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## 1 Weak vs. Strong NT

As I personally prefer weak NT opposed to the majority of Finnish bridge players, I thought it could be useful to collect some advantages and disadvantages of weak and strong NT. With weak NT I mean $10-13,11-14$ or $12-14$. I have labelled the different items with "-", "+" or "o" depending on whether it is negative, positive or either way from the weak-NT point of view.

+ A 1NT opening preempts the opponents from using 1-level bids, and the weak NT is much more frequent than a strong NT. The frequencies for the 16-18, 15-17, 12-14, 11-14 and 10-13 1 NT openings are $3.5 \%, 4.9 \%, 9.7 \%, 13.4 \%$ and $15.5 \%$ respectively (all including 5 -card majors).
+ The NT openings are the most descriptive openings, as both strength and distribution are within narrow bounds. And thus the responder can usually quite easily narrow the alternatives for the best final contract to a small number. And thus the more frequent the NT-openings are, the better. And weak 1 NT is more frequent than strong, see above.
+1 -level suit-openings are stronger when you use weak NT, as minimum balanced hands are excluded from these. A $10+$ hcpt 2 -over-1 becomes almost game-forcing.
- Related to the previous, you might get into trouble with minimum unbalanced hands and a misfitting 2 -over-1, as it might be difficult to stop in partscore.
+ Releted to the previous, you do not have to protect for $1 \boldsymbol{m}-2$ NT type of situations, where opener has 12 hcpts and responder 10 . This means that the 1 NT response to a 1 -level opening does not have to be semi-forcing with up to 11 or 12 hcpts.
- A minimum hand with 4441 distribution is more difficult to bid with weak NT, as a NT-rebid is strong (partner usually bids your short suit). Of course, with strong NT you are in trouble with 15-17 4441:s, but than you can downgrade your hand to a minimum hand if partner bids your short suit.
o If you play different from the field you will sometimes play the contract from the other side, AND get different number of tricks.
o You bid and go down (or make), and preempt opps from doing it instead.
o You bid and go down (or make), when the hand would be otherwise passed out.
o You get doubled in a partscore, AND get set more (or less) than the value of opps contract.


## 2 Two-way Stayman

In two-way Stayman both $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ and $2 \diamond$ are used as major asks. $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ promises invitational strength, and the bidding is highly natural. One may also use $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ if you are only interested in checking for 4 -card majors for selection of game, as $2 \diamond$ can reveal unnecessary information about openers hand (i.e. 5 -card minors).
1NT- $2 \boldsymbol{\%}-2 \diamond-3$ NT is a perfectly reasonable auction. $2 \diamond$ is game forcing and usually shows some kind of slam interest. Possible exceptions are when responder has a five card major and wish to check for a three card fit, or when responder want to find out about openers distribution for selection between 3NT and 4 M (e.g. with a 4333 distribution). Lets look closer at the $2 \diamond$ bid

| Responses to 1NT-2 $\diamond$, t-w Stayman |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 2 \boldsymbol{1} \end{aligned}$ |  | $4 / 5$ cards, does not deny $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}, 2 \mathrm{NT}$ asks $4 / 5$ cards, denies $4 \bigcirc$, 2NT asks |
|  | 1NT-2M-2NT responses |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \AA \\ 3 \diamond \\ 3 \mathrm{OM} \\ 3 \mathrm{M} \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \end{gathered}$ | 4-card suit <br> 4-card suit <br> 4- or, if denied, 3-card suit 5-card suit corresponding 4333 |
| 2NT |  | no 4 card major or 5 card minor, $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ asks |
|  | 1NT-2NT-3\% responses |  |
|  | $3 \diamond$ | 3-3-4-3 |
|  | 30 | 2-3-4-4 |
|  | $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 3-2-4-4 |
|  | 3NT | 3-3-3-4 |
| $3 \%$ |  | 5 card suit |
| $3 \diamond$ |  | 5 card suit |

