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First of all, I would like to thank the organizers of the tournament for the proposal to be its judge, and also all composers who took part in it.

To my regret, this year the twomovers section was smaller than ever before (I only received 30 problems in anonymous form from the tournament Director) and not quite rich in original and eye-catching works.

I discovered no anticipations for the entries; but on the other hand, many compositions were based on well-known mechanisms and schemes.

A number of problems that were contenders for a place in the award had to be left out, in view of the following drawbacks:

**A14** - A well-known mechanism with first moves made diagonally by queen, with pseudo Le Grand and Shedey themes. The problem was not included in the award, since the entire complex of change of move functions is formal (the thematic mates are set); and I don’t think that there is a big difference between a one-square move by a pawn in different phases and a capturing move by that same pawn with the mate preserved.

**A17** - A cyclic five-phase pseudo Le Grand. Complete symmetry and play set in the diagram position. The preservation of defensive effects, shown by the author, in different black moves in the third and fifth phases failed to inspire me.

**A19** - An attempt to present theme H in cyclic form. Very appealing; but theme purity is spoiled, since in the second phase the queen move is unrelated to theme line interference – it is merely a decoy.

**A27** - An interpretation of the well-known mechanism used in problems by W. Mazul ([http://www.yacpdb.org/#16517](http://www.yacpdb.org/#16517) and some others), with Burmistrov combination and the addition of a try with mates “according to Makihovi,” which made it possible to present doubled Le Grand twice following the same black defense. A large-scale concept, one that could be a contender for a prize; but the presentation is quite careless, involving dual first moves of tries and a factually superfluous white rook in the post-key phase. If desired, the author can contact the tournament judge, who has a more acceptable version of this problem.

The proposed award is as follows.
A multi-phase twomover without a complicated complex of modern themes. “A minimal set consisting of Le Grand, Dombrovskis paradox and changed mates,” a specialist versed in chess composition may say. All of that is true. However, I was attracted here by purely chess nuances. In the diagram position, there is set play by a strong battery, which in subsequent phases is eliminated four times, with flight provision and formation of new batteries in two cases. The first moves to adjacent squares are made by the same piece — queen. All those points, combined with change of white move functions, cyclic interchange of defenses and linear motifs in Black’s play, simply look excellent. There are no reasons whatsoever to be critical about the form of the problem or the workload of the pieces.
Well, here one can’t help recalling the winner of the latest Olympic tourney (http://www.yacpdb.org/#465736). The same matrix, but a somewhat different synthesis of themes: instead of the original Burmistrov combination, there is a related theme, Le Grand: change of mates is brought to Zagoruiko form (3x2), plus Salazar. Everything is very harmonious. Yet the impression is somewhat spoiled by the weak post-key load of the white queen (which actually acts as a bishop), Black duals in one of the variants in the second phase, and presence of technical white pawns. These circumstances prevented the problem from being placed higher in the award.
Once again, familiar motifs – this time “in the footsteps” of a number of problems by Z. Gavrilovski (see e.g. http://www.yacpdb.org/#378997). Compared to the original problems, there are new post-key battery mates after the black king’s moves, with dual avoidance based separation of mates. Also, two attempts are added, with change of white move functions (first moves of attempts – mates in a try and in the solution), and with an extra change of mate after a thematic move by the black queen. A rare case when Black’s defenses on the same square (the king’s move to a flight and blocking of the same square) lead to Le Grand arising not after the black king’s move. The drawbacks include certain symmetry in White’s play, presence of variants with repetition of mates in the attempts and tries, technical white pawns, and the generally brutal character of play involving mutual captures.

