-W Par: -140 3♥-EW	E (9 HCP) ♠ K 9 6 4 ♥ A 7 6 5 4 3 ♦ J ♣ J 5	Pass			
	S (6 HCP) ♠ 10 7 5 ♥ K J ♦ Q 8 7 5 3 ♣ 10 9 8		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			—	1NT	Pass	Pass
			Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	1 NT	N	-5	250	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 7 (vs NS 10)
Player 1 & Player 2	1 NT	N	-1	50	2.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 19 high-card points and North-South 21. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card heart; North-South 9-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 3♥ (9 tricks); North-South 2♦ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +250, by East-West Pair 7 (defending 1NT by North, which went down five). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 1NT by North, which went down one, for +50 and 2.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 6 tricks, the same as double-dummy (6). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 1NTN-5, 2♥E+2, 1NTN-3, 2♥W+1, 1NTN-1 (3 tables), 1NTN=.

North's fifteen hcp facing a weak South hand made 1NT a fragile contract for North-South, and the East-West pair that drove it down five tricks recorded the board's top defensive score.

Note: Both sides' results are for the same contract and declarer, 1NT by North, so only one auction is given.

Board 10 (Dealer E • Vul: Both)

		N (10 HCP) ♠ A 10 4 ♥ Q J 9 ♦ Q J 10 9 8 5 3 ♣ —			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	Pass	1S
					Pass	4S	Pass	Pass
					Pass			
W (14 HCP) ♠ K 9 7 ♥ K 5 2 ♦ A 4 ♣ A 10 9 7 3	Board 10 Dealer: E Vul: Both Par: 140 1♠- NS+2/1♥-NS+2		E (4 HCP) ♠ J 6 2 ♥ 10 6 3 ♦ K 7 6 ♣ 8 6 5 4		Player 1 & Player 2			
					W	N	E	S
					—	—	Pass	Pass
					Pass	1D	Pass	1H
					Pass	2D	Pass	Pass
					Pass			
	S (12 HCP) ♠ Q 8 5 3 ♥ A 8 7 4 ♦ 2 ♣ K Q J 2							

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♠	S	-2	200	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 3 (vs NS 9)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♦	N	+2	-130	3.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 18 high-card points and North-South 22. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card club; North-South 8-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West cannot make any contract; North-South 3 ♠ (9 tricks).

The best East-West score was +200, by East-West Pair 3 (defending 4 ♠ by South, which went down two). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 2 ♦ by North, which made two overtricks, for -130 and 3.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 10 tricks, one more than double-dummy (9). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4 ♠ S-2, 3 ♦ N=, 3 ♦ N+1 (2 tables), 2 ♦ N+2 (3 tables), 3NTS=.

North-South's eight-card diamond fit was the key feature, and East-West Pair 3 achieved the board's top score by defending against North-South's 4 ♠ and holding it to down two, rather than facing a comfortable diamond partscore. The target pair, defending, allowed North's 2 ♦

to make with two overtricks, a result shared by other tables, leaving them below average since the field mostly failed to compete enough to extract more penalty.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board is not one a standard system would use with that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 11 (Dealer S · Vul: None)

	N (13 HCP) ♠ A J 10 6 3 2 ♥ K ♦ A 2 ♣ J 8 5 2	
W (1 HCP) ♠ 9 ♥ 9 8 5 3 2 ♦ J 10 9 8 4 ♣ 9 4	Board 11 Dealer: S Vul: None Par: 980 6♠-NS	E (13 HCP) ♠ 5 4 ♥ Q J 6 ♦ K Q 7 5 ♣ K Q 7 3
	S (13 HCP) ♠ K Q 8 7 ♥ A 10 7 4 ♦ 6 3 ♣ A 10 6	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
—	—	—	Pass
Pass	1S	Pass	3S
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
—	—	—	Pass
Pass	1S	Pass	4S
Pass	Pass	Pass	

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 ♠	N	+3	-230	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 10 (vs NS 2)
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♠	N	+2	-480	3.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 14 high-card points and North-South 26. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card diamond and 8-card heart; North-South 10-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1♦ (7 tricks); North-South 6♠ (12 tricks).