Notice these situations: 1 NT- $2 \diamond-2 \boldsymbol{\phi}-2 N T-3 \circlearrowright=5-3-x-x$, and $1 N T-2 \diamond-2 \boldsymbol{N}-2 N T-3 \boldsymbol{N}=5-2-3-3$. With a 4 -card minor responder bids it, and responder may bid $3 \bigcirc$ for checking for a 3 -card suit ( $3 \mathrm{NT}=$ two $\operatorname{card} \Theta$, others $=$ three card $\Theta$ ).
Other bids not defined above are natural, suit bids promise 5-card suits, as relaying with 2 NT does not always reveal all 3 -card suits. Jump in a new suit is splinter. For example:
1 NT $-2 \diamond-2 \circlearrowleft-2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ shows a $5+$ suit, and might be only a game-selection bid. With $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ responder bids $2 N T$ 1 NT- $2 \diamond-2 \mathrm{M}-3 \boldsymbol{\omega} / \diamond$ shows $5+$ suit and is always slam-invitational, 3 NT by opener is only negative.
1 NT- $2 \diamond-2 \bigcirc-2 \mathrm{NT}-3-4 \boldsymbol{\circ}$ is a cue-bid setting spades as trumps.
Responder shows a long minor suit as follows:

1. With a weak hand, bid 1NT-3m, and opener passes
2. With an invitational hand, go through $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$, and opener passes or bids 3NT
3. With a slam invitational hand, go through $2 \diamond$

The meanings of 1 NT- 3 m and 1 NT-2 2 -2any- 3 m is sometimes interchanged, especially if $1 \mathrm{NT}-3 \mathrm{M}$ is invitational.

## 3 Puppet Stayman

Puppet Stayman allows asking about both 4- and 5 -card majors. Works fine after both 1 and 2NT. Usually one use transfers to one hand, below opener is strong and responders transfers after 2NT-3\&-3 $\diamond$. One can also do the other way, if responder is strong. Or you may not use transfers at all, if this is preferred.

| Responses to 2NT-3\& Puppet Stayman |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Response | Description |
| $3 \diamond$ | At least one 4-card major, no 5-card major |
| $3 \circlearrowleft / \boldsymbol{\Phi}$ | 5 -card suit |
| 3 NT | No 4 or 5 card major |

After $3 \diamond$ responder shows his 4-card majors with transfers.

| Responses to 2NT-3\&-3 $\diamond$ Puppet Stayman |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Response | Description |
| $3 \circlearrowleft$ | 4 spades |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | 4 hearts |
| 3NT | Was only interested in 5-card majors |
| 4\& | 4 hearts and 4 spades, opener shows his suit |

## 4 Minor Stayman

When using transfers the spade bid is not needed as a natural one. Usually it is used for minor explorations. It can be transfer to clubs, or minor Stayman, asking for four card minors.

| Responses to 1NT-2¢ minor Stayman |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Response | Description |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \mathrm{NT} \\ & 3 \boldsymbol{4} / \diamond \\ & 30 / \boldsymbol{\wedge} \end{aligned}$ | No four card minors. $3 \$ / \diamond$ by responder is a $5+$ card suit, still trying, 3NT by opener only negative, others are support and cue $4+\text { suit }$ <br> 5 card major, (could instead show 4-4 in the minors) |

I have also under the Joppe-NT-section described another version of minor asking bids. Note that it is in Joppe-NT possible to check for 4 -card minor suits through $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$, and $2 \boldsymbol{\omega}$ and 2 NT can be used for sign-off, long-suit game try, or long-suit slam try in the minors.
I have also thought of combining minor Stayman with a quantitative invite (usually done with 4NT, and which also is minor oriented) in the $3 \mathbf{~ b i d}$, and let 4 NT be Blackwood.

| Responses to 2NT-3¢ minor Stayman |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Response | Description |
| 3 NT | minimum, $4 \boldsymbol{\phi} / \diamond$ by responder is a 4 card suit, still trying, 4NT by opener only negative, $4 \diamond$ is a four card suit, others are support and cue |
| $40 / \diamond$ | $4+$ suit, positive hand |
| $40 / \sim$ | 5 card major, maximum (could instead show 4-4 in the minors) |
| 4NT | maximum, no 4-card minor or 5 card major |

