

WORLD FEDERATION FOR CHESS COMPOSITION

# 11<sup>th</sup> WORLD CHESS COMPOSITION TOURNAMENT

RESULTS

October 2022

The 11<sup>th</sup> World Chess Composition Tournament (WCCT) of the WFCC is completed. In total 33 countries participated in the tournament with 550 compositions in eight sections. The tournament was announced in May 2020 and the closing date for the submission of entries was July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021. One document with clarifications and one with claims and replies were circulated to the participating countries. In March 2022 WFCC decided to exclude the teams of Russia and Belarus from the tournament in response to the hostilities in Ukraine and the Official Statements of FIDE Executive Council. The closing date for the judgments was extended to August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022 and they were all received on time. My sincere thanks to the team captains, the co-ordinators and judges in the countries as well as to the members of the WCCT committee, all of whom helped to ensure that the tournament was concluded successfully and in line with the schedule.

As in the previous WCCT, the tournament includes 8 sections with only the 7 best section results considered for the score of a team. The highest and lowest marks for each composition are discarded in all cases; if a composition belongs to a judging country, its score is the sum of the two middle marks multiplied by one and a half. If a composition receives a zero mark from two or more judging countries, it is excluded from the tournament and receives no points. The scale step of 0.2 points was used again; no complaints were received this time, which implies that the scale can be considered established in WCCT.

In each section the twenty highest-placed compositions (hereinafter called the "top 20") are printed on diagrams with full solutions. If several entries are ranked equally and share the 20<sup>th</sup> place, all of them are printed on diagrams. If the third-placed entry of a country belongs to the "top 20" list, it is also printed on diagram even though it does not contribute to that country's score. The compositions not belonging to the "top 20" list are mentioned only by means of their reference number, composer and country names, score, place and comments. These compositions are to be considered as published.

Harry Fougiaxis, Director of the 11<sup>th</sup> WCCT

# In memoriam

Marco Campioli	Italy	(10.06.1954 - 17.10.2021)
Bizyagin Buyannemekh	Mongolia	(20.07.1946 - 01.11.2021)
Unto Heinonen	Finland	(25.12.1946 - 17.09.2022)

# Results

The winner of the 11<sup>th</sup> WCCT is Slovakia, ahead of Ukraine and Germany. All 33 participating countries received points. The table with the full results is as follows:

Place	Country	Code	А	В	С	D	Ε	F	G	Н	Total
1	Slovakia	SVK	16,8	22,0	16,0	17,2	18,4	18,0	22,2	14,4	130,6
2	Ukraine	UKR	16,6	17,6	18,0	17,4	17,7	15,6	18,2	16,8	122,3
3	Germany	GER	13,6	17,0	18,0	16,2	15,8	15,9	17,0	19,5	119,4
4	Serbia	SRB	18,3	18,4	14,0	15,2	16,2	17,8	17,0	13,0	116,9
5	France	FRA	13,4	12,8	8,6	11,2	14,4	11,6	18,6	18,0	100,0
6	Israel	ISR	12,0	14,8	13,4	12,0	16,5	17,0	0,0	12,2	97,9
7	North Macedonia	MKD	15,6	17,4	16,6	3,6	13,4	14,7	15,4	4,4	97,5
8	Netherlands	NED	9,6	11,1	9,2	0,0	14,4	12,6	14,0	17,8	88,7
9	Finland	FIN	10,6	16,0	15,6	9,0	13,2	12,4	6,2	7,8	84,6
10	Great Britain	GBR	12,0	10,6	6,8	12,9	14,1	11,8	11,6	9,6	82,6
11	India	IND	12,9	14,4	0,0	2,0	14,0	10,4	14,4	11,0	79,1
12	Italy	ITA	12,2	11,8	4,6	12,0	11,4	13,0	10,2	8,2	78,8
13	United States	USA	11,6	8,2	5,4	9,2	13,8	14,4	3,4	15,0	77,6
14	Poland	POL	12,4	12,0	14,6	12,2	9,4	16,5	0,0	0,0	77,1
15	Slovenia	SLO	10,2	6,4	10,8	5,8	13,5	12,4	0,0	17,2	76,3
16	Czech Republic	CZE	12,2	14,4	6,8	11,2	10,4	11,4	0,0	6,6	73,0
17	Switzerland	SUI	10,6	4,2	13,5	0,0	9,4	9,4	12,6	4,8	64,5
18	Spain	ESP	12,4	10,8	7,2	13,0	8,8	4,6	6,2	5,8	64,2
19	Armenia	ARM	9,4	9,4	6,8	11,0	9,0	8,4	0,0	9,6	63,6
20	Sweden	SWE	11,6	8,1	4,5	6,0	12,2	2,0	5,1	14,8	62,3
21	Hungary	HUN	8,0	3,8	0,0	11,2	13,6	8,4	6,2	6,8	58,0
22	Denmark	DEN	9,0	0,0	7,2	16,8	7,4	6,4	0,0	6,6	53,4
23	Romania	ROU	8,6	3,6	0,0	10,5	10,4	4,4	0,0	12,0	49,5
24	Lithuania	LTU	8,6	0,0	0,0	9,2	11,8	0,0	0,0	16,0	45,6
25	Greece	GRE	9,8	7,2	0,0	2,8	10,4	5,6	0,0	6,4	42,2
26	Argentina	ARG	10,2	8,6	0,0	0,0	9,8	0,0	0,0	13,2	41,8
27	Canada	CAN	11,4	7,4	0,0	8,8	6,0	0,0	0,0	3,0	36,6
28	Azerbaijan	AZE	9,8	6,4	0,0	6,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	22,6
29	Mongolia	MGL	0,0	0,0	0,0	7,8	10,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	18,6
30	Croatia	CRO	6,2	0,0	0,0	0,0	6,6	4,2	0,0	0,0	17,0
31-32	Brazil	BRA	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	9,6
31-32	Japan	JPN	0,0	0,0	3,6	0,0	0,0	6,0	0,0	0,0	9,6
33	Belgium	BEL	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,8

Section scores shown in grey background are not considered for the team result.

# Number of compositions per country

Country	Code	А	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	Total
Argentina	ARG	2	3	-	-	3	-	-	2	10
Armenia	ARM	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Azerbaijan	AZE	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
Belgium	BEL	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Brazil	BRA	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	3
Canada	CAN	3	3	-	3	1	-	-	3	13
Croatia	CRO	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	3
Czech Republic	CZE	3	3	3	3	3	3	-	2	20
Denmark	DEN	3	-	2	3	3	2	-	3	16
Finland	FIN	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	3	21
France	FRA	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Germany	GER	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Great Britain	GBR	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	23
Greece	GRE	2	3	1	2	3	1	-	3	15
Hungary	HUN	3	2	-	2	3	3	2	3	18
India	IND	3	3	-	2	3	3	3	3	20
Israel	ISR	3	3	2	3	3	2	-	3	19
Italy	ITA	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	23
Japan	JPN	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	2
Lithuania	LTU	3	-	1	2	3	-	-	2	11
Mongolia	MGL	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	6
Netherlands	NED	3	2	3	-	3	2	2	3	18
North Macedonia	MKD	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	22
Poland	POL	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	-	19
Romania	ROU	2	1	-	3	2	1	-	3	12
Serbia	SRB	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Slovakia	SVK	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Slovenia	SLO	2	1	3	3	3	3	-	3	18
Spain	ESP	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Sweden	SWE	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	21
Switzerland	SUI	3	2	3	-	3	3	3	2	19
Ukraine	UKR	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
United States	USA	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	24
Total		80	69	61	68	86	65	48	73	550

# Index of authors with compositions in the "top 20" lists

A total of 113 problemists had one or more compositions placed in the "top 20" lists. Those with the highest number are: Zoran Gavrilovski (12), Peter Gvozdják (12), Ladislav Salai Jr (10), Emil Klemanič (9), Michel Caillaud (8), Aleksandr Semenenko (7), Valery Semenenko (7), Valery Kopyl (6), Marjan Kovačević (6), Dragan Stojnić (6), Mikhail Marandyuk (5), Silvio Baier (4), Mark Erenburg (4), Štefan Sovík (4), Hans Uitenbroek (4).

Aliev Ilham	D04	Karamanits Anatoly	G08*** G44**** G54***
Aunver Indrek	A35*	Keith Daniel	D33
Baier Silvio	E83*** H49 H60 H75	Kekely Ľuboš	D05*
Balasubramanian S.K.	E34*	Kirtley Mark	H48
Barth Michael	C10 F33*	Klemanič Emil	A84*** C53*** C59* D21* D66*
			E04**** E54* F15*** G52**
Baumann Anton	C05*** C64*	Kolčák Marek	E56 H59
Baumann Klaus	A73	Kolesnik Mikola	E24** E49** E86**
Borodavkin Sergiy	F02*	Kopyl Valery	A03* C46* F18** G08***
0.9			G44**** G54***
Borst Dirk	H66 H74	Kovačević Marjan	A59 E29 E55 F63 F65 G51*
Brabec Juraj	A01***	Kozulya Mikhail	H73*
Buyannemekh Bizyagin (†)	D19	Kozyura Gennady	F18**
Caillaud Michel	A53** E48 E92 G06 G15*	Krätschmer Ralf	C34
	G42 H65 H78		
Chernyavsky Mikola	A02* A04 G44****	Krizhanivsky Vasil	A03*
Comay Ofer	B38*	Kryuchkov Aleksandr	C08
Degener Udo	E65*	Labai Zoltán	A01*** E04****
Didukh Sergiy	D50 D57*	Laue Hartmut	F33* F64
Djurašević Branislav	D70	Liakos Dimitris	A17
Doukhan Gérard	A53**	Lörinc Juraj	G52**
Dučák Ján	B35*	Loustau Jean-Marc	A53** G15*
Dupont Nicolas	H68	Maeder Thomas	G30
Einat Paz	B38*	Manikumar S.	E34*
Engström Kaj	A35*	Marandyuk Mikhail	B37 B69 B70 C06* C46*
Erenburg Mark	C13 C50 F51 F55	Mikitovics János	D68
Fiedler Frank	E83***	Miljanić Mirko	D45
Frolkin Andriy	H72 H73* H77**	Minski Martin	D07* D61**
Gäb Wolfgang	A23	Narayanan C.G.S.	A29 B61
Gatti Daniele	F71	Nielsen Steffen	D02 D63
Gavrilovski Zoran	A49 A76 B50 B55 B64 C33	Novitsky Petro	A02*
	C48 C57 F01 F03 G31 G38		
Gómez Palazón Luis	A78	Nunn John	D35
González Luis Miguel	D30	Osorio Roberto	H51
Grönroos Mikael	B07	Paavilainen Jorma	B31* C03 C54
Gvozdják Peter	A01*** A41 A84*** B03	Pachl Franz	G16* G19
	B51 B57* C53*** E04****		
	F15*** F21* G07 G47		
Havran Jozef	F10 F21*	Packa Ladislav	E04****
Haymann Jean	E66*	Parzuch Stefan	A67
Heinonen Unto (†)	H50	Piliczewski Bogusz	F14
Hlinka Michal	D05*	Prcic Mike	F35
Hoffmann Martin	C05***	Prentos Kostas	E88*

