## When They Open 1NT

## When and Why Bidding is Almost Always Right <br> (How is up to you!)

## Declaring 1NT

- Larry Cohen "One Million Deals"
- 1NT - All Pass is declarer's most successful contract 58\% @ MP and ½ IMP per board!!
- Taking 7 Tricks on Defense is hard!
- Interfering
- Takes away opponent's constructive bidding tools.
- Guides our defense
- Gets them out of their "best" spot


## Consider...

- Vulnerability - safer NV than V; More to gain when they are V.
- Position $-2^{\text {nd }}$ seat $\&$ balancing seat are different!
- Shape - Think Tricks (not HCP)!
- Opener's Strength - 15-17 (very different from 12-14 or 10-12)
- When They open 1NT (15-17), their expected combined strength is $\mathbf{2 0 . 9}$ HCP. Expect opener to have 15.7 and responder about 5.2 on average.
- When responder invites, expect 8+ HCP and 23.5+ minimum for their side. They can play safely at 2 N or higher with 23+ HCP.

Bridge Association

## Defending 15-17 1NT

## $2^{\text {nd }}$ Seat, NV, Do you act?

(1) AKQ1064 PQ102 *953 64
(24KQ1064 PQ102 A53 © Q 4
(34KJ1042 PQJ104 \$53 62
(4) \&KJ1042 PQJ1054 \$53 26
(54KQ10642 『Q102 *953 2

## Hand Types vs 15-17 1NT

## Mel's (Colchamiro) Rule of 6+2:

[ ] Minimum 6 HCP
[ ] Number of Cards in 2 longest suits, minus
[ ] Number of Losers
[ ] Is greater than or equal to 2
Where Losers are missing $A, K$ or $Q$ in a Suit.

Modern Losing
Trick Count assigns
$A=1.5, K=1$ and
$\mathrm{Q}=0.5$ winners.

Mel's Rule depends on Losing Trick Count. LTC works when we have an 8 card fit. The chances of an 8-card fit are much greater with $55+$ and 6 -card suits. 54 shapes and 44 shapes not so much). 5332/4333 are very bad.

|  | Hands | HCP $\geq 6$ | \# Cards (2 suits) | Losers | \#C-L | Bid? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | (54KQ10642 Q 102 953 6 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 2 | YES |
|  |  | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3 | YES |
|  |  | 6 | 11 | 6 | 5 | YES |
|  |  | 7 | 10 | 7 | 3 | YES |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | (1) MQ 1064 PQ102 953 64 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 0 | NO |
|  | (2) 4 KQ1064 Q 102 - 453 (Q4 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 1 | NO |
|  | (3^KJ1042 МQJ104 53 62 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 1 | NO |
|  |  | 4 | 10 | 9 | 2 | Maybe |
| oese moesefamily@aol.com |  |  | Cincinnati |  | Northern Kentucky Bridge Club |  |

## Balancing Seat

- Power to your LEFT (Not good).
- $1 \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{P}$ means they have a max of $17+7=24$. If you have ZERO, Partner has 16!!! Well located points.
- Double - treat as Balancing Takeout Double, not conventional. Partner can pass for penalty!
- Act on WEAKNESS and any singleton or void - DO NOT ACT ON HCP. LHO has HCP OVER you.
- Respect Vulnerability - need 9 trumps to play safely at 3 -level. Cannot afford down 1 doubled.

Defending a Strong NT, penalty doubles are ineffective. Use the double to show shape. Balancing Doubles compete. $2^{\text {nd }}$ seat converts if/when appropriate.

## Vs Their Weak NT ( $\leq 13-15$ )

- Need for an Opening Hand
- Need a Strong Double (Max+1 HCP or better)
- 10-12 1N? Need 13 (any shape) to double TOP+1
- 12-14 1N? Need 15 (any shape) to double TOP+1
- More Caution - Mel's Rule 6+2 $\rightarrow 10+2$ !!
- Suit bids deny Double strength! But are more sound.
- Collaborative bidding required...

| NT Range | Invites | Opener | $3^{\text {rd }}$ Seat Pass | Sum |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $15-17$ | 8 | 15.7 | 5.2 | 20.9 |
| $12-14$ | 11 | 12.9 | 7.6 | 20.5 |
| $10-12$ | 13 | 10.9 | 8.1 | 19.0 |

## Taming The Weak NT

Bridge Winners, Steve Weinstein and Adam Kaplan Feb. 7, 2013 http://bridgewinners.com/article/view/taming-the-weak-notrump-part-1/

## Weak NT:

- More volatile auctions
- Preemption
- Game our way more probable than when they open Strong NT


## Competing dangers:

- Opponents have narrowly defined 1 of their hands,
- Partner's strength and distribution is unknown.
- If they misstep, it is much harder for us to penalize them;
- If we misstep, it's easy for them to penalize (they already know so much more about their side's values and shape). They can have MORE than after 1SNT
- More Strength unaccounted for means variance in their holdings is bigger (than over SNT).