## 5 Baron

Baron 2 or $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ is a game-forcing bid asking for four card suits, with NT replacing clubs. The bid looks for a $4-4$ fit, and usually denies good five-card suits. Subsequent bidding is natural.

| Responses to 2NT-3\&-3any, Baron |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| Response | Description |
| 3 any | 4 card suit |
| 3 NT | to play |
| 4 any | support in partners last suit, and cue in bid suit |

After 1NT one can use the same principle. Three-level minor bids are usually considered as suit bids, usually indicating a $4-5$ major-minor hand. For example in 1NT-2 $-3 \boldsymbol{Q}$ responder shows $5-4$ in clubs and hearts. If responder has 4 clubs, he bids 2NT ( $=$ no spade fit, but 4 cards in an unbiddable suit), and opener should bid $3 \boldsymbol{q}+$ to show a 4 card suit. $3 \bigcirc$ in this situation must be support in spades and cue, as a 5-4 major-minor hand can be bid with an initial major-bid.

## 6 2\& as game forcing relay

If one is prepared to use $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ as game force, one can relay for openers exact distribution below 3NT in all situations. This is especially useful if the 1 NT bid is already game forcing, e.g. as $1 \boldsymbol{\%}-1 \mathrm{NT}$ in J-Moscito. The system is actually constructed with this situation in mind, as the 1NT-bidder transfers his suits to the relay-bidder. Furthermore, it is also possible to include the 4441 distribution in the responses, as can be seen below.

| Responses to 1\%-(1 $\diamond$-1 $\bigcirc-)$ 1NT-2\%, GF is established |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2 \diamond$ | $4+8$ |
| 20 | $4+\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ (denies 4®) |
| 2^ | 4+\% (denies 4M) |
| 2NT | $4+\diamond$ (denies other 4 suit) |
| Optional 4441 responses |  |
| 3\% | 1444 |
| $3 \diamond$ | 4144 |
| 30 | 4414 |
| 3 - | 4441 |
| Responses to (...-)1NT-2¢-2 $\diamond-2 \odot$ |  |
| 2^ | 4\% |
| 2NT | 4 |
| 3\% | $4 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | 3523 (2-card suits are bid directly, as in Joppe-NT) |
| 30 | 3532 (long suit replaces ¢) |
| $3 \boldsymbol{1}$ | 2533 |
| 3NT | 3433 |
| Responses to (...-)1NT-2¢-2 $\downarrow$ - 2 ¢-2ヵ-2NT |  |
| 3\% | 3424 (3-card-suit shown from above in steps, ...) |
| $3 \diamond$ | 2434 (... as unbalanced two-suiters) |

Other distributions are shown using the same principle $4+$ suit-relay- 3 NT is always $4333,4+$ suit-relay$3 \diamond / \circlearrowleft / \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ is always 5332 with 2 cards in bid suit, long suit replacing $\&$ when necessary, lower bids are transfers to second 4 -suit, when upon relay 3 -card suit is shown from above in steps.
The 5332 -distributions are shown by bidding the 2-card suit directly, as it is done so in Joppe-NT. One may of course change it to showing it from above in steps.
I have also included optional responses for describing 4441 distributions. This is useful at least in JMoscito after one negative bid ( $1 \boldsymbol{\infty}-1 \diamond-1 \circlearrowleft-1 N T$ ), but it should naturally be avoided in openings, as it can lead to plays on 5-1 trumps.