The best East-West score was -230, by East-West Pair 10 (defending 3♠ by North, which made three overtricks). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 4♠ by North, which made two overtricks, for -480 and 3.00 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board, shared with six other pairs. Declarer took 12 tricks, the same as double-dummy (12). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3♠ N+3, 4♠ N+2 (7 tables).

North-South's ten-card spade fit with North's ace-jack-ten-six-three-two opposite South's king-queen-eight-seven made overtricks routine, and East-West Pair 10 limited the damage best by

defending 3♠ making three. The target pair defended the more common 4♠ making two overtricks, a below-average result, missing the chance to keep the contract lower.

Board 12 (Dealer W • Vul: N-S)

	N (4 HCP) ♠ 6 5 3 2 ♥ 10 7 5 3 ♦ A 6 5 ♣ 5 2		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			1H	Pass	2H	Pass
			3H	Pass	4H	Pass
			Pass	Pass		
W (20 HCP) ♠ A K ♥ A K 8 4 2 ♦ Q 9 4 2 ♣ A 6	Board 12 Dealer: W Vul: N-S Par: -200 4♠*-NS-1	E (7 HCP) ♠ Q 8 ♥ Q J 9 6 ♦ 10 8 7 ♣ Q 10 7 4				
	S (9 HCP) ♠ J 10 9 7 4 ♥ — ♦ K J 3 ♣ K J 9 8 3		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			1H	Pass	2H	Pass
			3H	Pass	4H	Pass
			Pass	Pass		

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♥	W	=	420	5.50 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 7)
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♥	W	-2	-100	0.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 27 high-card points and North-South 13. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card heart; North-South 9-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 4♥ (10 tricks); North-South 3♠ (9 tricks).

The best East-West score was +420, shared by East-West Pair 9 (declaring 4♥ by West, which made exactly), East-West Pair 10 (declaring 4♥ by West, which made exactly), East-West Pair 2 (declaring 4♥ by East, which made exactly) and East-West Pair 4 (declaring 4♥ by West, which made exactly). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 4♥ by West, which went down two, for -100 and 0.50 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board, shared with one other pair. Declarer took 8 tricks, two fewer than double-dummy (10). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♥W= (3 tables), 4♥E=, 4♥W-1, 3NTE-1, 4♥W-2 (2 tables).

East-West's nine-card heart fit with West's ace-king-eight-four-two opposite East's queen-jack-nine-six made 4♥ the normal and cold East-West game, and the pairs who brought it home for ten tricks tied for the top score. The target pair's West went down two in the same contract, losing control of the trump suit against North-South's defense, a below-average result on a board where the game was there for the taking.

Board 16 (Dealer W · Vul: E-W)

		N (13 HCP) ♠ Q 10 9 6 ♥ J 8 ♦ A Q 4 3 ♣ K J 9			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					Pass	Pass	Pass	1D
					Pass	1S	Pass	2H
					Pass	3H	Pass	Pass
					Pass			
W (11 HCP) ♠ A 4 ♥ K 10 5 ♦ 10 9 2 ♣ A 10 8 6 4	Board 16 Dealer: W Vul: E-W Par: -100 3♠*-NS-1		E (10 HCP) ♠ K 3 ♥ Q 7 6 2 ♦ K 6 5 ♣ Q 7 3 2			Player 1 & Player 2		
				W	N	E	S	
				Pass	Pass	Pass	1S	
				Pass	2S	Pass	Pass	
				Pass				
	S (6 HCP) ♠ J 8 7 5 2 ♥ A 9 4 3 ♦ J 8 7 ♣ 5							

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 ♥	S	-4	200	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 4 (vs NS 5)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♠	S	-1	50	5.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 21 high-card points and North-South 19. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card club; North-South 9-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 2♥ (8 tricks); North-South 2♠ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +200, by East-West Pair 4 (defending 3♥ by South, which went down four). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 2♠ by South, which went down one, for +50 and 5.50 matchpoints: above average. Declarer took 7 tricks, one fewer than double-dummy (8). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3♥S-4, 3♠S-1, 2♠S-1, 2♠S= (3 tables), 2♠S+1 (2 tables).