1st Honourable Mention
Vladimir Sorochan
Russian Federation

*1...d3(a) 2.♕:e3(A)#
1...d4? - 2.♕e6(B)#
1...♕:d4(c) 2.♕:e3(A)#
1...♕c4(d) 2.♕c4#, 1...♕c8!
1.♕:e3? - 2.♕e6(B)#
1...d3(b) 2.♕:e3(A)#
1...d3(a) 2.♕g2#
1...♕c8 2.♕d3#
1...♕a5 2.♕c6#, 1...♕b3!
1.♕e3(A)! - 2.♕d4#
1...d3(a) 2.♕e6(B)#
1...♕c4(d) 2.♕c6#

In the two tries and the solution, the first moves with active sacrifices of white pieces involve play around the hidden pin on the 4th rank. A synthesis of Erokhin and pseudo Erokhin themes, with change of mates in response to three black defenses and Rukhlis. Again, reciprocally brutal play. In my opinion, the try with the rook sacrifice and provision of a flight should be made the post-key phase.
Honourable Mention
ANATOLY SLESARENKO
Russian Federation

2nd Honourable Mention

Reverse and direct Dombrovskis, with double threat and dual avoidance, Rudenko, Salazar, simple change of mates, and Rukhlis. An interesting and complicated complex of themes. The queen’s retreat from attack, which creates a powerful battery in the post-key phase, while being quite logical, is not a positive point for the problem, from the viewpoint of chess esthetics.

1... c3(a) 2. e3(A1)# (2. b2?)
1... d5 2. f7#
1... d5(c) 2. d6#, 1... f5!
1. d3(D)? -
2. e3(A1)/ b2(A2)#
1... d1(b) 2. f7(C)#
1... b6 2. c6#, 1... c3(a)!
1. f7(C)! - 2. d4#
1... c3(a) 2. b2(A2)# (2. e3?)
1... d1(b) 2. d3(D)#
1... d5(c) 2. d5#
1... c5 2. c5#
1... b6 2. c6#

1. 5~ - 2. a5(X)# and/or
2. b2(Y)# and/or 2. d6(Z)!,
1... c3(a)! / e3(b)!
1. b3(A) - 2. a5(X)!
1... e3(b) 2. e8(C)#, 1... c3(a)!
1. d3(B) - 2. b2(Y)!
1... c3(a) 2. e8(C)#, 1... e3(b)!
1. e8(C)! - 2. d6(Z)!
1... c3(a) 2. d3(B)!
1... e3(b) 2. b3(A)!
1... e8 2. f1#
(1... b5 2. d6#)

A well-known half-battery mechanism involving Banny, doubled Salazar, and Arnhem. The problem’s originality stems from White Correction in the tries and a good flight-providing key.

~
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MARCO GUIDA
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3rd Honourable Mention

10+10

12+6
Presentation in a light form of choice of first move with changed mates, Rukhlis, cyclic interchange of defenses and pseudo Le Grand. Moreover, there area Dombrovskis effect (the second and third phases) and a secondary Dombrovskis effect (if one compares set play 1...g~.d6 2...b2# with the correcting 1...f4 2...f4# and the post-key variant 1...f4 2...b2#). Unfortunately, the try is refuted in a brutal way.

Choice of first move and threefold Threat Correction, Barnes, Rukhlis. The thematic mate 2...g3# in the first three phases features the pin of the black d5. The key is a paradoxical unpin of the knight; one of that piece’s moves leads to the sought-for mate (Neva theme).
A rich set of modern themes: Barnes, Salazar, Dombrovskis paradox, pseudo Erokhin, defenses on the same square, and a good key. Yet all refutations are far from being esthetically appealing; again, the same applies to the entire play as well.
Tertiary Threat Correction (TTC) with elements of White Combinations and a remarkable encounter between the black queen and the white rook and queen.

*Came-and-go* presented by officers in three variants, with change of mate to one of the defenses. Cute!
Doubled pseudo Le Grand, or pseudo Burmistrov combination, with an additional try, changed mates and defenses.

White Correction with Threat Correction, dual avoidance, changed mates and defenses.
I give one of the most beautiful themes, a favorite of mine – Schiffmann defense – its due. Here, it is presented twice (Schiffmann-1 and Schiffmann-3), in combination with choice of first move and white half-battery play, black defenses on the same square, and Barnes. However, the position is too heavy and enchained.