## 7 Joppe-NT

The system is by Jukka Mattila, and the original version written in Finnish can be found at http://org.utu.fi/harrastus/bridge/joppent.html. I have also suggested some modifications to the responses $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}-3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$, which are found under a separate subsection.

| Responses to 1NT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2\% | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \diamond \\ & 2 \circlearrowleft \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | asks <br> no major <br> $4 / 5$ cards, does not deny <br> 4/5 cards |
| 1NT-2\&-2 $\diamond$ responses |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 2 @ \end{aligned}$ | $2 \mathrm{NT}$ <br> 3\% $\begin{gathered} 3 \diamond \\ 30 \\ 3 \boldsymbol{1} \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \diamond \\ 3 \circlearrowleft \\ 3 \uparrow \\ 3 毋 \\ 3 \uparrow \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \end{gathered}$ | ```Majors at least 4-4, pass or correct asks, GF \(\overline{5 \text { card } \boldsymbol{\phi}}, 3 \boldsymbol{\&}\) asks for more 3-3-2-5 (you bid your doubleton) 3-2-3-5 2-3-3-5 5 card \(\diamond, 3 \diamond\) asks for more: 3-2-5-3 2-3-5-3 3-3-5-2 (you bid your doubleton, NT replaces 3-3-4-3 (cf. t-w Stayman 3\& ask) 2-3-4-4 (cf. t-w Stayman 3\& ask) 3-2-4-4 (cf. t-w Stayman 3\& ask) 3-3-3-4 (cf. t-w Stayman 3\& or Baron 3\&-3NT) invitational GF (5) \(6+\) cards to play``` |



| Responses to 1NT, continued |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \diamond$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}, 3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}, 3 \diamond \\ 2 \mathrm{NT} \\ 3 \Omega \\ 3 \uparrow, 4 \boldsymbol{\Perp}, 4 \diamond \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \\ 4 \mathrm{~S} \end{gathered}$ | transfer to $\triangle$ (promises $5+\varnothing$ ), further responses are $4+$ suits and round forcing <br> balanced, inv. <br> slam-invitational, 3 NT and $4 \bigcirc$ are negative resp. <br> $6+\mathrm{k}$ Vand splinter <br> choose game $3 \mathrm{NT} / 4 \bigcirc$ <br> to play |
| 20 | $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{NT} \\ 3 \boldsymbol{\natural}, 3 \diamond, 3 \varnothing \\ 3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow} \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\leftrightarrow}, 4 \diamond \\ 4 \bigcirc \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow} \end{gathered}$ | transfer to $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ (promises $5+\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ ), further responses balanced, inv. <br> $4+$ suits, round force <br> slam-invitational, 3 NT and $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ are negative resp. <br> $6+$ and splinter <br> 5-5 majors, choose game <br> choose game $3 \mathrm{NT} / 4 \boldsymbol{4}$ <br> to play |
| 2^ | $\begin{gathered} \text { pass } \\ 3 \diamond \\ 30 \\ 3 \uparrow \end{gathered}$ | transfer to 3母, weak or slam-inv. in minor, responder can bid opener must pass slam-invitational in \&, 3NT only neg. slam-invitational in $\diamond$, 3NT only neg. |
| $\begin{gathered} 2 \mathrm{NT} \\ 3 \boldsymbol{\wedge} / \diamond / \varnothing / \boldsymbol{\oplus} \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \end{gathered}$ |  | invitational inv, promises XXxxxx-suit traditional |

Examples:

2. 1 NT- $2 \diamond-2 \bigcirc-3$ - - ?
a) $3 \bigcirc=$ negative
b) $4 \triangle=$ hearts ok
c) $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}=5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, and so on, natural, remembering that $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ is only round force
3. $1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \bigcirc-2 \mathrm{C}-3 \boldsymbol{4}-$ ?
a) $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}=$ negative
b) $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}=$ spades ok
c) $3 \bigcirc=5 \circlearrowleft$, and so on, natural, remembering that $3 \%$ is only round force

### 7.1 Minor asks and the 5431 convention

The following alternative conventions was suggested by Marcin Skwark. The c)-alternatives on 2 A and 2NT responses and the major length queries after $3 \boldsymbol{\&}$ and $3 \diamond$ responses were added by JB.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Alternative meanings to the bids 2¢ -3^} <br>
\hline 2^ \& 2 NT

$3 \%$ \&  \& | a) Bal. inv. b) to play in $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$, c) slam inv. in \&. Responses minimum, responder bids |
| :--- |
| to play |
| short suit, slam invitational in weak slam invitation in $\boldsymbol{\&}$, opener is allowed to pass slam invitational in \&, start cue-bidding maximum, responder bids to play short suit, slam invitational in slam invitational in \&, start cue-bidding | <br>

