

## Editorial

March has been a fairly quiet month at our club. Table numbers are generally good, except for the Thursday session. More players for Thursdays, please.

The NSW Bridge Federation (NSWBA) has, up until now, had two roles: as the coordinating body for bridge in this State, and as a bridge club at the premises in Goulburn St., Sydney. At a recent AGM (28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Feb.) it was decided to separate these functions. The new peak body will be known as Bridge NSW (BNSW) and will continue the coordinating functions of the former NSWBA, including running of state events. The former NSWBA will be renamed as the Sydney Bridge Club, and will function as a regular bridge club, holding regular sessions at the Goulburn St. venue.

## Easter



| BRISBANE WATER BRIDGE CLUB INC |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| NAME | RANK | TOTAL |
| Caust, Pauline | Life | 301.37 |
| Mackey, Peter | Regional | 50.46 |
| Duke, Meryl | Silver Local | 35.09 |
| Anderson, Kerry | Club | 5.54 |
| Creasey, Annie | Graduate | 2.29 |

## Player Promotions

Last month 5 of our members moved up the bridge ranking scale. Congratulations players. Well done. May all your finesses come off.

## Awesome

From the Directors Chair - by Austraiian Director Matthew McManus
Just because you think it is boiling hot, it doesn't mean everyone else does. Please remember!

## Club Special Events

## - Autumn Pairs (12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March)

17 duos signed up for this event.

| $1^{\text {st }}$ | Barry Foster and Sylvia Foster | $61.33 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ | Judy Wulff and David Adams | $60.00 \%$ |

- Teams of 3 (20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ March)

This is always a fun event for both newer and more experienced players. This year 8 teams competed, with the Foster B team the winners and the Hasemore team a close second.

$1^{\text {st }} \quad$ Elaine Hume, Kathy Ivits, Alma Van Der Walt and Barry Foster<br>$2^{\text {nd }} \quad$ Carolyn Harper, Merilyn Read, Anne Birt and Chris Hasemore

## Away Special Events

- Central Coast Bridge Club Super Congress (23 ${ }^{\text {rd }} \& 24^{\text {th }}$ March)

Pairs and Teams events were held at The Entrance Diggers Club, directed by Alan Bustany. 60 pairs competed, 24 in the Open Division and 36 in Restricted/Novice. The best result by BWBC members was 6th by Christine Hadaway and Chris Hannan in the Open section. The best was left until Sunday, where 24 teams entered. The Mitchell team (Wendy Mitchell, Henrietta Hohnen, Christine Hadaway and Chris Hannan) WON the Teams event. A great result! Our other players finished down the field.

## From the Library

Last month I reviewed the first of a series of books by Derrick Browne. The book, ‘Beginners Play’, specifically targeted newbies. If you've been playing for around 6 months... go for it!

This month I'm reviewing Derrick's $2^{\text {nd }}$ book; 'Improvers Play'. If you've been playing for 18+ months and you and your partner have a clear understanding of your system then this book is for you. There are 8 chapters each of which tackles a bridge skill. Quality players will have all of these in their armoury. Each chapter is stand alone so there's no need to read the whole book before working on a particular concept. Usually, a topic is
 presented before a quiz is given to test your understanding. Some chapters are...

Ruffing Losers, Discarding Losers, Signals, Discards, Hold Up Play and more.
Check the club library for this book and many others. Our club librarian Karen Ody will be pleased to offer any advice and help.

## From the Internet

This month live found 2 resources for our members.
Firstly, How to play the Card Game Bridge. This resource is a series of very basic bridge lessons. Each tutorial runs for a minute or so and targets the newest players.

Secondly, there's nothing like a quick tip. Karen Walker has put together a quick tip guide. Of course, there are way too many for you to take in in one go. But remember, it's a web resource and any time you feel like a tip it's there waiting for you. Click here for Quick Tips for Improving Your Bridge Game.

## Mysteries of Matchpoints by Jan

Most regular pairs sessions at bridge clubs are scored by 'Matchpoints'. Do beginners ever get taught about how Matchpoint scoring works and what implications this has for bidding decisions? I doubt it, as learning to bid and play has a much greater claim on time. Yet, it is worth knowing something about this.

## Continued at the end of this newsletter...

## Coming Attractions

- Easter Pairs - Red Points - 12:30 start
- April Point Score - Tuesdays - 12:30 start
- Long Jetty Country Teams - Wednesday, $3^{\text {rd }}$ April - 9:30 start.
- Club C'ship for Mixed Pairs - Saturday, $13^{\text {th }}$ April, $1^{\text {st }}$ Session $-12: 30$ start.
- Saturday, $20^{\text {th }}$ April, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Session $-12: 30$ start.
-Club C'ship for Novice Teams - Wednesday, $17^{\text {th }}$ April, $1^{\text {st }}$ Session $-12: 30$ start.
-Wednesday, $24^{\text {th }}$ April, $2^{\text {nd }}$ Session $-12: 30$ start.
- ANZAC Day Pairs - Thursday, $25^{\text {th }}$ April $-12: 30$ start.
$\checkmark$ Interclub Teams - Monday, 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ April - @BWBC - 9:30 start.