Radović Srećko Richter Frank Rittirsch Manfred Rusinek Jan Salai Jr Ladislav	B19 B24 F27 C41 F16 G16* C09 D60 F57 A01*** A84*** C59* C53*** D21* D66* E04**** E54* F15*** G52**	Sonntag Gunter Soroka Ivan Sovík Štefan Sphicas George P. Sprenger Jan	D10 F18** A84*** B57* C53*** F15*** E88* D07* D61**
Samilo Volodimir	D74*	Stojnić Dragan	A11 A75 B29 G20 G50 G51*
Satkus Vidmantas	H56 H58	Svítek Miroslav	A42 B35* B58
Schaffner Gerold	C05***	Syväniemi Janne	B31*
Schreckenbach Michael	B42*	Tarasyuk Vladislav	D57* D74*
Schulze Eberhard	E83***	Tribowski Marcel	B42* G27
Semenenko Aleksandr	E24** E49** E86** G08*** G44**** G54*** H77**	Tylor Christopher	E58
Semenenko Valery	E24** E49** E86** G08*** G44**** G54*** H77**	Uitenbroek Hans	B40 E31 F43* G02*
Serafimović Ilija	C66	Waelzel Helmut	D61**
Shaligin Oleg	F02*	Werner Dieter	C05*** C17 C64*
Shamir Shaul	E66*	Wicklund Göran	H70
Shankar Ram Narayan	G22	Wiehagen Rolf	E65* E83***
Shapiro Misha	E14	Witztum Menachem	E39
Šivic Klemen	E35 H62 H69	Yarmonov Igor	C06* C31
Smits Gerard	F43* G02*		

The number of stars \* indicates the number of co-authors.

### SECTION A: TWOMOVERS

#### Judging countries: Great Britain, India, Israel, Serbia, Slovakia

Theme (proposed by Great Britain): In a try (or tries) and the key a white unit (including a pawn) vacates a square which is then occupied in the variation play or in the refutation by at least two black units. The white thematic unit may be the same or there may be different white units in try (tries) and key. White's mates may result from the occupation itself or from some other self-weakening by Black.

#### General remarks from Great Britain

In theory the set theme should have offered the world's composers the chance to produce twomovers with rich thematic content and plenty of interesting play. Disappointingly, however, many of the entries utilised the same basic idea (moves and mates by a wS), and it turned out that most of them were shown to be partially or almost wholly anticipated. Some, indeed, displayed the theme in very prosaic fashion, with settings that would hardly have been acceptable for publication in a regular problem column. Such entries inevitably attracted scores below 1.0.

A few of the entries deviated from the above-mentioned idea, but hardly any of them reached the high standard that has been achieved in previous WCCTs, and some also turned out to have partial forerunners. As a consequence, the scores we have given are generally quite low. We offer no apology for this; we simply felt that the overall standard was mediocre.

#### General remarks from Israel

One of our main considerations in judging this section involves the well-known changed mates following knight tries and solution, employing mainly mates by the knight making the first moves. This is often accompanied by a phase in which a second knight makes the mates after the try/solution moving knight relieves it from guarding duties. This has been done by many problems showing Zagoruiko, mainly with defences which are non-thematic in relation to the WCCT-11 theme. The WCCT-11 theme imposes a clear restriction, requiring certain types of threats to force the required defences, and we viewed this favorably in deciding on the level of originality of each problem. However, we significantly reduced the scores to problems concentrating on knight-mates as mentioned above. Three problems presented a task of Zagoruiko 4×2 mostly with the elements we mentioned above, but also with other relatively explored elements. Such a task cannot be ignored and our scores were relatively high, and the internal comparison between them involved the new elements used as well as the construction.

Another trend, involving several problems, was the use of line opening defences combined with selfinterfering tries. This was done several times before and the question was how to consider the addition of one line, making a task. In general, our view is that the predecessors cause those problems to be of lower originality and the tasking does increased the score but not to a high extent. Lastly, counting thematic moves is of no interest in our point of view. Complexity, unity, artistry and interest are much more important than flat numbers.

#### General remarks from Serbia

Out of 86 entries, 51 used the same thematic piece and the same thematic square (wS orthogonally from bK), as the most promising method to present several phases with changed play, but this turned to be quite exhausted ground. The vast majority of these entries didn't surpass already known thematic combinations, or allowed technical drawbacks: bad refutations of tries, unused white pieces in the solution, non-thematic double threats, parasite black defences, etc. The level of the tourney was additionally diminished when some of the most original entries (especially A64) were excluded.

This all made difficult to apply high marks, and to differentiate very similar contents in the middle part of the award. One of the questions for judges was how to evaluate different kinds of technical drawbacks, and this is where subjectivity decides.



1<sup>st</sup> Place (9,6 points) A59: Marjan Kovačević (Serbia)

1.S×g5? [2.Qf3‡] 1...Se4 2.Sg4‡, 1...Be4 2.Sf1‡, 1...Qa8 2.Q×c5‡ but 1...Be2! 1.Sd6? [2.Qf3‡] 1...Se4 2.Sf5‡, 1...Be4 2.Sc4‡, 1...Qa8 2.Q×c5‡, 1...Be2 2.Sf5‡ but 1...g4! 1.S×c5? [2.Qf3‡] 1...Se4 2.R×d3‡, 1...Be4 2.Bd4‡, 1...g4 2.Qh6‡, 1...Be2 2.Bd4‡ but 1...Qa8! 1.Sc3! [2.Qf3‡] 1...Se4 2.Sd5‡, 1...Be4 2.Re2‡, 1...Qa8 2.Q×c5‡, 1...g4 2.Qh6‡, 1...Be2 2.R×e2‡ Thematic Zagoruiko 4×2 (Z-42-28) (Country) The third problem showing 4×2 Zagoruiko (see also A04 & A41). In terms of clarity and refutations it is the best, but the additional thematic defence in A04, even with the double threat, gives it an edge (ISR) Four-phase changed mates after two defences. Even if great portion of its content is well known (see the Claims document), improving the mechanism to four phases makes the highest difficulty and sufficient originality. Perfect construction and refutations (SVK)

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Place (9,4 points) A04: Mikola Chernyavsky (Ukraine)

1.S×f7? [2.Qd4‡] 1...Be5 2.Q×e6‡, 1...Se5 2.R×d6‡, 1...Bc5 2.Q×e6‡ but 1...e5! 1.Sq6? [2.Qd4‡] 1...Be5 2.Se7‡, 1...Se5 2.Sf4‡, 1...e5 2.Q×f7‡, 1...Bc5 2.Sf4‡ but 1...Sb3! 1.S×f3? [2.Qd4‡] 1...Be5 2.Sb4‡, 1...Se5 2.Se3‡, 1...e5 2.Q×f7‡, but 1...Bc5! 1.Sd7! [2.Qd4‡] 1...Be5 2.Rc5‡, 1...Se5 2.Sb6‡, 1...e5 2.Q×f7‡, 1...Sb3 2.Be4‡, 1...Bc5 2.R×c5‡ Zagoruiko 4×2, cycle of defences and refutations, white combinations (Country) This is one of three problems (with A41 & A59) that present a complete 4×2 Zagoruiko that the predecessor mentioned did not achieve. The mate 1.S×f7? Be5 2.Q×e6‡ is one of the main elements enabling this achievement. We find the repeated non-thematic defence 1...Bc5 as somewhat diminishing the purity of the defences on the evacuated square (this exists in all three Zagoruiko 4×2 problems), and this arises from the need to have the WQ on f6 and not on g6 as in the predecessor. Still, the use of 1...Bc5 as a useful refutation compensates for this. In comparison to A41 and A59, the fact that there are three thematic defences here gives it an advantage, as well as some more distancing from the Slesarenko predecessor (ISR) This seems to be one of the first three twomovers (including A41 and A59) with a thematic Zagoruiko 4×2, featuring three different refutations. In comparison with the same matrix used in A59, here we have an additional thematic move (1...e5) at the cost of some technical pieces to refute one of the tries: wBh7, bSd2 & bPf3 (SRB) Four-phase changed mates after two defences. Even if great portion of its content is well known (see the Claims document), improving the mechanism to four phases makes the highest difficulty and sufficient originality. Another thematic defence 1...e5 being a refutation in one phase but followed by the same mate in the other phases, is just a mechanical addition (SVK)

3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) A01: Zoltán Labai, Juraj Brabec, Peter Gvozdják, Ladislav Salai Jr (Slovakia) 1.Sb6? [2.Bc5,Qc4‡] 1...Bd5 2.Sc2‡, 1...Sd5 2.Sb5‡ but 1...d5! (2.Qa7?)

1.Sc7? [2.Bc5,Qc4‡] 1...d5 2.Se6‡ (2.Qa7??), 1...Sd5 2.Scb5‡ but 1...Bd5!

1.Se7? [2.Bc5,Qc4‡] 1...d5 2.Sc6‡ (2.Qa7??), 1...Bd5 2.Sf5‡ but 1...Sd5!

1.Sf6! [2.Bc5,Qc4‡] 1...d5 2.Qa7‡, 1...Bd5 2.Rd3‡, 1...Sd5 2.R×e4‡

Three fully unified tries based on dual avoidance (S interferes Q) and cycle of black defences. A compact 12-fold thematic content (the same 3 defences in 4 phases) with 9 variations having changed mates and 3 refutations (Country) Cyclic refutations with 9/9 mates (IND) This is a task of Zagoruiko 3×3 spread over 4 phases. The main addition here is the use of blocks for the queen mate 1...d5 2.Qa7‡ with each of the three thematic moves being a refutation of one of the tries. The A01b predecessor has repeated mate on 1...f5 and fails to produce a 3×3 Zagoruiko. Similarly, A01c has a repeated mate and does not use the bP defence. The double threat is a drawback. Predecessor problems cannot be ignored: they cover most of the changed mates, but the use of the queen mate, combined with the three tries that prevent this mate, deserves a high score reduced due to the double threat (ISR) A cycle of thematic changes and thematic refutations with three new mates in the solution, completing the maximal number of 9 different mates over 4 phases. Double threats in all the phases was the price to pay for this record thematic achievement (SRB)



3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) A76: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

1.Sc3? [2.g3‡] 1...Be4 2.Se2‡, 1...Re4 2.Sd5‡, 1...e4 2.Q×f5‡ but 1...Qe4!