\hline 2NT \& $3 \%$

$3 \diamond$ \& \[
$$
\begin{gathered}
3 \diamond / \mathrm{NT} \\
3 \circlearrowleft / \boldsymbol{\wedge} / 4 \boldsymbol{\varrho} \\
4 \diamond \\
3 \circlearrowleft / \boldsymbol{\wedge} / 4 \boldsymbol{\varrho} \\
3 \mathrm{NT} \\
4 \diamond \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
$$

\] \& | a) Inv. with $\diamond$ b) to play in $3 \diamond$, c) slam inv. in $\diamond$. Responses maximum, responder bids |
| :--- |
| to play |
| short suit, slam invitational in $\diamond$ |
| slam invitational in $\diamond$, start cue-bidding |
| minimum, responder bids |
| short suit, slam invitational in $\diamond$ |
| weak slam invitation in $\diamond$, opener is allowed to pass |
| slam invitational in $\diamond$, start cue-bidding | <br>

\hline $\begin{array}{cc}3 \% \\ \\ 3 & \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ 30 \\ 3 \uparrow\end{array}$ \& $3 \diamond$

$3 \bigcirc$

$3 ¢$ \&  \& | $5431=$ short \&, $5+$ in $\diamond, 33,43$ or 44 in majors, GF, $3 \diamond$ asks ? asks for major length, responses |
| :--- |
| $4 \Omega, 3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| $3 ๑, 4 \boldsymbol{\oplus}$ |
| $3 \Upsilon, 3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ |
| 4450 |
| $5431=$ short $\diamond, 5+$ in $\boldsymbol{\&}, 33,43$ or 44 in majors, GF, $3 \bigcirc$ asks ? |
| asks for major length, more interested in $\Omega$, responses |
| $3 ๑, 4 \boldsymbol{\oplus}$ |
| $3 ๑, 3 \boldsymbol{\beta}$ |
| $3406(4 \bigcirc+$ better \& than promised) |
| $4405(4 \bigcirc+$ better $\diamond$ than promised $)$ |
| 3415 ( $4 \bigcirc$ but no extras |
| asks for major length, more interested in $\boldsymbol{\oplus}$, responses |
| $3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}, 3-4 \odot$ |
| 4306 ( $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}+$ better $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ than promised) |
| $4405(4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}+$ better $\diamond$ than promised $)$ |
| 4315 ( 4 but no extras) |
| $5431=$ short $\odot, 3 \boldsymbol{\oplus}$, at least 54 in minors, GF |
| $5431=$ short $\boldsymbol{\wedge}, 3$, at least 54 in minors, GF | <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

The purpose of the 5431-convention is threefold:

1. To avoid hopeless 3 NT contracts when the 1 NT-bidder hasn't the short suit sufficiently stopped.
2. To find the right trump suit among three possible ones.
3. To find good slams when available due to good fit.

Ron Klinger suggests that you may also use these bids with 4441 and also 6331 distributions. He also suggests that you should bid below your shortness, which is further discussed in the next section.
If the three-level responses are 5431-bids, 1 NT - transfer - major - raise must be game invitational and not slam invitational, as in the original system. Slam invitations with $6+$ majors must then be done via splinters or side-suits. With 6322 and 7222 distributions one have to go through $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$ and ask for openers distribution and controls. Also if 5431 :s are used, one should agree on openers rebids. Is a relay for controls or major-length ?

The suggested meanings for $2 \boldsymbol{\omega} / 2 \mathrm{NT}$ does only introduce new features into the system, although the original version is simpler to remember.