Stay safe out there - Cheers Barry and Jan

## Mysteries of Matchpoints - Continued by Jaan

To illustrate how this works, consider a hypothetical game with, say, 8 tables, and consider a possible set of results on some particular board. Let us assume that neither side is vulnerable, and that $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ find a good fit in spades. A table of results might look like this

| Table no. | Contract | Result | Score |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Matchp'ts | Percentage(NS) |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 4S by North | +1 | +450 | 14 | $100 \%$ |
| 2 | 4S by North | $=$ | +420 | 9 | $64 \%$ |
| 3 | 3NT by South | +1 | +430 | 12 | $86 \%$ |
| 4 | 3S by North | +1 | +170 | 3 | $21 \%$ |
| 5 | 4S by North | -1 | -50 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| 6 | 4C by East | -2 | +300 | 6 | $43 \%$ |
| 7 | 4S by South | $=$ | +420 | 9 | $64 \%$ |
| 8 | 2S by North | +2 | +170 | 3 | $21 \%$ |

The first point to make is that your matchpoint score on a board is not determined by your actual score, but by how your score compares with other pairs sitting in the same direction. You score 2 points for every pair you beat and 1 point for every pair you equal. Thus, in a very real sense, your opponents are not the other pair at your table but the pairs in your direction at all the other tables.

Referring to the above table, pair 1 made 4 spades with an overtrick, and outscored all the other $7 \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{S}$ pairs, thus getting a matchpoint score of $7 \times 2=$ 1 , which is the maximum available. Pairs 2 and 7 made 4 spades exactly, and outscored pairs $4,5,6,8$ thus gaining $4 \times 2+1=9$ matchpoints, and so on. These are usually converted to percentages.

A number of things can be noted
(1) If pair 1 had bid and made a grand slam in spades, their matchpoint score would not change - 'a top is a top'. Likewise, if pair 5 had been doubled and ended up with - 1100 rather than -50 , they would still get zero matchpoints - 'a bottom is a bottom'.
(2) Overtricks are like gold. Compare the score of pair 1 with pairs $2 \& 7$. The overtrick gains an extra $36 \%$.
(3) Matchpoint scoring favours NT contracts, provided you make the same number of tricks. Pair 3 gains $22 \%$ over pairs $2 \& 7$ by making 10 tricks in 3NT.
(4) Competitive bidding can gain matchpoints. At table 6 the E/W pair were allowed to play in 4 clubs doubled, going 2 off, for +300 to N/S. However the E/W pair get $57 \%$ for this, while the E/W at table 3 , who allowed N/S to play in 3NT, only get a paltry $14 \%$.

It is clear that Matchpoint scoring can be grossly unfair. Even if you bid and play your hand perfectly, if defenders at other tables allow their opponents to make undeserved overtricks or make wild sacrifices and go for big penalties, your score will suffer in ways which you have absolutely no control over. It should even out in the long run. But how long is the 'long run'? This also explains the apparently strange effect that your score, as seen on the computer, can change, even after you have finished playing, as long as at least one board is still in play somewhere in the room.

There are two well known strategies in Matchpoint play.

1. In a non-contested auction it does not pay to try for marginal games or slams. Here is an example. Let's suppose your pair is faced with a decision whether to play in a safe 3-spade contract, or to try for game. Suppose there are 8 tables and the results are

- 2 pairs bid and make 4 spades (score $+420,+620$ )
- 2 pairs stop in 3 spades and make 10 tricks (score +170 )
- 2 pairs stop in 3 spades and make only 9 tricks (score +140 )
- 2 pairs bid 3 spades and make only 9 tricks (score -50, -100)

The brave, or lucky, pairs score $13 / 14$ or $93 \%$. The cautious, or timid, pairs who make 10 tricks in 3 -spades score $9 / 14$ or $64 \%$. Those who tried for game but failed score $1 / 14$, or $7 \%$. Of course, if 4 -spades looks a good bet and most pairs are likely to bid it, you should go with the field.
2. In contested auctions the opposite is true. You should try to push the opponents as high as you dare. If you are allowed to play your contract and go for -50 or -100 you will beat almost any part score that your opponents might have made. If you are vulnerable, however,
caution is needed since a score of -200 (2 off undoubled) will be a disaster on most hands.