1.Sd6? [2.g3‡] 1...Qe4 2.Se6‡, 1...Be4 2.B×e3‡, 1...e4 2.Q×f5‡ but 1...Re4!

1.Sc5? [2.g3‡] 1...Qe4 2.Sce6‡, 1...Be4 2.B×e3‡, 1...Re4 2.S×d3‡ but 1...e4!

1.Sf2? [2.g3‡] 1...Qe4 2.R×g4‡, 1...Re4 2.S×d3‡, 1...e4 2.Q×f5‡, 1...e2,e×f2 2.Q×d2‡ but 1...Be4!

1.Sg5? [2.g3‡] 1...Qe4 2.S5e6‡, 1...Be4 2.B×e3‡ but 1...g3!

1.Sf6! [2.g3‡] 1...Qe4 2.R×g4‡, 1...Be4 2.B×e3‡, 1...Re4 2.Sd5‡, 1...e4 2.Q×f5‡, 1...g3 2.h×g3‡

Four thematic moves change their functions as defences in 4 tries and the solution, or as refutations of the tries. 3×1 change of mates after 1...Qe4; 2×1 change of mates after 1...Re4; and 2×1 change of mates after 1...Re4. The fifth try by the key piece embellishes the content (Country) Cyclic refutations with 8/16 mates (IND) A significant task using four thematic defences with each one serving as a refutation of the respective try. The variety of mate changes adds to the overall impression (ISR) The best entry with four thematic variations and four thematic refutations. The perfect construction spontaneously includes an additional try 1.Sg5? g3! where the pinning effect of black defences 1...Be4/Qe4 remains, while unguard of f3 disappears. wQ gets additional duty in the 1.Sf2? phase (SRB) Four thematic defences refute four tries. In other phases, the mates after these defences are changed, but quite irregularly and therefore the impression is less harmonic (SVK)

5<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points) A11: Dragan Stojnić (Serbia) 1.Se3? [2.Qe4‡] 1...Bd5 2.Q×c3‡, 1...Sd5 2.S×c4‡ (2.Sd7?), 1...Qh1 2.S×g4‡ but 1...d5! (2.Qc7?) 1.S×f4? [2.Qe4‡] 1...d5 2.Qc7‡, 1...Bd5 2.S×d3‡ (2.Qc3?), 1...Qh1 2.S×g6‡ but 1...Sd5! (2.Sd7?) 1.Sf6? [2.Qe4‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sfd7‡ (2.Sbd7?), 1...d5 2.Q×e6‡ (2.Qc7?), 1...Qh1 2.S×g4‡ but 1...Bd5! (2.Qc3?)

1.Se7! [2.Qe4‡] 1...Bd5 2.Q×c3‡, 1...Sd5 2.Sd7‡, 1...d5 2.Qc7‡, 1...Qh1 2.S×g6‡, 1...e×f5 2.S×g6‡ White correction play in the form of Velimirović attack, for the first time presented with all three thematic defences on the same square. Flight-giving in all three thematic tries, changed mates after 1...Sd5 (3×1), d5, Bd5 and Qh1 (Country) Velimirović attack. Cyclic refutations with 7/9 mates. White correction (IND) A perfect Velimirović attack. The defence 1...Sd5 has three different mates while the other two have only two different ones. The control of 1...Qh1 is also fine. Comparing to 11a, here the errors by the tries are unified: flight provision, driving the entire mechanism (this also ensures that 2.Sbd7 is a mate only in the solution) and, as such, there is no issue in terms of originality (ISR) An attempt to combine the required theme with the difficult Velimirović attack. However, the mechanism is imperfect as a new and disturbing mate 2.Sfd7 appears instead of the thematic 2.Sbd7 (SVK)

6<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points) A35: Kaj Engström, Indrek Aunver (Sweden)

1.Ba1? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...Rdd4!

1.Bb2? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...Sed4!

1.Be5? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...d4!

1.Bf6? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...Sfd4!

1.Bg7? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...Rgd4!

1.Bh8? [2.Qa7‡] but 1...B×f2!

‡2

1.Bc3! [2.Qa7‡] 1...Rdd4 2.Ra1‡, 1...Rgd4 2.Rg8‡, 1...Sed4 2.Qa2‡, 1...Sfd4 2.Qf8‡, 1...d4 2.Ra5‡, 1...B×f2 2.Rh8‡, 1...Ra1 2.R×a1‡

5 thematic moves to d4 with thematic self-weakening tries and a try (1.Bh8?) with all thematic variations but another refutation due to white obstruction (Country) 6 line closing/square block tries of which 5 are thematic (IND) This specific arrangement of the black knights and rooks was not shown before. While it is symmetric, it offers a task of five thematic lines to be closed by the tries. A sixth line, non-thematic, is a bonus (ISR) A record achievement of five thematic refutations. With bBh4 on h2, a sixth refutation (1...Bg1!) would be much nicer (SRB)



(10+11)

(8+10) ‡

(9+10)

5

‡2

Å

‡2

7<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) A41: Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia)

1.Sb4? [2.Rb6,Qc6‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sb5‡, 1...Bd5 2.Sc8‡ but 1...Bd7!

1.Sb6? [2.Qc6‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sc4‡, 1...Bd5 2.Sbc8‡ but 1...Rf3!

1.Sf4? [2.Qc6‡] 1...Sd5 2.R×e6‡, 1...Bd5 2.Rd7‡, 1...e×f4 2.B×f4‡ but 1...e4!

1.S×f6! [2.Qc6‡] 1...Sd5 2.Se8‡, 1...Bd5 2.B×e5‡, 1...Bd7 2.B×e5‡, 1...Rf3,Rb6 2.R(×)b6‡

First-time presentation of a 4×2 Zagoruiko with this well-known arrangement around the bK (Country) 4×2 Zagoruiko. Elegant construction with no white pawns (IND) Compared to A04, and the Slesarenko predecessor, we find this 4×2 Zagoruiko closer to the predecessor and inferior to A04 due to the use of only 2 thematic defences. On the positive side, the use of wBh2 & bPe5 for one of the refutations and a thematic mate in the solution is excellent (ISR) The third example of a thematic Zagoruiko 4×2. The double threat in the first try and technical pieces (wRb7, wBh1) make it inferior to A04 and A59 (SRB)

8<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points, not counting for the country) A84:

Peter Gvozdják, Štefan Sovík, Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemanič (Slovakia)

1.Sd7? [2.Rf4,Qf4‡] 1...Be5 2.Sc5‡, 1...e5 2.Sf6‡, 1...R×f3 2.B×f3‡, 1...B×e3 2.Sf6‡ but 1...Q×e2! 1.S5c4? [2.Rf4,Qf4‡] 1...Be5 2.Qd3‡, 1...e5 2.Qd5‡, 1...R×f3 2.B×f3‡, 1...B×e3 2.Qd3‡ but 1...Se5! 1.Sd1? [2.Rf4‡] 1...Be3 2.Sc3‡, 1...Se3 2.Sf2‡, 1...R×f3 2.e×f3‡, 1...B×e5 2.Sf2‡ but 1...Sd2! **1.S3c4!** [2.Rf4‡] 1...Be3 2.Qd3‡, 1...Se3 2.Sd2‡, 1...R×f3 2.e×f3‡, 1...B×e5 2.Qd3‡, 1...Sd2 2.S×d2‡ Twomover of the future: 2-phase changed mates after moves of wSe5, yet another 2-phase changed mates after moves of wSe3; four phases, four thematic defences, plus non-thematic changes after capturing defences (Country) Two thematic squares with 2+2 thematic defences and 2+2 changed mates (IND) Two thematic squares with two phases relevant to each of them. Thus, there are two pairs of mate changes, and an additional change on 1...Rxf3 that connects the two pairs in an interesting way (ISR)

8<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points) A03: Valery Kopyl, Vasil Krizhanivsky (Ukraine)

1.Sf6? [2.Rf5‡] 1...Sce4 2.Sd5‡, 1...Sge4 2.Sh5‡ but 1...Bd3!

1.Sc5? [2.Rf5‡] 1...Sce4 2.Qe3‡, 1...Sge4 2.e3‡, 1...Bd3 2.S×d3‡, 1...Rh4 2.R×h4‡ but 1...R×g5!

1.Sef2! [2.Rf5‡] 1...Sce4 2.Qf3‡, 1...Sge4 2.Rf3‡, 1...Bd3 2.S×d3‡

Zagoruiko; in the try 1.Sc5? and the solution 1.Sef2!, mates are delivered on the same squares (e3 and f3 respectively) by different white units (Country) Zagoruiko. Mates on same squares in two phases (IND) The changes in the try 1.Sc5? and the solution are original and fresh, but the play in the try 1.Sf6? is on similar lines to many previous problems, weakening the entire concept. The relatively high score is given on the originality of the two phases mentioned. Although A19 is an Israeli composition, comparison must be made. The use of 1.Sf6? try with the banal wS mates compared to unified phases in A19 is a significant difference (ISR) Two wonderfully united phases, with mates on the same squares prepared by line closing first moves, and line opening defences (SRB) Three-phase changed mates after two defences. A nice addition of mates from the same square is shown in only two phases out of three (SVK)



8<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points) A23: Wolfgang Gäb (Germany)

1.Bg8? [2.Sd3‡] 1...Q×c5 2.S×c4‡, 1...Qd5 2.f4‡, 1...S×c5 2.Q×d4‡, 1...Sd5 2.R×f5‡ but 1...b×c5!

1.Se6! [2.Q×c7‡] 1...Qc5 2.f4‡, 1...Q×d5 2.S×c4‡, 1...Sc5 2.e×d4‡, 1...S×d5,Sc8 2.Sc6‡, 1...R×e6 2.Q×e6‡, 1...c5 2.b8=Q‡

Reciprocally changed mates and 2 × changed mates (four changed mates in total). WCCT theme 2×2 and fifth square occupation (Country) Two thematic squares. Reciprocal changes. Two additional changes for non-thematic defences (IND) An interesting realization of the well-known reciprocal changes mechanism. The weak refutation, which can be avoided (e.g. move bPb6 to a7 and add a bPg4), reduced the score (ISR) Two pairs of variations on two thematic squares produce a 2×4 change, including a known mechanism of reciprocal change. Excellent construction, except for the brutal refutation 1...bxc5! (SRB)

8<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points) A53: Michel Caillaud, Jean-Marc Loustau, Gérard Doukhan (France)

1.Sg4? [2.B×e4,Be6‡] 1...e5 2.Sg×f6‡, 1...Re5 2.Qd2‡ but 1...Be5!