### 7.2 Klingers version of the 5431-convention

I have not myself read Ron Klingers NT-book, but I have heard that he suggests bidding below your shortness instead of the shortness itself. He also allows use of three level bids with 4441-distribution, which I think is not allowed in the Polish version. Both versions deny 5-card majors. As openers bid of the short suit may never be a trump suggestion, it can be used as the most positive bid stating that you have no wasted values in the suit. If opener has a double stopper in the short suit he shows it by bidding 3NT. Other bids show a 4 -card suit (or a 3 -card suit, as 4333 and 5332 without stoppers in the long suit are of course also possible), and also implying some wasted values.

| 3\% | $3 \diamond$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \circlearrowleft \\ 3 \wedge \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\natural} \\ 4 \diamond \end{gathered}$ | three-suiter with short $\diamond$, GF most positive, responders rebids $4 \Omega, 3$ 内 <br> 4ゅ, $3 \mathrm{\infty}$ <br> 4414 <br> 3316 ?? <br> 4405 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3 \diamond$ | 30 | $\begin{gathered} 3 \boldsymbol{\wedge} \\ 3 \mathrm{NT} \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\phi} \\ 4 \diamond \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | three-suiter with short $\varnothing$, GF most positive, responders rebids 4- <br> 4144 $5+\boldsymbol{\%}$ $5+\diamond$ |
| 30 | 3* | $\begin{gathered} 3 \mathrm{NT} \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\AA} \\ 4 \diamond \end{gathered}$ | three-suiter with short $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$, GF most positive, responders rebids 40 <br> $5+$ $5+\diamond$ |
| 3¢ | $4 \%$ 4 M | $\begin{gathered} 4 \diamond \\ 40 \\ 4 \boldsymbol{\wedge} \\ 4 \mathrm{NT} \end{gathered}$ | three-suiter with short \&, GF most positive, responders rebids Asks for 4-card major 3451 or 3460 , non-forcing 4351 or 4360 , non-forcing 3361, forcing 5 -card suit, non forcing |

Note that responder often is just looking for the right game, and thus $1 \mathrm{NT}-3 \mathrm{~h}-4 \mathrm{M}$ must be nonforcing.

## 8 Chrowhurst/Checkback Stayman

Checkback is a convention used in the situation $1 \mathrm{x}-1 \mathrm{y}-1 \mathrm{NT}-$ ?, y always being a major. Responder might have a 5 -card suit or a 3 -card support and want to find out which contract is the best. Thus $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ and/or sometimes $2 \diamond$ are used as conventional bids in this situation. First, my suggestion which try to be as natural as possible, and also enable us of 2-level invitations ( $\mathrm{z}=$ new suit):

| Checkback 1x-1y-1NT-? |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \mathbf{q}$ | Checkback, invitational or better values |
| $2 \mathrm{x}, 2 \mathrm{y}, 2 \mathrm{z}$ | natural, denies invitational values unless it is a reverse |
| 2 NT | invitational, denies 5y and 3x (if x is a major) |
| 3 x | invitational, 4 card x |
| 3 y | invitational, 6 card y |
| 3 z | natural game force |
| 3 NT | to play |

If the opening bid was $1 \boldsymbol{\%}$, it is quite common to use $2 \diamond$ as Checkback and $2 \boldsymbol{\&}$ as sign-off. In the responses 2 in the free major replaces the $2 \diamond$ response, denying 3 -card support (and showing minimum). The basic responses to the checkback are 2 y , showing 3 -card support, 2 x denying support but showing 5 -cards in x , and $2 \diamond$ denying both $3 y$ and $5 x$. Below I have also included minimum and maximum responses (except when you have 5 x but not 3 y ).

## Checkback 1x-1y-1NT-2\&

| $\quad$ Checkback 1x-1y-1NT-2\& |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ | minimum, denies 3y and 5x |
| 2 x | denies 3y, shows 5x, min or max |
| 2 y | shows 3y and minimum |
| 2 NT | maximum, denies 3y and 5x |
| 3 x | shows 3y and 5x and maximum |
| 3 y | shows 3y and maximum (i.e. a 4333) |
| 3 z | shows 3y and 4z and maximum |
| 3 NT | to play |

If you play strong $1 \boldsymbol{\%}$ and the $1 \diamond$ opening includes the $3-3-2-5$-distribution, one can let $3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ in $1 \diamond-1 \mathrm{M}-$ $1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{\infty}-3 \boldsymbol{\%}$ show 3 M and $5 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$, and thus only 2 or $3 \diamond$.

