

Mestel, Jonathan

03-01, sk
01:43 (prieš
10 dienų)

skirta aš, Luc, Marjan, Axel, nsr

Dear All,

Broadly, I agree with Luc and Axel. Whatever we do, there is the possibility of injustice: if the result is allowed to stand but it is bogus, then we are being unfair to the other competitors. If we disallow her result and it is genuine, then we are being unfair to her. We have to decide what, on the balance of probabilities, is likely to be the most just course of action.

It is clear that she has not fully understood the problems. I have more sympathy than others do with her finding the key 1. Bg3 in the #3. When I looked at the problem, I too found Bg3 before finding the Kc4 variation. I also used the logic Bf4 blocks Qf3 so that Bxh3 will defend, while Bh2 allows g3. Whereas 1Bg3 hxc3 allows 2 Rh5. **But absolutely if you choose 1 Bg3 you give the 1... hxc3 variation.** To give 1 Bg3 with no indication at all of its special nature is very strange.

I also do not like her giving 1...Rc1 as a defence rather than 1...Rd1. Both allow 2 Nxe3+ but only once is it necessary. I can well imagine if looking at a list of variations (while cheating) one might look for lines with different mates and pick one where it is actually a dual.

The other problem discussed, the #5: It is quite possible to find 1 Kg4 on general principles, as I did, before seeing the threat. Once you find a variation, it is normal then to investigate whether it is a threat and only consider moves which prevent it. It is not normal to give a second variation which allows the same mate.

The "variation" 1..Re8 is similar to 1...Rc1 in the previous problem. It doesn't prevent 2 Bd3, but allows the 2nd mate as the Rc8 no longer guards c3. However 1..Re8 looks as though it "might" defend against the quiet threat, so I don't find that quite so suspicious. But it fits the pattern.

It is also strange to give variations including the mating move.

I very much approve of checking her scripts from previous events. Unfortunately, and **off the record**, I fear she may have been dishonest in the last ISC. The #3 with the key 1 Ne4 (nice problem, by **the** way!) has a ridiculous selection of variations given, from anyone who is actually thinking about the position. You cannot not consider 1...Kxe4 or ...Kxc6 but instead mention 1...a5 as a second variation which doesn't defend a checking threat. Why was she given 3.75 for this problem anyway!? You're not usually that generous to me!!

In general, it is possible to guess the key, miss the threat, give a few lines ending in mate, and then move on to another problem. If you do that, sometimes you will get it wrong. If I had seen a "solution" from a different event which did this with the **WRONG** key given, I would be more inclined to consider that this might be her "style", and conceivably she was just very lucky on this occasion. Clearly, that is what we are being asked to believe. Yes she is underrated, but even so, she would not do this well ordinarily, but might do so occasionally with a lot of luck. But the absence of a wrong guess anywhere (I accept I have not seen many attempts, but even so) is very worrying.

If some cheating took place, obviously I don't know what mechanism may have been used; some people have more than one phone and only give one in, or have smart watches, or obtain communication from a confederate etc. We do not need to rule on that.

So I think we cannot allow this result to stand. Nevertheless, we must be diplomatic in what we say. Confidentially, I am almost certain that she somehow cheated, but we can only say there is too much of a risk, given the strange selection of lines given which do not demonstrate comprehension of the problems and that we have to be fair to all competitors.

In conclusion, I know that under pressure of time solvers write all kinds of rubbish. Sometimes they pick up an extra point or two out of good fortune. But Luc and Axel have extensive experience at looking at solving sheets, and I am reassured that they have come to the same conclusions I have.

I apologise for the late response. And thanks again to Arvydas for all his careful work which made our task so much easier.

Best wishes to all,

Jonathan