Propose a weak NT opening has a minimum of a good 13 or less (13-15 or less)

## Doubling the Weak 1NT

We need a way to show strength ranges: 0-8, 10-Top, $\geq$ Top+1.
Objectives for a Double of 1-WNT:

1. Establish that it's our hand.
2. Penalize the opponents.
3. Compete for part-scores.
4. Judge game/part-score accurately.
```
2 nd seat HCP:
0-8 HCP - Pass
10-Top - Bid if Length-Losers \geq2
 Top+1 - Double
Where Top = HCP at top of their
WNT range
```

5. Avoid going for a number.

Choose a method that allows PENALTY DOUBLE of 1NT when defending 10-12 or 12-14

When bidding in $4^{\text {th }}$ seat, all of the above applies. RHO has described their hand-type. Though we sometimes have less bidding space, we have more information to work with.

More range / options to cover than when they open 1 Strong NT.

## (1 WeakNT) - Double, then what?

- Double $=15+$ HCP/12-14 (13+ over 10-12 NT) Any Shape. 3rd hand pass or XX Balance of Power / Low Offense/Defense Ratio
- PASS = no clear direction, $5+$ HCP (7+ over 10-12), sets up forcing pass through 2V. NOT GF Hand/Penalties
- first double of natural bid becomes takeout


## Weak/Run out

- 2\& = ART, 0-4 HCP, no 5-card $/ \vee / \curvearrowright$ suit
- With 0-3 s, doubler should pull to a 5-card suit, or their cheapest 4-card suit.
-2 = natural, $5+s, 0-4$ HCP (6)
$-2 \downarrow=$ natural, $5+$ vs, 0-4 HCP (6)
$-24=$ natural, $5+$ ss, 0-4 HCP (6)


## GF / High Offense / Defense

- 2NT = ARTIFICIAL, GF 2-suiter (5-5 or better)
- Doubler bids 3-card suits up the line, or 3 to show long spades
- $\mathbf{3}$ any = natural, GF one-suiter
- NOTE: The first Double by our side after the Penalty Double is TAKEOUT or CARDS. All others are PENALTY


## Advancing Partner's Penalty Double

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E |  |  |
| 1N | X | P | P |  |
| XX | P | 2 | X |  |

Since this would be the first double by our side after the penalty double, and their bid is natural, our Double is
takeout. If
2 were artificial (say, the majors), then Double shows cards.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { South } \\ & \wedge \text { K54 } \\ & \vee 108 \\ & \text { K1052 } \\ & \times 9852 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E | S | 5 |
| 1N | X | P | P |  |
| 28 | X | 2 | X |  |

Our side has already used our takeout double, now all our doubles are penalty. Doubling $2 \vee$ here shows 4+ cards in their suit.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { South } \\ & 9843 \\ & \text { J854 } \\ & 83 \\ & \text { Q102 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E | S |
| 1N | X | P | 2 |

With below our suggested minimum to pass and no 5-card suit, we hope to find a safe playing spot by bidding 2*-general weakness. This bid does not promise clubs, it just shows the lack of a biddable 5-card suit.

| South <br> - K9853 <br> - 4 <br> - KJ8742 <br> $\because 4$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E | S |
| 1N | X | P | 2N |
| P | 20 | P | 3 |
| P | 39 | P | 3. |

$3 *$ showed $\leqslant s$ and a major (if we had es and s, we’d have raised). Reaching a majorsuit fit takes priority over a minor-suit fit. Partner's $3 \downarrow$ shows $3+\bullet s$ and doesn't deny $3+$ s (raise later). Now, we can show with

| South <br> - 4 <br> - K9853 <br> - 4 <br> KJ8742 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E | S |
| 1N | X | P | 2N |
| P | 3\% | P | $3 \square$ |

When we hold es $s$ and a major and partner bids 3e, we bid our major - important to find our majorsuit fit. Unlike the previous hand, this $3 \vee$ bid does not deny a fit. We would bid the same way with both majors or with $\mathrm{vs}+\mathrm{s}$.


