

Key to Abbreviations

MI: misinformation
UI: unauthorised information
TD: tournament director
LA: logical alternative

Other bridgetalk forums

Polling Booth
 The Bridge Table
 Bridge Issues
 Ask an Expert
 Information

[Click here for Code Guide](#)
[Click here for Emoticon Key](#)

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspace](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

bridgetalk.com forums :: Laws & Rulings

International Bridge Laws Forum

If you need help with the Laws or rulings from
 any country in the world, this is the place!

Hosted by David Stevenson
 Senior Consultant Director
 English Bridge Union


**To ask a question, click [HERE](#) and type in your message.
 Please specify your **country** in your query where indicated.
 Right click your mouse button for help on abbreviations.**




Welcome, [Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

Pages: [[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) **[13](#)**]

[Mark Forum Read](#)

[[New Discussion](#)]

	Subject	Replies	Views	Last Post T U
	IMP scoring	1	313	bluejak 21:34:00 Sun Jun 9 2002

	ruling scoring	1	148	bluejak 21:30:11 Sun Jun 9 2002
	Unauthorized Information	5	265	bluejak 14:59:00 Fri Jun 7 2002
	Welcome	0	179	bluejak 17:50:13 Thu Jun 6 2002

[New Discussion](#)

[Get Email Advice of New Discussions in This Forum](#)

Pages: [[1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [4](#) [5](#) [6](#) [7](#) [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) **[13](#)**]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: **texian13**.

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 09:19:07 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ↑

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend ::  **Read Topic** ::  **Unread Topic**



Help | **Full Format: ON :: OFF** | **Text: ON :: OFF** | **Email Status**

tom_cornelis

offline

2 posts

bridgetalk member



[Reply](#)

IMP scoring (22:38:16 FriJun 7 2002)

hi all,

although i'm not a td, i'm very interested in bridge laws, particularly in the organisational part (scoring, movements).

i came across a discussion about imp scoring.

it was about the datum score with a butler calculation.

cross-imps was mentioned too, but no other reason than a gut feeling was given why this should be preferred.

i experimented with some results on a board and this is my conclusion: the total of imps scored in ns can be different from the total of imps scored in ew if you use a datum score to compare to (whatever datum score you use); in fact the totals are each others opposites.

to me this seems a very good reason why cross-imps should be preferred, as the total number of imps is 0 (zero) for ns as well as ew.

it cannot be acceptable that the method of scoring has influence on the results, because lucky or unlucky pairs can end higher or lower in the ranking regardless their result on a specific board was bad or good. bad results should lead to lower places, and good ones to higher places.

that's why i propose that this matter should be taken in consideration when the laws of 2007 are going to be decided, and that they include that cross-imps are obligatory.

best regards,

tom cornelis.

bluejak

offline

435 posts

Forum Host

[Reply](#)

Re: IMP scoring (21:34:00 SunJun 9 2002)

I am not sure really what is the great advantage of scores adding up to exactly zero, and I doubt that what you say is correct anyway. Using either Butler or cross-imps they will not be far of zero in total.

There are advantages in Butler especially for less important events and there seems no reason to put something in the Laws to make an accepted and reasonably fair method illegal.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: **texian13**.

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 09:20:24 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2

© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)

Legend ::  **Read Topic** ::  **Unread Topic**



Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

tom_cornelis

offline

2 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

ruling scoring (23:23:29 FriJun 7 2002)

hi all,

on the matter of scoring i would like to propose the following in case a ruling breaks a result in pieces

example 1: (result broken down)

ns score -50 in 40% of the cases

ns score +110 in 60% of the cases

this means that the frequency of -50 will increase with 0.4

and the frequency of +110 will increase with 0.6

example 2: (split score)

ns score -50 in 100% of the cases

ew score +110 (ns score) in 100% of the cases

here herman de wael advocates the method of counting these scores for 0.5 frequency each, what makes sense, because that's their real frequency. when calculated,

ns should receive only the points for -50 and ew for +110, as if the frequency is 1 (100%) for them, which is the point of a split score.

example 3: (result broken down and split)

ns score -50 in 40% of the cases

ns score +110 in 60% of the cases

ew score -50 in 20% of the cases

ew score 0 in 30% of the cases

ew score +110 in 50% of the cases

although this is very unlikely to occur, it is not impossible.