1.S×c4? [2.B×e4,Be6‡] 1...Re5 2.Qd3‡, 1...Be5 2.Scb6‡ but 1...e5!

1.S×c6? [2.B×e4‡] 1...Be5 2.S×e7‡, 1...e5 2.Se7‡, 1...K×c6 2.a8=Q‡ but 1...Re5!

1.Sd3! [2.B×e4,Be6‡] 1...Re5 2.Sf4‡, 1...e5 2.S×f6‡, 1...Be5 2.Sb6‡

Zagoruiko split in 4 phases (all in all, 6 changed mates). In the tries, cycle of thematic black defences and refutations (Country) Cyclic refutations with 8/9 mates (IND) Zagoruiko split over 4 phases. The changes on 1...Re5 are refreshing and those on 1...e5 are more standard, with the S mate on e7 notable. All in all, a good problem and here we are somehow less bothered with the double threat (ISR) A very ambitious intention to show the 4×3 theme in four phases and three variations, which are refuting the three tries. However, the attempt is not fully successful as the mate 2.S(×)e7 occurs twice in the try 1.S×c6? (SVK)

12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (6,8 points) A67: Stefan Parzuch (Poland)

1.Bh6? [2.Qf6‡] but 1...g5!

1.Bf4? [2.Qf6‡] but 1...Shg5!

1.Be3? [2.Qf6‡] but 1...Rg5!

1.Bd2? [2.Qf6‡] but 1...Sfg5!

1.Bc1! [2.Qf6‡] 1...Shg5 2.Qf4‡, 1...Sfg5 2.Rd5‡, 1...Rg5 2.Se3‡, 1...g5 2.Qh7‡

20 thematic moves, 5 phases, defences and refutations on same square, option (Country) Four line closing/square block tries (IND) Three self-interferences and one obstruction by the try moves. This looks different from the predecessors but the effects are similar. It is nice that the c1-h6 diagonal is fully exploited (ISR) Four tries by a single white unit refuted by four different black units (SVK)



12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (6,8 points, not counting for the country) A02:

Petro Novitsky, Mikola Chernyavsky (Ukraine)

1.Sf7? [2.Qd6‡] 1...Sde5 2.Sb6‡, 1...Sce5 2.Se7‡ but 1...e5!

1.Sg6? [2.Qd6‡] 1...Sce5 2.Sge7‡, 1...e5 2.g8=Q‡ but 1...Sde5!

1.Sg4? [2.Qd6‡] 1...e5 2.Bf7‡, 1...Sde5 2.Sf6‡ but 1...Sce5!

1.Sd3! [2.Qd6‡] 1...Sde5 2.R×c5‡, 1...Sce5 2.Sb4‡, 1...e5 2.Bf7‡, 1...e×d3 2.Q×c4‡

Multi-phase change of mates, cycle of defences and refutations (Country) Cyclic refutations with 8/9 mates (IND) On similar lines as A01 with just one unique change mate 1.Sg6? e5 2.g8=Q‡ changed from 2.Bf7‡. All the rest are well known mate changes combined here with the thematic defences being refutations to the three tries. The ingenious use of the wQ mate and interference-tries in A01 makes a big change (ISR) A very ambitious intention to show the 4×3 theme in four phases and three variations, which are refuting the three tries. However, the attempt is not fully successful as the mate 2.Bf7 repeats after 1...e5 in two phases (SVK)

14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points) A42: Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic)

\* 1...f3 2.Qh2‡, 1...Rh1 2.e×f4‡

1.Qh2? [2.Qh8‡] 1...Rh1 2.Q×f4‡, 1...Bf7 2.Qh5‡, but 1...Bh3!

1.S×f4? [2.Qd6‡] 1...Bd5 2.Rg5‡, 1...d5 2.R×e6‡, but 1...Rd1!

1.Sb6? [2.Qd6‡] 1...Bd5 2.S×d7‡, 1...d5 2.B×c7‡ but 1...Bf7!

1.Se7! [2.Qd6‡] 1...Bd5 2.Rf5‡, 1...d5 2.S×c6‡, 1...Rd1 2.e×f4‡

Zagoruiko of thematic moves (Country) This Zagoruiko rendering blends a few knight mates with fresh mates and good refutations, making it an original combination (ISR)

14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points) A49: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

1.Sf3? [2.Qd3‡] 1...Qd4 2.Sg5‡ but 1...Rd4!

1.Sb3? [2.Qd3‡] 1...Rd4 2.Sc5‡ but 1...Qd4!

1.S×f5? [2.Qd3‡] 1...Rd4 2.S×c3‡, 1...Qd4 2.Rh4‡, 1...R×f5+ 2.Q×f5‡ but 1...Rd8!

1.Se2! [2.Qd3‡] 1...Rd4 2.Se×c3‡, 1...Qd4 2.S×g3‡, 1...Rd8 2.Q×f5‡

Four thematic phases in which the two black thematic moves serve as defences allowing change of mates in a form of split Zagoruiko (1+1+2+2) and also appear as refutations of two tries (1.Sf3? and 1.Sb3?) (Country) One mate, in this split Zagoruiko, deviates from the standard knight-mates. Good use of the self-pin try (ISR) The dual avoidance after self-pinning is a nice detail (SRB)



14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points) A29: C.G.S. Narayanan (India)

1.Se~? [2.Qd4‡] but 1...Re5!

1.S×d3? [2.Qd4‡] 1...Re5 2.Rd6‡, 1...Be5 2.Q×g2‡, but 1...R×d3!

1.Sg4? [2.Qd4‡] 1...Re5 2.Sf6‡, 1...Be5 2.Se3‡ (2.Q×g2??) but 1...Rf6! (2.Q×g2??)

**1.Sf3!** [2.Qd4‡] 1...Re5 2.Sc7‡, 1...Be5 2.e4‡ (2.Q×g2?), 1...Rc4 2.b×c4‡, 1...Re4 2.Be6‡, 1...Rf6 2.e4‡ White correction. Zagoruiko of the thematic moves (with five interferences and one self-block). Tertiary correction play by the wS interfering with the wQ bent line g7-g2-d5 (Country) Close to a Grimshaw-Zagoruiko but for one mate in the 1.Sg4? try. The mate 2.Q×g2 is nicely prevented in two phases. The try 1.Sg4? features very generic content while 1.S×d3? has a very bad refutation. Presentation as white correction shows the need to actively provide for 1...Re5 (ISR) White correction of 3<sup>rd</sup> degree and a thematic Zagoruiko with 5 out of six mates using black interferences. The refutation of the 1.S×d3? try could have been less brutal (SRB)

14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points, not counting for the country) A75: Dragan Stojnić (Serbia)

1.S~? (1.Sb6?) [2.Re4‡] 1...Rd5 2.Q×e3‡, 1...d5 2.Bc7‡ but 1...Sd5!

1.S×e3!? [2.Re4‡] 1...Sd5 2.Q×f5‡ but 1...Rd5! (2.Q×e3??)

1.Sc7!? [2.Re4‡] 1...Sd5 2.R×e6‡ but 1...d5! (2.Bc7??)

1.Se7!? [2.Re4‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sg6‡ (2.Q×f5?), 1...B×c4 2.Sg6‡, but 1...Bd5+! (2.Sg6?)

1.Sb4! [2.Re4‡] 1...Sd5 2.S×d3‡, 1...Rd5 2.Q×e3‡, 1...d5 2.Bc7‡, 1...Rd4 2.c×d4‡, 1...Rg5 2.Q×f4‡ Quadruple white correction with 4×1 change after primary refutation, and 4 thematic refutations on d5 by different black units (S, R, P and B) (Country) Cyclic refutations with 5/9 mates. White correction (IND) Several interesting elements in this white correction problem, but it would have been great if the phase 1.Se7? could have been the solution with four thematic defences (ISR)

18th-20th Place (6,4 points) A78: Luis Gómez Palazón (Spain)

1.Sf6? [2.R×c4‡] 1...Sd5 2.R×e4‡, 1...Bd5 2.R×d3‡ but 1...d5!

1.Se7? [2.R×c4‡] 1...Bd5 2.Sf5‡, 1...d5 2.Sc6‡ but 1...Sd5!

1.Sf4? [2.R×c4‡] 1...d5 2.Se6‡, 1...Sd5 2.Se2‡ but 1...Bd5!

1.Sc7! [2.R×c4‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sb5‡, 1...Bd5 2.B×e5‡, 1...d5 2.Se6‡

Distributed Zagoruiko, cyclic defences and refutations, anticipatory obstruction, defences on same square, triple Kharkov 2 (Country) Cyclic refutations with 8/9 mates (IND) Another realization of the Schneider matrix (A02a) with small differences (ISR) A very ambitious intention to show the  $4\times3$  theme in four phases and three variations, which are refuting the three tries. However, the attempt is not fully successful as the mate 2.Se6 repeats after 1...d5 in two phases (SVK)



18th-20th Place (6,4 points) A17: Dimitris Liakos (Greece)

1.Sf4? [2.Q×d6‡] 1...Qd5 2.Sg6‡, 1...Sd5 2.Sd3‡ but 1...Bd5!

1.Sb6? [2.Q×d6‡] 1...Sd5 2.Sc4‡, 1...Bd5 2.Sd7‡ but 1...Qd5!

1.Sdf6? [2.Q×d6‡] 1...Bd5 2.Sd7‡, 1...Qd5 2.Sg4‡ but 1...Sd5!

1.Se7! [2.Q×d6‡] 1...Qd5 2.Sg6‡, 1...Sd5 2.S×c6‡, 1...Bd5 2.R×f5‡

Cyclic refutations with 7/9 mates (IND) The main difference from A02a is the use of the bQ as thematic piece (instead of bP). Again, the originality here is not on the high end (ISR) Four phases with three variations, but far too many repeated mates (SVK)

18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Place (6,4 points) A73: Klaus Baumann (Germany)

1.e×d5? [2.Qa4‡ A, 2.Se6‡ B] 1...Re4 2.Rd3‡ C, 1...Be4+ 2.Rf3‡ D, 1...R×e5 2.Qa4‡ A, 2.R×e5‡ E 1...S×e5 2.Se6‡ B, 2.R×e5‡ E but 1...Sc5!