At unfavorable vulnerability, this is a clear 3a bid. It's possible 1NT-X may not be enough to make up for your practically certain game.

## When RHO Bids over Partner's X

Responder bids 2 or higher...

- 3 rd hand bids 2\&, 2 , or 2 conventionally
- If 3rd hand's bid promises length in the suit bid and could be passed
- DOUBLE = takeout and sets up a force through $2 \vee$ (subsequent doubles penalty)
- PASS = no clear direction, sets up force through 2ソ, first double is takeout
- Bids = natural, non-forcing
- If 3rd hand's bid does not promise length
- DOUBLE = values and sets up a force through $2 \vee$ (subsequent doubles penalty)
- PASS = failure to show cards, implied weakness, we are NOT in a force
- DOUBLE and DOUBLE of a transfer $=3$-card penalty double
- PASS then DOUBLE of a transfer $=4$-card penalty double
- 3rd hand bids 2ar higher
- We are not in a force
- PASS = weak hand, no clear direction
- DOUBLE = values/cards
- 2NT = artificial (lebensohl) relay to 3e (as above)
- new suit at 3-level = natural ( $5+$ ), forcing [even if there is no room to lebensohl]


## 1-Weak NT Defense: Example Hands



Passes set up a force through $2 \downarrow$ (they cannot play $2 \vee$ or lower undoubled), our $1^{\text {st }}$ double is takeout. We avoid doubling with a void in their suit. After we make 1 TO double, later doubles are penalty: Direct penalty doubles show 4+ trump; balancing penalty doubles show $3+$ trumps.
A forcing pass shows a hand without clear direction or a penalty pass. If the strong hand reopens with double, once advancer fails to pass, they must have a hand without clear direction: 2 NT is natural, nonjumps are non-forcing, and a cuebid is a general force.


Direct bids at the 2-level are NF and natural. At the 3-level, there are 3important hand-types: GF, INV, and competitive. When we have a natural bid available on the 2-level, we can accomplish all 3: Compete on the 2-level, invite by bidding 2NT followed by 3 of our suit, and force by making a direct 3-level bid. When we do not have a 2-level bid available, even with Lebensohl, we only have 2 ways to bid on the 3 -level. In favor of showing GF and competitive hands, we choose to give up showing the INV hand; when we have the INV hand, we overbid or underbid slightly. Facing 15+ HCP, this hand isn't enough to game-force, but is more than a competitive 2 4 .

A direct cue-bid shows a forcing offensive hand short in the opponent's suit unsuitable for a TO double. Bidding 2NT then cue-bid shows a forcing hand with a stopper and 5+ cards in a major. This is a textbook hand for a direct cue-bid: We have a 3 -suited hand, enough to GF, and cannot double because of the $\varphi$ void.

When they play "Systems On" or 2-Suit Runouts After Stayman by 3rd hand, double shows values \& creates a penalty double situation. Other bids are natural. Lebensohl applies. After a transfer by 3rd hand, Pass is forcing, and 2NT and higher are the same. We use the 2-level "cue-bid" to replace a takeout double, so a double shows values. Double followed by double shows a 3-card penalty, while pass then double shows a 4-card penalty in the target suit

| South <br> - A83 <br> $\checkmark$ K985 <br> - 54 <br> \& 10832 |  |  |  | South <br> - 9 <br> $\checkmark K 954$ <br> - A8752 <br> \& 1084 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W | N | E | S | W | N | E | S |
| 1N | X | 2 | P | 1N | X | $2 \checkmark$ | 24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

After a 2 -suited bid by 3 rd hand, if they are bidding one of their suits, double is takeout of that suit, and other bids are natural. If they are not bidding one of their suits, double creates a penalty double situation, and other bids are natural.

Cincinnati
Bridge Association

# Acting in $4^{\text {th }}$ Seat 

Partner Passes...
(1NT) - P - (P) - Dbl

- Same as direct except DOUBLE only promises $13+\mathrm{HCP}(11+\mathrm{HCP})$
- Advancer still passes with 5+ HCP (7+) and runs with 0-4 (6) HCP.
- first double = takeout
- Only a penalty pass of 1NT-X or a double sets up a forcing pass through $2 \boldsymbol{}$
(1NT) - P - (bid) - Dbl
- DOUBLE = values (15+) if bid is ARTIFICIAL, takeout (13+ support points) if bid is NATURAL
- 2NT = artificial (lebensohl), relay to 3e (as above)
- new suit at 2-level = to play
- new suit at 3-level = natural (5+), forcing
- first double = card-showing
- Only a penalty pass or card-showing double by 2 nd hand sets up a forcing pass through 2 V