in fact the possibility to calculate such a result may lead to frequent use of this type of ruling.

the point i am trying to make is that each ns score should add half of its frequency, as the ew scores should do as well.

a simple way of calculate all the rulings is then to weigh to scores:

in example 3:

line ns ew score weightns weightew

x xx yy -50 2 2

x+1 xx yy 0 0 3

x+2 xx yy +110 3 5

added frequency for -50: $0.5 * 2/5 + 0.5 * 2/10 = 0.3$

added frequency for 0: $0.5 * 0 + 0.5 * 3/10 = 0.15$

added frequency for +110: $0.5 * 3/5 + 0.5 * 5/10 = 0.55$

total added frequency: 1 (to be expected)

each score should then be awarded a number of points according their frequency.

each pair should then be awarded a number of points according the weight of their scores.

this method should be used in any form of calculation:

matchpoints, imps, total points.

e.g. matchpoints in example 3:

-50: 7.7 points for ns

0: 10 points for ns

+110: 20.3 points for ns

score ns: $2/5 * 7.7 + 3/5 * 20.3 = 15.26$

score ew: $2/10 * 7.7 + 3/10 * 10.0 + 5/10 * 20.3 = 14.69$ (ns points!)

also by calculating according the frequency, it's easier to neubergize. the method of comparing all results in ns, and in ew after that should be made obsolete. it is only debatable if on a certain table ns and ew have different scores. in that case, each score should be accounted for. what i mean is that if on a certain board, ns recieves score A and ew score B, all ns pairs should be compared to score B (and A) and all ew pairs to score A (and B), simply because these scores occurred. a more intuitive reason would be that it seems wrong that a certain table will receive more or less points on that board than another, only because of the ruling at some table.

best regards,

tom cornelis.

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: ruling scoring (21:30:11 SunJun 9 2002)

It looks very interesting, Tom, but I regret I do not understand what you are trying to say. 🙄

Apparently you have some worries about weighted scores [not split]. But when you say

>a more intuitive reason would be that it seems wrong that a
>certain table will receive more or less points on that board >than
another, only because of the ruling at some table.

I agree but surely this does not happen?

There are times when a split ruling is given [not a weghted one] which is an unbalanced one. This is rare, and does nto seem to be the cae about which you are talking.

To make it clear, if a TD gives both sides a rluing such as
30% of NS+680
+ 70% of NS-100
that is called a weighted ruling.

If a TD gives N/S NS +680, and gives E/W NS +1430, which can happen for a couple of reasons, that is called a split ruling.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 09:20:44 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

[top](#) ↑

[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)

Legend ::  **Read Topic** ::  **Unread Topic**



Help | **Full Format:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Text:** **ON** :: **OFF** | **Email Status**

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Unauthorized Information (19:46:03 ThuJun 6 2002)

Date: 06/6/02 09:29:58 AM
Name: Mathias Maurer
Email: mathias.maurer@t-online.de

Hello,
Team (IMPS) no side vulnerable

The undisturbed auction went:
N S
1D - 2C
3NT - 5C (after admitted hesitation and the remark:
"We are playing team")
6C - P

Result: 6C=

The hands:
North: Axxx; Kxxx; AKQx; K
South: x ; Qx ; xxx ; AQJxxxx

One remark:
The 3NT bid by North is showing only 15-16 HCP
A 2NT rebid was showing 17-18 HCP
The partnership doesn't have an agreement on strong
3-suiter

The TD adjusted the score to "5C+1"
North has used an UI and "pass" was a logical
alternative.

Your ruling please. Thank you.

[Edited By bluejak at 10:11:48 Fri Oct 4 2002]

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorized Information [copied from Bravenet site] (19:47:48 ThuJun 6 2002)

Date: 06/6/02 04:01:40 PM
Name: Ed Reppert
Email: ereppert@rochester.rr.com

TD left out an element in his ruling. UI present? Check. LAs to the action taken present? Check. Opponents damaged? Check. But... Did the UI "demonstrably suggest" that 6C would give a better result than pass? I dunno. On the bidding, there are an awful lot of unbalanced hands with long clubs on which East might be unsure whether to bid 5C or pass 3NT. My experience in these kinds of judgement call isn't good enough to be sure. I'm tempted to agree with the TD ruling, feeling that perhaps 6C **is** "demonstrably suggested", but I have this nagging feeling I could be wrong about that. 🌈

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorized Information [copied from Bravenet site] (19:49:31 ThuJun 6 2002)

Date: 06/6/02 06:28:17 PM
Name: David Stevenson
Email: laws@blakjak.com

Ed certainly has the methodology right, but fails to have the courage of his convictions!