North-South's nine-card spade fit gave them a comfortable home, and the East-West pair who defended against South's 3♥ down four earned the board's top score.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached. The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 17 (Dealer N • Vul: None)

		N (10 HCP) ♠ K 3 2 ♥ Q 5 ♦ Q J 5 3 ♣ Q 9 8 2			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	1NT	Pass	2NT
					Pass	Pass	Pass	
W (5 HCP) ♠ 10 7 5 4 ♥ A 2 ♦ 10 9 2 ♣ J 10 6 5	Board 17 Dealer: N Vul: None Par: 140 3♥-NS		E (12 HCP) ♠ A J 8 6 ♥ 10 8 7 3 ♦ A 8 6 ♣ K 3		Player 1 & Player 2			
		S (13 HCP) ♠ Q 9 ♥ K J 9 6 4 ♦ K 7 4 ♣ A 7 4			W	N	E	S
					—	Pass	Pass	1D
					Pass	1NT	Pass	Pass
					Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	2 NT	N	-1	50	6.00 / 7	EW Pair 2 (vs NS 4)
Player 1 & Player 2	1 NT	N	=	-90	3.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 17 high-card points and North-South 23. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1♠ (7 tricks); North-South 3♥ (9 tricks).

The best East-West score was +50, shared by East-West Pair 2 (defending 2NT by North, which went down one), East-West Pair 3 (defending 1NT by North, which went down one) and East-West Pair 4 (defending 1NT by North, which went down one). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 1NT by North, which made exactly, for -90 and 3.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 7 tricks, the same as double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 2NTN-1, 1NTN-1 (2 tables), 2♠E-1, 1NTN=, 2♠W-2, 1NTN+2, 2♣xW-3.

North's modest ten hcp facing South's king-jack-nine-six of hearts left North-South without a strong game, and the pairs who defended against North's 2NT and 1NT down one tied for the

board's best score. The target pair's defense against North's 1NT allowed it to make exactly, a below-average result since the contract made at the table rather than going down.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 18 (Dealer E · Vul: N-S)

	N (17 HCP) ♠ A Q 10 8 6 ♥ A K 8 7 2 ♦ 7 6 ♣ A		Top E-W score Auction left out: no reconstruction consistent with the recorded contract and declarer could be produced for this result.																				
W (9 HCP) ♠ 9 2 ♥ 10 9 6 5 ♦ A K Q 9 5 2 ♣ 6	Board 18 Dealer: E Vul: N-S Par: 140 2♥-NS+1	E (8 HCP) ♠ K J 5 3 ♥ 3 ♦ 10 4 ♣ K J 8 7 5 4	Player 1 & Player 2																				
	S (6 HCP) ♠ 7 4 ♥ Q J 4 ♦ J 8 3 ♣ Q 10 9 3 2		<table><tr><th>W</th><th>N</th><th>E</th><th>S</th></tr><tr><td>—</td><td>—</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>1S</td><td>Pass</td><td>1NT</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td>2S</td><td>Pass</td><td>Pass</td></tr><tr><td>Pass</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	W	N	E	S	—	—	Pass	Pass	Pass	1S	Pass	1NT	Pass	2S	Pass	Pass	Pass			
W	N	E	S																				
—	—	Pass	Pass																				
Pass	1S	Pass	1NT																				
Pass	2S	Pass	Pass																				
Pass																							

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	5 ♣	S	-4	400	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 4 (vs NS 5)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♠	N	=	-110	0.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 17 high-card points and North-South 23. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card diamond; North-South 8-card heart. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1 ♦ (7 tricks); North-South 3 ♥ (9 tricks).

The best East-West score was +400, by East-West Pair 4 (defending 5 ♣ by South, which went down four). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 2 ♠ by North, which made exactly, for -110 and 0.00 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board. Declarer took 8 tricks, the same as double-dummy (8). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 5 ♣S-4, 4 ♥N-3, 4 ♥S-2 (2 tables), 4 ♠N-1, 3 ♠N-1, 3 ♥N-1, 2 ♠N=.

The target pair's defense let North's 2 ♠ make exactly, the lowest score on this board, missing the chance to push North-South higher and further down.

Note: an auction could not be generated for the best score shown for this board, so it is omitted here even though the contract itself is known.