| Checkback 1x-1y-1NT-2¢-2 $\diamond$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2x | 3 x and invitation, opener passes with 1y |
| 2 y | 5 y , denies 3 x , invitation |
| 2z | 4 z , invitation or GF if $\mathrm{z}>\mathrm{y}$ |
| 2NT | invitation, more balanced than 2 x and 2 y |
| 3 x | 4 x , game force |
| 3 y | 6 y , game force |
| 3 z | 4 z , game force (must be 3 x also, as responder did not bid 3 z directly) |
| 3NT | to play |
| Checkback 1 $\bigcirc$-1县-1NT-2¢-2 $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 2^ | $5 \uparrow$, denies $3 \bigcirc$, invitation |
| 2NT | invitation, denies $3 \bigcirc$, more balanced than $2 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ |
| 30 | $3-4 \bigcirc$, game force |
| 34 | $6 \mathbf{4}$, game force |
| 3 z 3 NT | 4 z , game force (must be 5 d and 30 also, as responder did not bid 3 z directly) to play |

Obviously 2 NT could be used as invitation with $3 \triangle$ after $1 \Omega-1 \boldsymbol{\infty}-1 \mathrm{NT}-2 \boldsymbol{\infty}-2 \Omega$, as $2 \boldsymbol{d}$ says almost the same in the above suggestion. But it strongly deviates from natural bidding.

### 8.1 Variations

One can also use $2 \boldsymbol{\phi}$ as transfer to $2 \diamond$ which is a sign off in $\diamond$ OR showing invitational values (by not passing ...-1NT- 2 \&- $2 \diamond$ ). $2 \diamond$ is game forcing asking primarily about openers major holdings. Bids above $2 \diamond$ show weak hands (except reverses) looking for a low-level contract.
One can also use $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ (or $2 \diamond$ after a $1 \boldsymbol{\%}$ opening) Checkback as only game-forcing bid, and use other 2-level bids as weak (reverse is roundforcing) and 3-level bids as invitational.

## 9 Competition

### 9.1 Rubensohl

The Rubensohl convention (by Jeff Rubens) is a more accurate variation of Lebensohl, and is normally used after interference after 1NT opening. It is also useful after interference on a $15+1 \boldsymbol{\%}$ opening, as a standard strong 1NT opening is the most likely holding for the $1 \boldsymbol{1} \boldsymbol{\%}$ opener.
In Rubensohl doubles are strongly penalty oriented. It is also possible to use doubles of 2 M as takeout in teams (your sissy partner won't dare to leave it in anyway...), and as penalty in pairs. Furthermore, one can also let double always be negative after $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ opening, as opener will than most likely make a reopening double. Other bids are as follows:

| Rubensohl after 1¢/1NT-(2x)-? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2 \diamond-2$ ¢ | to play |
| 2NT | transfer to 3\%, to play in suits below $\mathrm{x}, 3 \mathrm{x}$ and higher are GF and promise a stopper |
| 3¢-30 | transfers, promises $5+$ suits and is at least invitational, a completion of the transfer is negative, all others GF. |
| 3/ | a) minors at least 54,3 card free major <br> b) majors at least 55 , if both majors are free |

A transfer to a suit shown by the opponents (not necessarily x) asks for a stopper in that suit. A completion of the transfer denies stopper (suits are natural $4+$ looking for a fit after that), other bids promise a stopper and (when possible) show/deny 4+ suits. Most problematic is the case 1NT-(2巾)-3@$3 \boldsymbol{\wedge}-$ ? , when:
$3 \mathrm{NT}=4 \odot$ semi-stopper in $\boldsymbol{\oplus}$ (opener is allowed to pass with Jxx or Txxx)
$4 \boldsymbol{\varrho}=4+\boldsymbol{\infty}, 4 \bigcirc$
$4 \diamond=4+\diamond, 4 \diamond$
Higher bids seem to be unnecessary
That is, responders $3 \circlearrowleft$ after $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ interference do always show $4 \odot$, without stopper and without $4 \bigcirc$ responder should bid 3NT !
There are a number of other special cases, which are defined as follows:

| Bidding | Stopper | Major length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1\%/NT-(2x)-2NT-3\%-3x | yes | 4 (in at least one major) |
| 1\%/NT-(2x)-3NT | shaky | < 4 |
| 1\%/NT-(2x)-2NT-3\%-3NT | yes | <4 |
| 1\%/NT-(2x)-2NT-3\%-3y>x | yes | $5+\mathrm{y}$ |

As a general rule, if responder shows a suit via 2 NT it also promises a stopper, direct bids does not say anything or promise a shaky stopper.
The interference bid 2NT does quite often promise both minors, and it possible to use Rubensohl:ish conventions in this case also: $1 \boldsymbol{\uparrow} / \mathrm{NT}-(2 \mathrm{NT})-$ ? :
$3 \boldsymbol{\%}=$ Asks for four card majors, when $3 \diamond=$ no $4 \mathrm{M}, 3 \mathrm{NT}=$ no 4 M , minors well stopped
$3 \diamond \circlearrowleft=$ transfer, at least invitational, completion most negative
$3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}=55+$ in majors.
After a $15+1 \boldsymbol{\$}$ opening the opener can be stronger ( $19+\mathrm{hcpts}$ ) or more distributed, and in these cases the opener cannot complete any of the transfers (apart from the stopper ask, which is anyway GF), because responder can pass. A cue bid from opener is a relay (3NT shows stopper, others are natural), and show $19+$ hcpts, and is the only forcing bid. Other non-Rubensohl bids are natural and promise more distribution, but are not forcing.

### 9.2 Escapes

When playing weak 1 NT , opponents tend to (and should) double frequently, and thus an escape system is also useful. My favourite is DONT-escapes (similar to DONT-defense), which allows playing 1NT doubled when both hands are balanced (which is quite common, as openers hand is it for sure).

| DONT-escapes 1NT-(dbl)-? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 in a suit | two-suiter, 4-4 or better in bid suit + higher suit. With reasonable strength and a 4432-distribution you should consider passing |
| 2^ | $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$-suit, wants to play or preempt, opener may raise with a fit. $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ via redouble is a more clear-cut escape (hoping that opponents will bid something). |
| rdbl | one-suiter, demands $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ by opener |
| pass | balanced $0-13$ hcpts, suggesting that 1 NT doubled is the best contract. Redouble by opener promises maximum and a five-card suit (responder removes 1NT-XX if he is too weak). Suit bids by opener promises a good 5 card suit and a minimum. |
| 2NT | GF, asks for four card suits from below (the 2NT bid has never occurred in real life). |
| 3 x | $6+$ suit, invitational |
| higher bids | as without the double |

I have also played Brozel-escapes, which are more accurate in describing two-suiters, but you lose the option to play 1NT doubled. And the opponents are also more accurately informed.

| Brozel-escapes 1NT-(dbl)-? |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2 \%$ | ¢ + - at least 4-4 |
| $2 \diamond$ | $\diamond+\bigcirc$ at least 4-4 |
| $2 \bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc+\boldsymbol{巾}$ at least 4-4 |
| 2㒳 | - -suit, wants to play or preempt, opener may raise with a fit. $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ via pass is a more clear-cut escape (hoping that opponents will bid something). |
| rdbl | two-suiter at least 4-4, remaining combinations $\boldsymbol{\phi}+\diamond \boldsymbol{\phi}+\boldsymbol{\phi}$ or $\diamond+\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Opener bids $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ or $2 \diamond$ depending on his $\boldsymbol{\phi}$-holding |
| pass | one-suiter or strong, demands rdbl by opener, responder bids his suit (which may be 4 cards with 4333) or passes with a strong hand |
| 2 NT | GF, asks for four card suits from below (the 2NT bid has never occurred in real life). |
| 3 x | $6+$ suit, invitational |
| higher bids | as without the double |