## Further Reading

- Mel Colchamiro, How You Can Play Like an Expert, Magnus Books (2007). ISBN-10: 0963753347
- Steve Weinstein and Adam Kaplan "Taming the Weak Notrump, Part 1", Feb. 7, 2013, Bridge Winners, http://bridgewinners.com/article/view/taming-the-weak-notrump-part-1
- Steve Weinstein and Adam Kaplan, "Taming the Weak Notrump, Part 2" Feb. 14, 2013, Bridge Winners http://bridgewinners.com/article/view/taming-the-weak-notrump-part-2
- Defenses against 1NT: Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of defenses to 1NT

| Rule | About | Bridge By the Numbers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-3-4- <br> (5) | Bid | How high should I preempt? Count losers and subtract from 13. Add 2-3-or 4 to that number and bid that number of tricks. Choose $2 / 3 / 4$ based on vulnerability (Unfav/VV or NN/Fav). Use $2 / 3 / 4 / 5$ when making a jump overcall (Unfav/VV/NN/Fav) |
| 4 | Bid | 4-4- fits are often better than 5-3 fits when choosing trumps. |
| 5 | Bid | 5-Level belongs to the opponents. |
| 6+2 | Bid | When to interfere over their strong NT? With $\geq 6 \mathrm{HCP}$ and Length - Losers $\geq 2$, BID! |
| 7 | Play | How many round do you hold up your ace playing NT? 7 minus the number of cards you hold! |
| 9 | Bid | When to convert partner's takeout double for penalties at a low levels? Add the \# of trumps + \# of Trump Honors (A-10) + Level of doubled contract $\geq 9$, should result in defeat. Beware missing game bonuses when V vs NV . |
| 10 | Bid | When we own $20+$ HCP and no fit, if \# trump winners + the \# tricks contracted $\geq 10$, double for penalties. |
| 10-12 | Lead | The version of Rule of 11 used when leading or decoding " 3 rd or $5^{\text {th" }}$ leads! |
| 11 | Lead | When they lead $4^{\text {th }}$ best, subtract the number of pips on the card from 11 to determine \# cards outstanding higher than the card led. Then subtract all higher cards in your hand and dummy to get \# higher cards in the hidden hand. Everyone at the table should do this!!! |
| 15 | Bid | Do you open in $4^{\text {th }}$ seat? Add the $\#$ of $\boldsymbol{t}$ to your HCP and if $\geq 15$, OPEN! Pearson Points. (Corrollary: Open in $4^{\text {th }}$ seat on marginal hands only if you do not fear your opponents). |
| 17 | Bid | When partner opens a Weak 2 , add your HCP to the \# of trumps (partner's suit) and bid game if $\geq 17$. BETTER: Use Rule of 2-3-4 and count how many cover cards you have. Determine if an asking bid can give you what you need to know. |
| $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (22) \end{gathered}$ | Bid | Open 1 suit when the \# Cards in your 2 longest suits + HCP $=20$. BETTER: Open 1 Suit when the \# Cards in your 2 longest suits + HCP in those suits +3 Quick Tricks $\geq 22$. Q 8764 Q 8764 QJ\&A $=21$ by the rule of 20 , but only 15 by the rule of 22. PASS. AKQ8764YAQ8764 $43 * 2$ is $\mathbf{2 1}$ and $\mathbf{2 2 . 5}$ OPEN! |
| 23/32 | Bid | When we own $>20 \mathrm{HCP}$ and have no fit, make an OPTIONAL PENALTY DOUBLE with at least 3 trumps at the 2 level and 2 trumps at the 3 level. |
| 26 | Bid | If you or partner has a singleton or void, and you can count 26 HCP in the 3 remaining suits, consider bidding slam if not off 2 control cards in one suit. |

Point Count Odds


HCP

# Mel's (Colchamiro) Rule of 6+2: 

[ ] Minimum 6 HCP
[ ] Number of Cards in 2 longest suits, minus
[ ] Number of Losers
[ ] Is greater than or equal to 2
Where Losers are missing $A, K$ or $Q$ in a Suit.

## Explore Create Shopr Help.

## Penalty Double of 1NT

$\#$
by Steve Moese June 24
What is the HIGHEST range for which you would choose to play a penalty double over an opponents 1 NT opening bid? Choose a range so that that range and all below would have a penalty double by you.