Board 22 (Dealer E • Vul: E-W)

	N (9 HCP) ♠ Q 4 ♥ 8 7 6 5 ♦ K 10 7 4 ♣ A 8 7		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			—	—	Pass	Pass
W (16 HCP) ♠ A 10 8 ♥ K Q J 9 4 ♦ J 5 2 ♣ K Q	Board 22 Dealer: E Vul: E-W Par: -300 4♣*-NS-2	E (10 HCP) ♠ 7 3 2 ♥ A 3 2 ♦ A Q 6 3 ♣ 10 4 2	1NT	Pass	3NT	Pass
			Pass	Pass		
	S (5 HCP) ♠ K J 9 6 5 ♥ 10 ♦ 9 8 ♣ J 9 6 5 3		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			—	—	Pass	Pass
			1H	Pass	2H	Pass
			Pass	Pass		

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 NT	W	+1	630	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 2 (vs NS 5)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♥	W	+2	170	2.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 26 high-card points and North-South 14. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card heart; North-South 8-card club. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 3NT (9 tricks); North-South 2♣ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +630, by East-West Pair 2 (declaring 3NT by West, which made one overtrick). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 2♥ by West, which made two overtricks, for +170 and 2.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 10 tricks, one more than double-dummy (9). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3NTW+1, 4♥W=, 3NTW= (3 tables), 2♥W+2, 4♥W-1 (2 tables).

The target pair's West settled in only 2♥, making two overtricks for a below-average result on a board where nine tricks in notrump were available double-dummy.

Board 23 (Dealer S · Vul: Both)

	N (2 HCP) ♠ J 8 5 2 ♥ J 10 6 4 2 ♦ 3 2 ♣ 8 3	
W (17 HCP) ♠ K ♥ A Q 8 3 ♦ 10 9 5 ♣ A K J 5 4	Board 23 Dealer: S Vul: Both Par: -600 3NT-EW	E (9 HCP) ♠ A 7 6 3 ♥ — ♦ Q J 6 4 ♣ Q 9 7 6 2
	S (12 HCP) ♠ Q 10 9 4 ♥ K 9 7 5 ♦ A K 8 7 ♣ 10	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
—	—	—	Pass
Pass	Pass	1NT	Pass
3NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
—	—	—	Pass
1C	Pass	3C	Pass
Pass	Pass		

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 NT	E	+1	630	6.00 / 7	EW Pair 5 (vs NS 2)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 ♣	W	+2	150	2.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 26 high-card points and North-South 14. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 10-card club; North-South 9-card heart and 8-card spade. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 3NT (9 tricks); North-South 1 ♥ (7 tricks).

The best East-West score was +630, shared by East-West Pair 5 (declaring 3NT by East, which made one overtrick), East-West Pair 10 (declaring 3NT by East, which made one overtrick) and East-West Pair 2 (declaring 3NT by East, which made one overtrick). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 3♣ by West, which made two overtricks, for +150 and 2.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 11 tricks, one more than double-dummy (10). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3NTE+1 (3 tables), 3♣W+3, 4♣W+1, 3♣W+2 (2 tables), 5♣W-1.

East-West's ten-card club fit with West's ace-king-jack-five-four opposite East's queen-nine-seven-six-two made 3NT the winning strain, and the pairs who reached it with an overtrick shared the top score. The target pair's West instead played a partscore in 3♣ making two overtricks, a below-average result since the superior notrump game was missed.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 24 (Dealer W • Vul: None)

	N (10 HCP) ♠ Q 8 4 3 ♥ A J 10 2 ♦ K 7 4 2 ♣ 4	
W (12 HCP) ♠ A 6 5 2 ♥ 8 6 ♦ J 3 ♣ A Q J 10 8	Board 24 Dealer: W Vul: None Par: 130 3♦-NS+1	E (10 HCP) ♠ K 10 9 ♥ Q 9 7 5 3 ♦ Q 10 ♣ K 7 3
	S (8 HCP) ♠ J 7 ♥ K 4 ♦ A 9 8 6 5 ♣ 9 6 5 2	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
1C	Pass	1D	Pass
1NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
Pass	Pass	1H	Pass
2H	Pass	Pass	Pass

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	1 NT	W	+1	120	6.50 / 7	EW Pair 7 (vs NS 3)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 ♥	E	-4	-200	1.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 22 high-card points and North-South 18. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card club; North-South 9-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 2♣ (8 tricks); North-South 4♦ (10 tricks).