What does "It's teams" really mean? I think one of two things:

He might have bid [or tried for] 3NT at Pairs. In what way does that demonstrably suggest bidding slam? No way that I can see!

He might have tried for game at pairs since you tend to bid bad games much more at Teams. Does that demonstrably suggest bidding slam? No way again!

In fact the UI clearly suggests not bidding the slam, and I feel confident the TD was wrong here.

Interestingly enough, if this hand had passed 5C and 6C had not made then I might have adjusted because that is what the UI suggests: do not bid on!

mathiasm

offline

1 posts

bridgetalk member



Reply

Re: Unauthorized Information [copied from Bravenet site] (08:28:57 FriJun 7 2002)

What card South is missing ? The K of ♣

The law says: "partner may not choose from among logical alternative actions one that **COULD** demonstrably have been suggested over another"

COULD the UI not suggest (more than the 5♣ bid alone): Partner if you have the K of ♣ we might make 12 tricks ?

My interpretation is surely not an expert one. But at the table were also "advanced" players and not "Experts".

JohnD

Reply

Re: Unauthorized Information [copied from Bravenet site] (11:03:43 FriJun 7 2002)

North has at least a King in reserve for his 3NT bid - it seems to me that he made a fairly normal bid.

I wonder whether sometimes, just because a hesitation is made, players and (tournament directors) are rather too anxious to exact a penalty.

Hesitations are not to be encouraged, but neither should they be unnecessarily penalised.

My interpretation of this has always been "without the hesitation, what would my bid be?" In this case, I would bid 6C in a heartbeat. I like my controls and the club King is golden... 🌈

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Re: Unauthorized Information [copied from Bravenet site] (14:59:00 FriJun 7 2002)

Well, JohnD, that is a judgement that means that pass is not an LA [logical alternative]. Mind you, it has to be a general opinion, not just yours, but if you believe that at least 70% of similar players would bid 6C, then there is no reason to adjust. 🎨 It is very close, certainly, and a lot of people would agree with you.

However, Mathias, I do not agree with you. 😞 When a person says "It is teams" he does not mean he was thinking of bidding slam: to most people it means he has either bid a doubtful game, or he has not bothered with 3NT. Those are the two things that people do when it is Teams.

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[<](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: **texian13**.

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 09:21:13 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)

top ↑

**[Thread Index](#) :: [FAQ's](#) :: [Main Menu](#) :: [Posting Hints](#) :: [Emoticon Key](#) :: [Search](#)
[David's Lawspage](#) :: [EBU](#) :: [ACBL](#) :: [WBF](#)**

Legend ::  **Read Topic** ::  **Unread Topic**

bluejak

offline

435 posts
Forum Host

Reply

Welcome (17:50:13 ThuJun 6 2002)

Hi all

Welcome to the International Bridge Laws forum. 🌈

If you have not been before then I hope you find it useful. 😊

However, if you have been before, you will notice that it is now different. I think this will be a big improvement, and Ed [who helps

me answer queries] and I are quite excited. 🐑

Goodness, that sheep!!!!

If you think it is better now, or worse now, or if you have any suggestions, please do let me know at David Stevenson
<bridge2@blakjak.com>

David Stevenson <laws2@blakjak.com>
Liverpool, England, UK
http://blakjak.com/lws_menu.htm

View Thread Page(s): [**1**]

[[Get Email Advice of Replies](#)] [[Print](#)] [[Send](#)] [[Watch](#)] [[Add a Reply](#)] [[>](#)]

1 bridge player(s) online in the last 15 minutes - 0 bridgetalk member(s), 0 incognito and 1 guest(s).
(The most ever was 52 09:45:43 Fri Feb 14 2003)

Total Members: **399**, Newest Member: [texian13](#).

[Register](#) :: [Log in](#)

The time is now 09:21:34 Mon Sep 1 2003

Powered By BbBoard V1.4.2
© 2001-2003 [BbBoy.net](#)