1.e×d6! [2.Rd3‡ C, 2.Rf3‡ D] 1...Re5 2.Qa4‡ A, 1...Se5 2.Se6‡ B, 1...R×e4 2.Rd3‡ C, 2.R×e4‡ F 1...B×e4+ 2.Rf3‡ D, 2.R×e4‡ F

WCCT theme 2×2; Odessa-theme; 2 × cycle threat/mate with double threat/double mate in variation play; dual avoiding square occupations (Country) Two thematic squares with two defences each showing the Odessa theme (IND) An interesting realization of the theme. We like the line opening mechanism leading to the threats by the wQ in the try and the wR in the solution. We regard the mentioned variations on e5 in the try and on e4 in the solution as non-defences, there is threat separation in both cases but at the price of duals (ISR) A highly original composition. Four thematic mates create the Odessa theme with different defences. The variations from one phase, instead of changing the mate in another phase, are just allowing a questionable dual mate (SVK)

21<sup>st</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place

- A09 (6,3 points): C.G.S. Narayanan (India) Threat correction in two tries and solution. Changed
  mates of the thematic defences in three phases. Reappearance of both threats of the tries in the
  solution (Country) Threat correction combined with the thematic content. The reappearance of
  Q×d5 threat as mate on a thematic defence is very good, while the other try threat reappears
  after a non-thematic defence. Good mate changes and fresh combination (ISR)
- A19 (6,3 points): Paz Einat (Israel) In the two tries and the solution, the first move makes an interference that is exploited for the two thematic mates. The two thematic defences are line opening. The white Rc8 is active in the solution, preventing 1...S×d4 (Country) Zagoruiko. Both tries and the key close a black line which is used for the mates after the thematic defences (IND) All 6 mates are based on line closing first moves in this unique thematic Zagoruiko, suffering only from the brutal refutation 1...Q×f6 (SRB)

23rd-27th Place

- A16 (6,2 points): Ivo Tominić (Croatia) Zagoruiko of thematic moves and four pin-mates after moves of the black half-pin (Country) An original Zagoruiko exploiting a variety of effects, including a half-pin. Although there are various pin-mates, the overall unity is not high (ISR)
- A33 (6,2 points): Stefano Mariani (Italy) Rukhlis in extended form (3 phases), 2 of which (try and solution) are thematic. In the setplay, both mates benefit from the pre-existing Nowotny-like interference on the thematic square e4. Setplay blends nicely with the WCCT thematic phases: both keys remove the set Nowotny interference on e4, preparing for thematic Grimshaw interferences to appear on the same square in both try and solution. Flight-giving key. In both try and solution, the W1 move key opens the line of wBb1 towards f5, threatening mates that will close white lines. Defence 1...d5 in setplay returns as refutation of the try. Threat 2.Bf6 in try returns as mate in solution after 1...S×d6 (Country) Extended Rukhlis. Grimshaw. Threat correction (IND) Gradual Rukhlis and a flight-giving key. Too simple thematically, but a very likable problem with two different threats and return of the threat of the first try as mate in the solution (ISR) Threat correction with theme A and two pairs of Grimshaw interferences (SRB)
- A38 (6,2 points): Kabe Moen (United States) The theme is shown in an Albino setting with great economy and without technical pieces (Country) Fine economical Albino showing the theme with much clarity (ISR) A light and pleasant combination with the Albino theme (SRB)
- A50 (6,2 points): Jean-Marc Loustau, Gérard Doukhan (France) Ellerman-Makihovi theme (phases 1.Se2, 1.Sa2, 1.Sb5 which are the thematic phases for WCCT); Phases 1.Se2, 1.Se4, 1.Sb5 are tertiary corrections of primary try 1.Sf1 and secondary try 1.Sa2; Three paradoxical Anti-Nowotny keys, followed by matching Grimshaw, with changed mates; Rudenko theme (phases 1.Bb6 and 1.Sb5); Three white obstructions by Sc3; The white queen gives 6 mates; No white pawns (Country) White tertiary correction. Ellerman-Makihovi and Rudenko themes (IND) Very good try play, including tertiary white correction. Reappearance of the threats of 1.Bb6? as mates in the solution (but also as dual mates in 1.Se2?). Two mate changes between Sa2? and 1.Sb5! with 1.Se2? being a kind of Makihovi, nonetheless they are duals in a thematic phase (ISR)
- A83 (6,2 points): Henk Prins (Netherlands) Zagoruiko (Country) An elegant Zagoruiko stepping out to some extent from the known elements. The solution with the self-pin and unpin battery mate is fine, and the additional change on 1...f×g3 adds good content (ISR)

28th-35th Place

- A06 (6 points, not counting for the country): C.G.S. Narayanan (India) White correction play by the wB (to provide for 1...Sd4). Three defences on d4. Changed mate for Sd4 from try to solution. Cyclic refutations on the same square (Country) Black correction play, but with symmetrical elements (Be3? Be5?) that are broken by the key. One changed mate (ISR)
- A07 (6 points): Marco Guida (Italy) A total of 5 phases, each showing 3 × the theme, triggered by wSe4 searching for a suitable arrival square; Zagoruiko across tries 1.Sf6?, 1.Sd2? and solution. All Zagoruiko variations are thematic. All mates given by a wS. Tries 1.Sf6?, 1.Sd2? fail due to obstruction by wS of white lines. In tries 1.Sg5? and 1.Sc5?, the thematic mates A and B are played by the same wS that plays mates A and B in the try 1.Sd2?, and on the same arrival squares. However, in the try 1.Sd2?, the departure square is different vs. the tries 1.Sg5? and 1.Sc5?. Three-fold cycle of thematic defences and refutations. In the try 1.Sd2? and in the solution, all thematic defences return as variations (Country) Cyclic refutation with 7/9 mates. Zagoruiko (IND) While different thematic pieces are used here, the similarity to the predecessors mentioned for A01 (and others) is clear, but this is clearly less good than A01 as it shows only a rather standard Zagoruiko. Also, the added try 1.Sd2? comes with a rather crude refutation (ISR)
- A20 (6 points): Michael Lipton (Great Britain) Multiple tries, changed and transferred mates in 7 thematic phases, involving 3 squares vacated by W1 move and then occupied by Black, with correction play by the wS (Country) Three thematic squares. 5 changed and 4 transferred mates (IND) A task using checking keys. The transfers are really trivial, but the changes are fine. This

cannot get a higher score (ISR) Witty, and grotesque play. The try 1.S×c7+? contains major duals after 1...Rcd5/Red5 (SRB)

- A36 (6 points): Cornel Pacurar (Canada) Four line closing/square block tries (IND) Four thematic moves with four line-closing try moves; this is rather close to the predecessors (ISR) Four tries by a single white unit refuted by four different black units (SVK)
- A44 (6 points, not counting for the country): Jean-Marc Loustau, Gérard Doukhan (France) Tertiary white correction (3<sup>rd</sup> degree). 2 changed mates on thematic defences (Country) Tertiary white correction and two changed mates (IND) Good realization with tertiary white correction and two mate changes. Heavy construction for such a content (ISR)
- A54 (6 points): John Rice (Great Britain) Each of White's 4 tries is defeated by a different one of Black's thematic replies; only the key provides mates to follow all 4 of them (Country) Cyclic refutations with 9/16 mates. Checking tries and key (IND) The key introduces three changes, which gives some justification for the use of checking keys. Still, this is inferior to other ways to show the theme (ISR)
- A72 (6 points, not counting for the country): John Rice (Great Britain) Each try provides for 2 of the 3 thematic defences (Country) Cyclic refutations with 7/9 mates (IND) Another realization of the Schneider matrix (A02a) with small differences (ISR)
- A79 (6 points): Imanol Zurutuza, Miguel Uris (Spain) Kharkov 2, Ahues, defences on the same square, knight option, Umnov defences, Somov B2, changed mates, 5 refutations on the same thematic square made by five different units (Country) Cyclic refutations with 5/9 mates (IND) There are three thematic refutations and two additional, non-thematic ones, capturing wSe5. The overall play is less interesting than that of other entries (ISR)

36<sup>th</sup> Place

 A08 (5,8 points, not counting for the country): Rainer Paslack (Germany) WCCT theme × 2, play on 5 lines, changed mates using the Ahues mechanism (type III) with dual avoidance and theme F effect (Country) 3+2 changed mates (IND) Fine dual avoidance that makes the known mate changes more interesting. Overall, it is less complex than other problems that are on similar lines (ISR)

37<sup>th</sup> Place

 A05 (5,7 points): Mark Erenburg (Israel) Three thematic defences, acting twice as refutations. Overall, 12 thematic moves. Zagoruiko spread over 4 phases (Country) 3×2 changes in 4 phases (IND)

38<sup>th</sup>-42<sup>nd</sup> Place

- A32 (5,6 points): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) 24 defences with the set theme, cycle of five defences and refutations, choice of key, change function move, 1 × Rukhlis, Bristol key (Country) 5 line closing/square block tries of which 4 are thematic (IND) Adding only one more non-thematic defence compared to the predecessor, so the originality is low (ISR)
- A37 (5,6 points): Marek Drejak (Poland) 15 thematic moves, 5 phases, defences on same square, refutations on same square, option, Bartolovic (Country) Cyclic refutations with 4/9 mates. Two more changes shown with an additional try and repeated refutation (IND) The use of the bQ differentiates it from the predecessors, but the wS mates are all well-known and there's only one mate that differs (ISR) Pity that the wBa8 has no role in the solution (SRB)
- A40 (5,6 points): Janne Syväniemi (Finland) Change of mates (Country) White pawn-batteries with two changed mates (IND) Unique thematic bK defence, but overall rather simple (ISR) Both thematic defences on the threat square, wP correction play (SRB)
- A48 (5,6 points): Martin Hoffmann (Switzerland) Leontieva Grimshaw with thematic tries (Country) Masked black Grimshaw with thematic tries (IND) Amusing Grimshaw with good thematic tries blocking the mating lines (ISR) A pair of phases with anticipatory interferences (SRB)

A66 (5,6 points, not counting for the country): Nikola Stolev, Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Four thematic phases in which the two black thematic moves serve as defences allowing change of mates in a form of split Zagoruiko (1+1+2+2) and also appear as refutations of two tries (1.Sc7? and 1.Sb6?) (Country) Three changed mates each for two defences (IND) Three times the mate 1...d5 2.Qa7 is prevented and twice a new mate is provided. Similar to A01 in this respect but obviously less good, as A01 has a third thematic defence and more changes (ISR)

43<sup>rd</sup>-45<sup>th</sup> Place

- A25 (5,4 points): Kabe Moen (United States) Six-fold rendering of the theme without duals by the thematic pieces (Country) Six thematic defences (IND) Nothing new with such tasks of defences on the same square and the tries are a small addition (ISR) Six thematic variations in the solution seem to be the current record (SRB)
- A34 (5,4 points): Jorge M. Kapros (Argentina) Three transferred mates (Country) Three square block tries, with a transferred mate after each try (IND) As for A32 there are four thematic defences, but with the fourth try missing and adding some mate transfers (ISR)
- A61 (5,4 points): Charles Ouellet (Canada) Four line closing tries (IND) Four-fold line closing tries not deviating much from the A27a&b predecessors (especially A27b which has a very nice threat) (ISR)