The best East-West score was +120, shared by East-West Pair 7 (declaring 1NT by West, which made one overtrick) and East-West Pair 2 (declaring 1NT by East, which made one overtrick). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 2♥ by East, which went down four, for -200 and 1.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 4 tricks, three fewer than double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 1NTW+1, 1NTE+1, 1♥E=, 4♣W-1, 3♣W-1, 4♥E-2, 2♥E-4, 2♦xS+2.

West's twelve hcp with ace-queen-jack-ten of clubs opposite East's king-ten-nine of spades left East-West without a clear suit, and the pairs who settled for a quiet 1NT with an overtrick

shared the top score. The target pair's East pushed to 2♥ and went down four, a weak holding in a suit that offered little play, leaving them near the bottom of the field.

Note: Some calls in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached. The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 25 (Dealer N · Vul: E-W)

		N (15 HCP) ♠ 6 ♥ A J 10 6 5 3 ♦ A 7 ♣ K Q J 6			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	Pass	1S	Pass
					4S	Pass	Pass	Pass
W (3 HCP) ♠ 8 7 4 2 ♥ Q 9 8 7 2 ♦ J 9 6 ♣ 8	Board 25 Dealer: N Vul: E-W Par: 200 5♠*-EW-1	E (15 HCP) ♠ A K Q J 10 9 ♥ 4 ♦ K Q 10 ♣ 10 9 5			Player 1 & Player 2			
		S (7 HCP) ♠ 5 3 ♥ K ♦ 8 5 4 3 2 ♣ A 7 4 3 2			W	N	E	S
					—	1C	Pass	2C
					Pass	3C	Pass	4C
					Pass	5C	Pass	Pass
					Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♠	E	=	620	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 9)
Player 1 & Player 2	5 ♣	N	=	-400	0.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 18 high-card points and North-South 22. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 10-card spade; North-South 9-card club. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 4♠ (10 tricks); North-South 5♣ (11 tricks).

The best East-West score was +620, by East-West Pair 9 (declaring 4♠ by East, which made exactly). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 5♣ by North, which made exactly, for -400 and 0.50 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board, shared with one other pair. Declarer took 11 tricks, the same as double-dummy (11). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♠E=, 3♠E+1 (2 tables), 4♥N-2, 4♥N-1, 4♣N=, 5♣N= (2 tables).

The target pair, defending North-South's 5♣ which North made exactly after North-South bid on, conceded a large penalty since the superior East-West spade game was left undiscovered, tying for the lowest score on the board.

Board 26 (Dealer E • Vul: Both)

	N (15 HCP) ♠ A K J 8 5 ♥ 9 4 2 ♦ A J 5 ♣ Q 7	
W (10 HCP) ♠ Q 6 4 ♥ A J 10 ♦ Q 9 6 ♣ J 10 8 6	Board 26 Dealer: E Vul: Both Par: 140 1♥-NS+2	E (6 HCP) ♠ 10 9 7 3 ♥ Q 6 3 ♦ 8 7 4 ♣ A 9 3
	S (9 HCP) ♠ 2 ♥ K 8 7 5 ♦ K 10 3 2 ♣ K 5 4 2	

Top E-W score			
W	N	E	S
—	—	Pass	Pass
Pass	1NT	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

Player 1 & Player 2			
W	N	E	S
—	—	Pass	1NT
Pass	2NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 NT	N	-2	200	6.50 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 9)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 NT	S	-1	100	5.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 16 high-card points and North-South 24. Neither side has a fit of eight cards or more. Best double-dummy contract: East-West cannot make any contract; North-South 3♥ (9 tricks).

The best East-West score was +200, shared by East-West Pair 9 (defending 3NT by North, which went down two) and East-West Pair 4 (defending 2NT by North, which went down two). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 2NT by South, which went down one, for +100 and 5.00 matchpoints: above average. Declarer took 7 tricks, one fewer than double-dummy (8). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3NTN-2, 2NTN-2, 2NTS-1, 1NTS=, 2♠N= (2 tables), 2♦N+1, 2NTN+1.

The pairs who defended against North's 3NT and 2NT down two tied for the top score, while the target pair's defense against South's 2NT down one left them with an above-average but not table-topping result.