Current Poll Results: See all public votes
None: 2 votes (1\%)
Other below 10-12: 1 vote (1\%)
$10-12 \mathrm{HCP}: 3$ votes ( $2 \%$ )
10/11-13 HCP: 2 votes (1\%)
11/12 - 14 HCP: 25 votes (15\%)
12/13-15 HCP: 53 votes (32\%)
13/14-16 HCP: 17 votes (10\%)
14/15-17 HCP: 13 votes ( $8 \%$ )
15/16-18 HCP: 9 votes (5\%)
Other above 15/16-18 HCP: 2 votes (1\%)
All: 37 votes ( $22 \%$ )
Other: 3 votes (2\%)
Abstentions: 8

Like

## Votes for Penalty Double of 1NT



| $12 / 13$ - 15 HCP | Kit Woolsey | John Diamond | Barry Rigal |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Adam Parrish | Bob Heitzman | Martin Wuest |
|  | Alan Frank | François "Dellache" | Mike Gill |
|  | Frank Lin | Dan lsraeli | Ray Yuenger |
|  | John Miller | Floyd McWilliams | Bill Shutts |
|  | Alex Dezieck | Niko Roemer | Ned Kohler |
|  | Ping Hu | Aleksis Zalitis | Steve Chen |
|  | Martin Henneber... | Sam Marks | Jim Olson |
|  | Daniel Delestre | Eric Sieg | Rosalind Hengev... |
|  | Richard Brown | David Kent | Howard Sandler |
|  | Hamish Brown | Rasmus Maide | Daniel Lieb |
|  | Gene Owens | Jack Donaghue | Collins Williams |
|  | Kerry Kappell | David MacRae | Art Korth |
|  | Mark Bartusek | Richard Whitehead | John O'Brien |
|  | Nick Warren | David Taylor | Julien Christen |
|  | Ola Stavas | Rich Rothwarf | Bob Okker |
|  | Andrew Sinclair | Bryan Morgan | Martin Bootsma |
|  | Andrew Collins | 2 private |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| 13/14-16 HCP | Jeff Ford Jeff Lehman W J Sund Nigel Kearney Bob Sebesfi Kevin O'Dea | Greg Herman Neil Silverman Ant Edwards Reid Barton Fiske Warren Patrick Shields | Adam Meyerson <br> Randy Thompson <br> David Cole <br> Bill Kent <br> Christoph F. Eick 1 private |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $14 / 15-17 \mathrm{HCP}$ 18 HCP | Yehudit Hasin <br> Paul Weinstock <br> Bill March <br> Barry Spector <br> Richard Smith | Phil Clayton <br> Louis Dekker <br> Brad Craig <br> Viorel Nan | Abraham Fisher Dennis Dewit Gregory Gauthier Luke Robison |
| 15/16-18 HCP | Michael Rosenbe... Gregory Nowak Mark Lehto | Mark Raphaelson Randy Pearson Stephen Henry | lan Grant <br> Peter Swensson <br> Tim Mann |
| Other above 15/16 $-18 \mathrm{HCP}$ | Nikos Stamatiou | Andrew Horton |  |
|  | Yuan Shen Oren Kriegel <br> Aviv Shahaf <br> Andrew Rosenthal <br> Victor Chubukov <br> Gábor Szō̃ts <br> Tracy Brines <br> Ronald Kalf <br> James Lawrence <br> Petter Bengtsson <br> Okan Cakmak <br> John Gillespie <br> 1 private | Steve Bloom <br> Jim Munday <br> Ben Kristensen <br> Kieran Dyke <br> Richard Fleet <br> Tom O'Reilly-Pol <br> John Moschella <br> Jeroen Wieland <br> Jerry Goldberg <br> Paul Huggins <br> Michael Hopkins <br> Robin Barker | Phillip Martin <br> Frances Hinden <br> Zachary Madden <br> Harald Berre Skj.. <br> Michael Askgaard <br> Leonard Helfgott <br> Brian Weikle <br> Mark Kaptein <br> Alexander Cook <br> Clive Owen <br> Brian Davies <br> Steve Tyer |
| Other | Mike Summers-S... | $\lg$ Nieuwenhuis | Alain Jacquet |
| Abstain | Vicki Gregory Larry Kahn Ross Driedger | Franck Guerrero Ken Cohen Tom Peters | Tanya Rodich Sriram Narasimh.. |