46<sup>th</sup>-48<sup>th</sup> Place

- A43 (5,2 points): Suleyman Abdullayev (Azerbaijan) Transferred mates (Country) Two thematic squares (IND) The wS tries show thematic play on f3 (refutations and defences) while the solution has (unconvincing) thematic play on b4. There is no connection between the two systems (ISR) The connection between phases is additionally weakened by the passive wSf3 in the solution (SRB)
- A68 (5,2 points): Ljubomir Ugren (Slovenia) Three line closing/square block tries (IND) Two obstructions and one interference by the wR tries (ISR)
- A80 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Francesco Simoni (Italy) A total of 6 phases, 4 of which showing 2 × theme. Bartolovic theme across tries 1.Se6?, 1.Sf3? and solution: thematic defences b and c, are met by mates A/C D/C (change of mate A) A/E (change of mate C) respectively across the three phases. Pseudo-le Grand theme across try 1.S×c2? and solution 1.S×c6!, around thematic defence a and b and threats/mates A and B respectively (AaB BbA) 2 × Dombrovskis in inverted and condensed form across try 1.Bf4? (with double threat A/B, refuted by x!) and setplay, where after move x, both mates A and B are possible. Barnes theme: 1.Bf4? (threats A and B); 1.S×c2? (threat A); 1.Sf3? and 1.S×c6! (threat B) Rudenko theme (3 phases form): threats A and B after 1.Bf4? become mates after defences a and b, respectively in 1.S×c2? and 1.Se6?/1.S×c6! (Country) Two changed mates (IND) The play, with varied threats and a couple of changes, is interesting. The addition of the double-threat Dombrovskis unifies well with the thematic threats, as is the Barnes threat separation. Thematically, the problem is not as good as many other entries, but the added content elevates its score (ISR)

49th-52nd Place

- A21 (5 points): Andreas Schönholzer (Switzerland) Two changed mates after 1...Rf4. Three changed mates after 1...Bf4 (Country) 3+2 changed mates (IND) All the changes are well-known and apart from the nice refutations there is not much originality (ISR)
- A46 (5 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) Two thematic squares. Promotion try and key (IND) Nice exchange between threat and mate. The use of the royal battery breaks the symmetry but, overall, low on content (ISR)
- A47 (5 points): Aleksandr Kryuchkov (Slovenia) Zagoruiko (IND) Zagoruiko, but the nonthematic defences by the thematic pieces diminish the effect and the construction seems not ideal. The Grimshaw in the solution is well known (ISR)

• A86 (5 points): Janne Syväniemi, Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) Change of mate (Country) Two thematic squares with 2+2 thematic defences (IND) Two thematic squares splitting the well-known line play into two systems. This scheme is used by various entries for rich try play, not the case here (ISR)

#### 53<sup>rd</sup>-56<sup>th</sup> Place

- A10 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Miguel Uris (Spain) Laitinen; cycle of defences and refutations; knight option; Umnov defences on the same square; four refutations on the same thematic square, made by four different units; check-provoking key (Country) Three line closing/square block tries (IND) White correction play: the WS must avoid prevention of mates on the thematic defences. The flight-taking tries and key are a drawback even with the set mate (ISR) This difficult combination of three thematic defences on the threat square needed flighttaking key-moves and an inactive wBc8 in the solution (SRB)
- A14 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Charles Ouellet (Canada) Three line closing/square block tries (IND) This "do not interfere" problem has a nice change introduced by the solution on 1...Re5. The nice 1...e5 2.Qh3 is noteworthy. But, overall, the predecessor (*Herbert Ahues, 2<sup>nd</sup> Prize Die Schwalbe 1977, 2q2QB1/4p1R1/2p1N1r1/4pb2/2N5/B1Kp4/P3R3/rk5n*) has most elements of such an approach (ISR)
- A18 (4,8 points): Jorge J. Lois, Jorge M. Kapros (Argentina) Two thematic squares (IND) Two thematic squares are employed here, but with try crude refutation, well known play and not enough variety (ISR)
- A55 (4,8 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) White combinations; wS option (Country) Three square block tries (IND) Three tries with weakening effects all affecting the wQ. Too heavy for what it shows and lesser content than many other entries (ISR)

#### 57<sup>th</sup>-62<sup>nd</sup> Place

- A15 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Kabe Moen (United States) White knight correction play and three changed mates with great economy (Country) 3×2 changed mates (IND) This has some differences from the A02a predecessor, but in general most elements are there. The two different mates on the BP defence and the light construction provide the difference, but the completeness of A02a overshadows such attempts (ISR)
- A39 (4,6 points): Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) White correction, Somov B2 theme (Country) Incomplete cyclic refutations with 5/9 mates. Sec5 does not appear as refutation (IND) The repeating mate in 1.Sa4? and the solution makes this inferior to other problems (ISR)
- A52 (4,6 points): Suleyman Abdullayev (Azerbaijan) Three interferences including a B/P Grimshaw (IND) The b3 square is "squeezed" in as thematic, but is not linked to the play on c6 (ISR)
- A56 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Progressive reduction of refutations (Country) Three thematic squares with 2+3+2 thematic defences (IND) Three thematic squares, but with no real connection between them (apart for the thematic effect). This makes the threat reduction weak, more so as not all initial three refutations are thematic. The mate on 1...Rf4 in the solution is also weak (ISR)
- A58 (4,6 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Choice of threat (Country) Two thematic squares. Grimshaw changed to self-blocks without change of mate (IND) Two thematic squares with change of weakening motives of the play on c4. Not much interest apart from that point (ISR)
- A85 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Andreas Schönholzer (Switzerland) Try and solution realize the theme on different squares each (Country) Two thematic squares with 2+2 thematic defences (IND) Two thematic squares with constant play on the two thematic defences from the try (ISR)

63<sup>rd</sup> Place

• A60 (4,5 points, not counting for the country): Emanuel Navon (Israel) Two thematic defences over four phases. The thematic defences are refutations in the first two tries. Unique mate changes in the solution with a switchback. Additional change after the non-thematic 1...Rf4, which also appears as a refutation (Country) Two changed mates (IND)

64<sup>th</sup> Place

• A70 (4,4 points): Ovidiu Crăciun (Romania) Three thematic squares with 2+2+2 thematic defences (IND) Three thematic squares without any connection (try and key to the same square is not enough). WSc8 is not used in the solution (ISR)

65<sup>th</sup>-68<sup>th</sup> Place

- A27 (4,2 points, not counting for the country): Bogusz Piliczewski (Poland) 37 thematic moves, 8 phases, defences on same square, refutations on same square, white knight's wheel, option, cyclic duals (Country) Promising matrix with 5 defences but spoilt by unprovided checks, pinning key and triple threat after key (IND) This realization of this very well-known task adds a white knight wheel and has five thematic defences. However, the unprovided set check (1...Sd4+) is a major weakness (ISR)
- A51 (4,2 points): Tibor Érsek (Hungary) All black moves are thematic (Country) Three square block tries (IND) Well-known obstruction and interference tries, the scheme differs somewhat from the predecessor but not far enough in our opinion (ISR)
- A63 (4,2 points, not counting for the country): Grigory Atayants (Armenia) Pseudo-le Grand theme. Defence on the square from which a white pawn left in 3 variations (Country) Three thematic defences (IND) The thematic play in the solution is fine, but it is not complemented by much in the other phases (ISR)
- A81 (4,2 points): Ovidiu Cr**ă**ciun (Romania) Two line closing tries (IND) Only two thematic tries, two thematic defences and two other insignificant tries (ISR)

69<sup>th</sup>-70<sup>th</sup> Place

- A13 (4 points): Bent Martin Muus, Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) Try 1.8×f4? with two thematic defences. Try 1.Sd2? with black defences capturing the thematic albino-pawn on the thematic square. WCCT theme combined with Albino and white self-interference tries (Country) Albino in tries and key (IND) An attempt to produce a thematic WP4 (Albino), but with a clutter of unneeded additions. The entire construction seems non-optimal, this version is even worse than A12 (ISR)
- A82 (4 points): Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) White correction, Somov B2 theme (Country) Two thematic defences and tries (IND) A third thematic try with 1...Se5 refutation is missing in the scheme, making it unsuccessful (ISR)

71<sup>st</sup> Place

• A65 (3,8 points): Tibor Érsek (Hungary) Two thematic squares with 2+2 thematic defences (IND) The thematic play on the two squares is not connected (ISR)

72<sup>nd</sup>-73<sup>rd</sup> Place

- A45 (3,6 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Two changed mates (IND) Constant mate on 1...Se5, well known changes on 1...e5, differentiation between the thematic and non-thematic bB defences, but dual in the 1.Sd3? try (ISR)
- A57 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Gábor Tar (Hungary) Two thematic squares with 2+2 thematic defences. WSc8 idle post key (IND) Two thematic squares, but not unified and lacks interesting play (ISR)

74<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> Place

- A26 (3,4 points): Henk le Grand (Netherlands) Two thematic squares, but very heavy construction (IND) Two thematic squares but low content. WRh5 serves to prevent 1...S×f5 as a refutation; it would have been much better to seek for a mate on this defence (ISR)
- A71 (3,4 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of an Albino with two defences. The capture try is brutal (IND) Very weak (ISR)

76<sup>th</sup>-77<sup>th</sup> Place

- A62 (3,2 points, not counting for the country): Janne Syväniemi (Finland) Flight-giving key (Country) Two thematic defences (IND) Flight-giving key but very weak (ISR)
- A74 (3,2 points, not counting for the country): Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) Two defences with two changes and one with three (IND) Not only anticipated but the double refutation of the first try is unacceptable (ISR)

78<sup>th</sup> Place

• A28 (3 points, not counting for the country): Rolf Uppström (Sweden) Two thematic defences in the try (one as a refutation); two others in the solution (Country) Two thematic squares, but very heavy construction (IND) A very weak problem (ISR)

79<sup>th</sup> Place

• A31 (2 points, not counting for the country): Henk le Grand (Netherlands) Two thematic squares (IND) Very weak and with unused white pieces in the solution (ISR)