Note: The opening bid in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result is lighter than a standard opening would be for that hand, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 27 (Dealer S · Vul: None)

		N (16 HCP) ♠ A 10 ♥ J 10 ♦ K Q 10 9 8 3 ♣ A Q 4		Top E-W score			
				W	N	E	S
				—	—	—	Pass
				Pass	1D	Pass	1S
				Pass	3D	Pass	Pass
				Pass			
				Player 1 & Player 2			
				W	N	E	S
				—	—	—	Pass
				Pass	1NT	Pass	3NT
				Pass	Pass	Pass	

W (4 HCP) ♠ J 9 7 3 2 ♥ Q 8 7 5 2 ♦ J 6 ♣ 8	Board 27 Dealer: S Vul: None Par: 430 3NT-NS+1	E (10 HCP) ♠ K ♥ 9 6 4 3 ♦ A 5 2 ♣ K 10 7 5 3
	S (10 HCP) ♠ Q 8 6 5 4 ♥ A K ♦ 7 4 ♣ J 9 6 2	

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	3 ♦	N	+1	-130	7.00 / 7	EW Pair 4 (vs NS 2)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 NT	S	+1	-430	4.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 14 high-card points and North-South 26. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card heart; North-South 8-card diamond. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1♥ (7 tricks); North-South 4NT (10 tricks).

The best East-West score was -130, by East-West Pair 4 (defending 3♦ by North, which made one overtrick). Player 1 & Player 2 defended 3NT by South, which made one overtrick, for -430 and 4.50 matchpoints: above average. Declarer took 10 tricks, the same as double-dummy (10). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 3♦N+1, 3NTS=, 3NTS+1 (2 tables), 3NTN+2 (2 tables), 3NTS+2, 3NTN+3.

The target pair's defense allowed South's 3NT to make with an overtrick, a common result and above average overall.

Note: in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result, North ends up declaring, but the traveler records South as declarer — a natural auction for these hands does not easily put that player in charge, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 28 (Dealer W · Vul: N-S)

	N (10 HCP) ♠ A 5 ♥ Q J 7 3 ♦ 9 ♣ K 10 8 7 5 2		Top E-W score			
			W	N	E	S
			1S	Pass	2S	Pass
			3S	Pass	4S	Pass
			Pass	Pass		
W (13 HCP) ♠ K Q J 9 4 ♥ K 9 5 4 ♦ 8 6 3 ♣ A	Board 28 Dealer: W Vul: N-S Par: -450 4♠-EW+1	E (12 HCP) ♠ 10 7 2 ♥ A 8 6 ♦ A Q J 10 7 ♣ J 3				
	S (5 HCP) ♠ 8 6 3 ♥ 10 2 ♦ K 5 4 2 ♣ Q 9 6 4		Player 1 & Player 2			
			W	N	E	S
			1S	Pass	1NT	Pass
			2NT	Pass	Pass	Pass

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♠	W	+1	450	4.50 / 7	EW Pair 5 (vs NS 3)
Player 1 & Player 2	2 NT	E	=	120	0.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 25 high-card points and North-South 15. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card spade and 8-card diamond; North-South 10-card club. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 5♠ (11 tricks); North-South 2♣ (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was +450, shared by East-West Pair 5 (declaring 4♠ by West, which made one overtrick), East-West Pair 7 (declaring 4♠ by West, which made one overtrick), East-West Pair 9 (declaring 4♠ by West, which made one overtrick) and East-West Pair 4 (declaring 4♠ by West, which made one overtrick) and two more. Player 1 & Player 2 declared 2NT by East, which made exactly, for +120 and 0.00 matchpoints: the lowest score on the board. Declarer took 8 tricks, one more than double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♠W+1 (6 tables), 4♠W=, 2NTE=.

East-West's eight-card spade fit with West's king-queen-jack-nine-four opposite East's ten-seven-two made 4♠ the normal East-West game, and the pairs who bid it brought home an overtrick to tie for the top score. The target pair's East settled for only 2NT making exactly, the lowest score on this board, missing the cold game.