# Section A: Twomovers

Place	Country	No	GBR	IND	ISR	SRB	SVK	Total
1	SRB	A59	1,2	3,4	3,2		3,2	9,6
2	UKR	A04	1,8	3,2	3,4	3,0	3,2	9,4
3-4	SVK	A01	0,8	3,0	3,0	3,0		9,0
3-4	MKD	A76	2,6	3,2	3,2	3,2	2,4	9,0
5	SRB	A11	1,8	3,4	3,2		2,6	8,7
6	SWE	A35	1,0	3,0	2,8	3,0	2,2	8,0
7	SVK	A41	2,2	3,4	3,0	1,8		7,8
8-11	SVK	A84	2,0	2,8	2,8	1,8		7,2
8-11	UKR	A03	2,0	3,2	2,6	2,2	2,4	7,2
8-11	GER	A23	1,0	3,0	2,6	2,8	1,8	7,2
8-11	FRA	A53	1,6	2,8	3,0	1,2	2,8	7,2
12-13	POL	A67	1,0	2,6	2,4	2,0	2,4	6,8
12-13	UKR	A02	1,4	2,8	2,2	2,0	2,6	6,8
14-17	CZE	A42	1,6	3,0	2,8	1,2	2,2	6,6
14-17	MKD	A49	1,4	2,6	2,6	1,8	2,2	6,6
14-17	IND	A29	1,6		2,4	2,4	2,0	6,6
14-17	SRB	A75	1,0	2,4	2,8		2,0	6,6
18-20	ESP	A78	1,2	2,8	1,8	2,0	2,6	6,4
18-20	GRE	A17	1,4	2,6	2,4	1,6	2,4	6,4
18-20	GER	A73	0,8	2,2	2,4	1,8	2,6	6,4
21-22	ISR	A19	2,0	3,4		2,2	1,8	6,3
21-22	IND	A09	2,2		2,8	1,0	2,0	6,3
23-27	ITA	A33	1,0	3,6	2,4	1,6	2,2	6,2
23-27	USA	A38	1,4	3,0	2,4	2,4	1,4	6,2
23-27	FRA	A50	2,4	2,0	2,4	1,0	1,8	6,2
23-27	NED	A83	1,4	3,0	2,8	1,2	2,0	6,2
23-27	CRO	A16	1,4	3,0	2,8	1,4	2,0	6,2
28-35	GBR	A54		2,8	2,2	1,6	1,8	6,0
28-35	ESP	A79	1,8	2,2	2,0	1,4	2,2	6,0
28-35	CAN	A36	0,4	2,6	1,8	1,8	2,4	6,0
28-35	FRA	A44	0,6	2,6	2,4	1,4	2,2	6,0
28-35	GBR	A72		2,6	1,8	1,0	2,2	6,0
28-35	ITA	A07	1,8	3,2	2,2	1,8	2,0	6,0
28-35	IND	A06	2,0		2,2	2,0	2,0	6,0
28-35	GBR	A20		3,0	2,4	1,6	1,2	6,0
36	GER	A08	1,2	2,4	2,0	2,0	1,8	5,8
37	ISR	A05	1,6	2,4		1,8	2,0	5,7
38-42	POL	A37	1,2	2,8	2,2	1,2	2,2	5,6
38-42	CZE	A32	0,6	2,6	1,8	1,8	2,0	5,6
38-42	SUI	A48	0,8	2,4	2,4	1,4	1,8	5,6
38-42	MKD	A66	1,2	1,8	2,6	1,6	2,2	5,6
38-42	FIN	A40	0,8	2,8	2,0	1,6	2,0	5,6

43-45	ARG	A34	0,8	2,4	1,8	1,6	2,0	5,4
43-45	CAN	A61	0,6	2,6	1,8	1,6	2,0	5,4
43-45	USA	A25	1,2	2,6	1,6	1,8	2,0	5,4
46-48	ITA	A80	1,4	2,0	2,6	1,0	1,8	5,2
46-48	AZE	A43	1,6	2,0	1,8	0,8	1,8	5,2
46-48	SLO	A68	1,0	2,4	1,8	1,4	2,0	5,2
49-52	SLO	A47	0,8	3,0	2,2	0,6	2,0	5,0
49-52	SUI	A21	1,0	2,0	2,2	1,0	2,0	5,0
49-52	DEN	A46	1,0	2,0	2,2	1,0	2,0	5,0
49-52	FIN	A86	1,2	2,2	1,8	1,0	2,0	5,0
53-56	ESP	A10	1,0	1,8	2,0	0,8	2,2	4,8
53-56	CAN	A14	1,0	2,0	2,2	1,0	1,8	4,8
53-56	ARG	A18	1,0	2,8	1,8	0,8	2,0	4,8
53-56	ARM	A55	1,0	2,4	1,8	1,0	2,0	4,8
57-62	LTU	A39	1,0	2,6	1,8	1,0	1,8	4,6
57-62	AZE	A52	1,2	2,0	1,6	1,0	1,8	4,6
57-62	CZE	A56	0,8	3,0	1,8	1,2	1,6	4,6
57-62	USA	A15	1,0	1,8	2,0	1,0	1,8	4,6
57-62	ARM	A58	0,6	2,6	1,8	0,8	2,0	4,6
57-62	SUI	A85	1,0	2,0	1,8	0,8	1,8	4,6
63	ISR	A60	0,8	2,2		1,2	1,8	4,5
64	ROU	A70	1,0	2,0	1,4	0,8	2,0	4,4
65-68	HUN	A51	0,8	2,4	1,8	1,2	1,2	4,2
65-68	POL	A27	0,4	2,0	1,8	0,6	1,8	4,2
65-68	ARM	A63	1,2	1,4	1,8	0,8	1,6	4,2
65-68	ROU	A81	1,2	1,4	2,0	0,6	1,6	4,2
69-70	LTU	A82	1,0	1,6	1,8	0,8	1,4	4,0
69-70	DEN	A13	1,4	2,0	1,2	0,8	1,4	4,0
71	HUN	A65	0,6	1,8	1,4	0,4	2,2	3,8
72-73	SWE	A45	0,8	1,8	1,8	0,6	1,0	3,6
72-73	HUN	A57	0,6	1,8	1,4	0,6	1,6	3,6
74-75	NED	A26	0,6	1,2	1,6	0,6	1,6	3,4
74-75	GRE	A71	0,4	1,6	1,4	0,6	1,4	3,4
76-77	FIN	A62	0,6	1,4	1,4	0,6	1,2	3,2
76-77	LTU	A74	0,6	2,4	1,2	0,6	1,4	3,2
78	SWE	A28	0,8	1,8	1,0	0,4	1,2	3,0
79	NED	A31	0,4	1,6	0,6	0,4	1,0	2,0
	DEN	A12	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0

The original points of A12 are: GBR = 1,0 - IND = 1,8 - ISR = 1,4 - SRB = 0,6 - SVK = 1,2. The country submitted A12 and A13 as versions. According to the rules, only the highest-graded version is kept in the award and may score points for that country.

# SECTION B: THREEMOVERS

Judging countries: India, Netherlands, North Macedonia, Sweden, Switzerland

Theme (proposed by Slovakia): Changed mates in sub-variations (variations on Black's second move) in the solution. There must be at least two sub-variations with changed mates between at least two variations on Black's first move. The threat may be one of those first-move variations.



1<sup>st</sup> Place (11,4 points) B57: Peter Gvozdják, Štefan Sovík (Slovakia) 1.b8=S! waiting

1...Ke3 2.Be5 b4/q5/f×q4/e×d3 3.Sc4/S×f5/R×e4/Bd4‡

1...Kd5 2.e3 b4/g5/f×g4/e×d3 3.Bc4/R×f5/B×e4/Rd4‡

1...b4 2.Se6+ (2.Sb5+?, 2.Sc6+?) Ke3/Kd5 3.Sc4/Bc4‡

1...g5 2.S×b5+ (2.Sc6+?, Se6+?) Ke3/Kd5 3.S×f5/R×f5‡

1...f×g4 2.Sc6+ (2.Se6+?, 2.Sb5+?) Ke3/Kd5 3.R×e4/B×e4‡

Adabashev synthesis of two thematic systems:  $2\times4$  changed play (if bK moves first) and  $3\times2$  changed play (if bPs move first). Both parts are connected by repetition of 5 defences at 1st as well as at 2nd moves, and also by repetition of 6 mates. Cyclic dual avoidance in white checking moves and formal cycle of types of units mating on c4-f5-e4. Altogether  $(2\times4) + (3\times2) = 14$  thematic elements (Country) A wonderful problem with two intertwined sets of variations with the white and black moves recurring in both sets. Four pairs of mates occur on the same squares (c4, d4, e4, f5). Most harmonious and lyrical (IND) 8 + 6 thematic mates in a light setting deserve a high score (MKD) Four changed mates combined with a  $3\times2$  Zagoruiko with mates on the same square is a very good rendering of the theme. Economical construction, but the key is a bit weak (NED)  $2\times4$  plus  $3\times2$  thematic mates. One pair of variations has four pairs of mates on the same square, using the bK's position to differentiate them (the same idea as in B51). Incredibly, that motif has been combined with three variations with different mates after the two bK moves, with a kind of dual avoidance in W2: the wS that isn't needed for one of the mates must check. All this in a harmonious and economical setting. A masterpiece (SWE)  $5 \times$  Povenets theme! Two systems woven into an Adabashev synthesis with the highest level of aesthetics (SUI)

2<sup>nd</sup> Place (10,6 points) B03: Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia)

1.f×e5! [2.e×f6+ Kc4/Ke4 3.Rb4/Qe6‡]

- 1...B×d6 2.e×d6+ Kc4/Ke4 3.Rb4/Qe6‡
- 1...Rg5 2.Sc7+ Kc4/Ke4 3.Qe6/Qc6‡
- 1...a5 2.c×b6+ Kc4/Ke4 3.Qc6/Rf4‡
- 1...d×c3 2.d×e7+ Kc4/Ke4 3.Rf4/Rb4‡
- 1...Kc4 2.Qc6 [3.Rb4,c×b6‡] d×c3 3.Rf4‡
- 1...Ke4 2.Qe6 [3.Rf4,e×f6‡] f×e5 3.Q×e5‡
- 1...f×e5 2.R×e5+ Kc4 3.Rb4‡

Pioneer orthodox threemover showing a fourfold cyclic Zagoruiko. Reappearance of all four white thematic moves in the by-play, and a time-split reciprocal change between rook-variation sub-variations on B2 and king-variations on B1 (Country) A symmetrical but miraculous matrix to achieve a 4×2 Rice cycle in an orthodox threemover for the first time. Driven by line openings (e6-e4, c6-c4, b4-f4), flight guards (b5, f5), white pawn-batteries (f5-d5, b5-d5, d7-d5). The thematic black and white moves reappear on B1 and W2. WBh8 is needed only in the byplay variation f×e5 (IND) Extraordinary cycle of moves with additional "pattern" play (MKD) This cyclic 4×2 Zagoruiko is very good and the by-play is fine. The unprovided flights in the diagram position and the uneconomical wBh7 and wSe8 are a pity (NED) A 4×2 Rice cycle (cyclic Zagoruiko) is an admirable achievement, but the matrix is symmetric with underused white bishops. The neatest part is the line-opening in two opposite directions by d×c3 (SWE) Spectacular tour de force. The strong keys and partial symmetry are easily forgiven (SUI)