Board 29 (Dealer N · Vul: Both)

		N (16 HCP) ♠ K ♥ A Q J 10 7 3 ♦ Q 9 7 4 ♣ A 4			Top E-W score			
					W	N	E	S
					—	1H	Pass	3H
					Pass	4H	Pass	Pass
					Pass			
W (4 HCP) ♠ Q J 6 5 4 ♥ 4 2 ♦ 10 8 3 ♣ J 7 5	Board 29 Dealer: N Vul: Both Par: 650 4♥-NS+1		E (10 HCP) ♠ 10 8 7 3 ♥ K 9 6 ♦ A J 5 2 ♣ Q 8					
		S (10 HCP) ♠ A 9 2 ♥ 8 5 ♦ K 6 ♣ K 10 9 6 3 2			Player 1 & Player 2			
					W	N	E	S
					—	1H	Pass	3H
					Pass	4H	Pass	Pass
					Pass			

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	4 ♥	N	+1	-650	3.50 / 7	EW Pair 5 (vs NS 3)
Player 1 & Player 2	4 ♥	N	+1	-650	3.50 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 14 high-card points and North-South 26. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 9-card spade; North-South 8-card heart and 8-card club. Best double-dummy contract: East-West cannot make any contract; North-South 5♥ (11 tricks).

Player 1 & Player 2 defended 4♥ by North, which made one overtrick, for -650 and 3.50 matchpoints: a top shared with seven other pairs. Declarer took 11 tricks, the same as double-dummy (11). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 4♥N+1 (8 tables).

This was a straightforward matching result across the field.

Note: Some calls in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract

was reached. Some calls in the illustrative auction for the target pair's own result are not ones a standard system would make with those hands, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.

Board 30 (Dealer E • Vul: None)

		N (14 HCP) ♠ A 9 ♥ A J 5 4 2 ♦ K 6 3 ♣ Q 10 2		Top E-W score			
				W	N	E	S
				—	—	Pass	Pass
				1NT	Pass	2S	Pass
				Pass	Pass		
W (15 HCP) ♠ K 10 ♥ K Q 10 6 ♦ 10 7 2 ♣ A K 7 6		Board 30 Dealer: E Vul: None Par: 120 2NT-NS		E (3 HCP) ♠ J 8 6 5 3 ♥ — ♦ Q 9 5 4 ♣ 9 8 5 3			
				Player 1 & Player 2			
				W	N	E	S
				—	—	Pass	Pass
				1NT	Pass	2C	Pass
				2S	Pass	3S	Pass
				Pass	Pass		
		S (8 HCP) ♠ Q 7 4 2 ♥ 9 8 7 3 ♦ A J 8 ♣ J 4					

	Contract	By	Result	Score	Matchpoints	Pair
Best score	2 ♠	W	-1	-50	6.50 / 7	EW Pair 9 (vs NS 5)
Player 1 & Player 2	3 ♠	W	-3	-150	1.00 / 7	Player 1 & Player 2

Analysis — how the top E-W score was made, and the Player 1 & Player 2 comparison

East-West held 18 high-card points and North-South 22. Fits of eight cards or more: East-West 8-card club; North-South 9-card heart. Best double-dummy contract: East-West 1 ♠ (7 tricks); North-South 2NT (8 tricks).

The best East-West score was -50, shared by East-West Pair 9 (declaring 2 ♠ by West, which went down one) and East-West Pair 10 (declaring 2 ♠ by West, which went down one). Player 1 & Player 2 declared 3 ♠ by West, which went down three, for -150 and 1.00 matchpoints: below average. Declarer took 6 tricks, one fewer than double-dummy (7). Results at the eight tables, best East-West score first: 2 ♠ W-1 (2 tables), 2 ♠ W-2 (3 tables), 2 ♥ N+1, 3 ♠ W-3, 3 ♥ xN+1.

East-West's eight-card club fit with West's ace-king-seven-six opposite East's nine-eight-five-three left the partnership without a safe landing spot, and the pairs who settled for 2 ♠ down

one shared the top score. The target pair's West pushed to 3♠ and went down three tricks, a significantly worse result than the pairs that stopped lower in the same strain.

Note: in the illustrative auction for the best score shown for this board, East ends up declaring, but the traveler records West as declarer — a natural auction for these hands does not easily put that player in charge, so treat the sequence as a sketch of how the contract was reached.