3<sup>rd</sup> Place (10,4 points) B42: Marcel Tribowski, Michael Schreckenbach (Germany)

- 1.Rb7! [2.Sg7+ Kd6 3.Rd7‡]
- 1...Bc7 2.Qd6+ R×d6/B×d6 3.Sf4/Sg7‡
- 1...Rd7 2.Rd6+ R×d6/B×d6 3.Sg7/Qa2‡
- 1...c×b5 2.R×b6+ Rd6/Bd6 3.Qa2/Sf4‡
- 1...Rd4+ 2.S×d4+ Kd6 3.Rd7‡

Rice cycle (cyclic Zagoruiko) (Country) 3×2 Rice cycle with black/white Bristol clearances, half Nowotny, self-blocks, self-pins and diagonal-orthogonal correspondence (IND) Rice cycle with an excellent key, outstanding construction and rich strategy, involving bicolour Bristol after 1...Bc7/Rd7 and self-pinning after 1...c×b5 (MKD) This is a very clear example of a 3×2 cyclic Zagoruiko. Rich content: mixed Bristol clearances, interferences and pin-mates. Good key (NED) 3×2 variations in the form of a Rice cycle. Black Bristols are used as a central part of the mechanism. The third variation 1...cxb5 comes in fairly naturally even though it is different in several aspects. The white economy is good, although Rd1 only works in one variation (SWE) Top notch! Very elegant presentation with concise Bristols (SUI)



4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Place (10,2 points) B24: Sre**ć**ko Radovi**ć** (Serbia) 1.Kb6! [2.Sf6+ Kd6/K×f6/Kf4/Kd4 3.Sc8/Bc3/Sh5/Sc6‡] 1...g3 2.S×g5+ Kd6/Kf6/Kf4/Kd4 3.Sf7/S×h7/Re4/Sf3‡

1...a×b4 2.Sd6+ K×d6/Kf6/Kf4/Kd4 3.B×b4/Sg8/Sg6/Sb5‡

1...Sc~ 2.Sc5+ Kd6/Kf6/Kf4/Kd4 3.Sb7/Sd7/S(×)d3/Re4‡

1...Kd4 2.Sc6+ K×d5 3.Rd8‡

1...Kf4 2.Sg3 [3.Sg6,Sh5‡] Sf6/Sf8 3.Sg6/Sh5‡

Thematic Zagoruiko 4×4 after bK-star; Task record (Country) 4×4 changes after bK-star flights. Symmetric. Light construction (IND) *"Standing on the shoulders of giants"* [I. Newton] such as B24a, B24b (MKD) Impressive task with a combination of 4×4 Zagoruiko and star-flights. The repetition of 3.Re4‡ is a minor flaw, but this is sufficiently compensated by two of the flights being granted in the thematic variations (NED) The best of several entries with traditional Siers play, with 4×4 mates after bK star-flights. Some mates are given by Se7 rather than Se4, so Siers is more of a tool than a theme. The key is excellent (note that 1.Kc6? doesn't solve) and the economy is excellent. But the originality is limited: the comparison problem B24b may have only 3×4 mates, but B24a even has 5×4 (with some repetitions - but if we disregard the 1...Bd1 variation, it is a clean 4×4 Zagoruiko. So, this B24 is not really a task record - but a fine problem anyway (SWE) Precision clockwork in extraordinary economy (SUI)

4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> Place (10,2 points, not counting for the country) B51: Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia)

1.R×d6! [2.Qe6+ Kd4 3.R×d5,Q×d5‡ (2.Re6+? Kd4!, 2.R×d5+? Ke4!)]

1...Kd4 2.Re6 (2.Qe6? B×d6+!) b5/R×c3/Rd3/Re3/S1~/S3~/d×c4

 $3.B \times c5/d \times c3/R \times d3/d \times e3/S \times f3/S(\times) f5/d8 = Q1$ 

1...Ke4 2.R×d5 (2.Qe6+? Be5!) b5/R×c3/Rd3/Re3/S1~/S3~

3.S×c5/S×c3/B×d3/R×e3/Q×f3/Q(×)f5‡

1...K×d6 2.Bb8+ Kc6 3.d8=S‡

1...Sf5 2.R×d5+ Ke4,Ke6,Kf6 3.Q×f5‡

6 changed mates from identical squares in two variations (Country) 6×2 changes after king flights. Original scheme. Give-and-take key, en prise key piece (see B57 on similar lines) (IND) An aggressive give-and-take key in a crowded setting, where the bK's positions in the thematic variations allow change of 6 mates (MKD) Beautiful task with 6 changed mates on the same square. The give-and-take key compensates for the unprovided flights in the diagram position (NED) 2×6 mates, a record number reached by using the bK's position to differentiate between mates on the same square (same mechanism as in B57). The mates are produced by simple unguards (or in one case unblock by capture), but the sheer number of them impresses. Ba7 is passive in one thematic variation, but luckily finds another use in the by-variation 1...K×d6 (which also gives a new function to Pd7). The

heavy position is justified by the content (SWE) 6 changed mates. Brilliant concept pushed to the limit; very smart (SUI)

6<sup>th</sup> Place (9,2 points) B69: Mikhail Marandyuk (Ukraine)

1.Se7! [2.f4+ K×f4/K×f6 3.Qd4/Qd6‡]

1...Bc2,Bb3 2.R×e2+ Kf4/K×f6 3.Qd6/Qd4‡

1...Ra4 2.S×c6+ Kf4/K×f6 3.Rg4/Rg6‡

1...c5 2.Qd5+ Kf4/K×f6 3.Qe4/R×f7‡

Four phases with exchange and simple change of mates. The key provides two thematic flights to the bK (Country) 4×2 changes with reciprocal change in one pair. Double flight giving key (IND) No particularly rich strategy is involved here, but the amount of play is still noticeable (MKD) Nice 4×2 Zagoruiko with reciprocal change of mates included in an economical construction. Unprovided flight in the diagram position. The key gives the thematic flights to the bK (NED) 4×2 mates after bK moves, including reciprocal change. That the composer has managed to supplement the reciprocal change with two more thematic pairs with good white economy is an impressive achievement. The key gives the thematic bK flights, but takes another (SWE)



7<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) B55: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

1.g3! [2.Se7+ Qd5/Kf6 3.S×c6/Sg8‡]

1...b4 2.Se3+ Qd5/Kf6 3.Sc4/Sg4‡

1...e3 2.Sc3+ Qd5/Kf6 3.d4/Se4‡

1...Sf5 2.Sdc7+ Qd5/Kf6 3.Re6/Se8‡

1...c×d5 2.Qc3+ K×d6/d4 3.Qc7/Q×d4‡

1...Q×d5 2.Qc3+ K×d6/Qd4+ 3.Rd7/Q×d4‡

1...Q×d6 2.Qc3+ K×d5 3.Sb6‡ (3.Sc7+?)

Zagoruiko 4×2 with 8 thematic mates (including 7 mates utilising the bQ's pinning and 6 mates by wSd5 from the Siers battery); Fourfold S/Q battery play on the W2 move forces black direct self-pin with white line opening (2...Qd5) or indirect self-pin by a K-move (2...Kf6) (Country) 4×2 changes. Siers battery. BQ self-pins (IND) Valuable direct and indirect pin-mates in a 4×2 Zagoruiko. Pity for the need of wPf7 (NED) 4×2 variations of the Siers type, but in an unusual form: one sub-variation in each pair is a normal Siers (in three cases out of four with pin of the bQ), the other sub-variation has the bQ self-pinning already on B2, leading to pin-mates. One could have wished for Sg8‡ to be a pin-mate too, but what we have is very satisfactory. The only technical weakness is Sa8, which is only needed for one by-variation (SWE)

8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) B64: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.Ba4? [2.Sb3‡]

1...Rd×d4 2.S×d6 [3.S×b7,Q×c4,Qe5,Q×f5‡] Q×d6+ 3.Q×d6‡

1...Rc×d4 2.Qe3 [3.Qc1‡] b3/Re5 3.Qc3/Q×d4‡

1...Rc1,Rc2 2.Sb5+ Kc4/Rd4 3.Sb6/B×d4‡

but 1...b3!

1.Qe3? [2.Se6+ Kb5 3.Qb6‡ and 2.Qd3 [3.Q×c4‡]] but 1...Rd×d4!

1.Sb6? [2.Sa4‡] but 1...Rc×d4!

1.Sa7! [2.Sd×c6+ Rdd4/Rcd4 3.Q×c4/Q×d5‡]

1...Q×f7 2.Qh6 [3.Se6‡] Rd×d4/Rc×d4/Re5 3.Q×d6/Qc1/Q×d6‡

1...b5 2.Qe4 [3.Se6‡] Rd×d4/Rc×d4 3.Q×c6/Qc2‡

1...Rc×d4 2.Qe3 [3.Qc1‡]

Zagoruiko with 6 thematic mates (including 5 pin-mates) by the wQ (duel between the bRs and the wQ). Change of functions of the self-pinning moves (B2 moves in the solution; B1 moves in the try 1.Ba4?; and refutations to the tries 1.Qe3? and Sb6?) and of the white moves (W1 in the tries 1.Qe3? and 1.Sb6?; W2 or W3 move in the try 1.Ba4?). The black rooks exchange roles in the threat. Square vacation in the solution (e6) and two tries (b3 or e6) (Country) 3×2 changes. 5 pin-mates and one line opening. The changes after the try 1.Ba4? are not thematic (IND) Quiet W2 moves in this nice 3×2 Zagoruiko. The black self-pins enhance unity, but sadly 3.Q×c6 is not a pin-mate. The W3 moves Qc1 and Qd2 are concurrent, which is a slight blemish (NED) 3×2 mates with quiet W2 moves in the variations in the solution (but not in the threat). 2.Qh6! is a wonderful move; 2.Qe4! is more expected but at least shows another square vacation sacrifice. The changed mates are good, except the pair of concurrent mates Qc1 and Qc2. To have Black's thematic defences return also in an additional try (1.Ba4?) and as refutations of two other tries increases the richness of the problem, even if that play is outside of the stipulated theme (SWE)

8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) B37: Mikhail Marandyuk (Ukraine)

1.Bf3! [2.R×e7+ Kd6/Kf5 3.Re6/R×e5‡]

1...d4 2.Sgf8+ Kd6/Kf5 3.Q×e7/Qg6‡

1...Sg5 2.Sdf8+ Kd6/Kf5 3.Qd7/S×e7‡ (3.Sh4+? R×h4!)

1...c4 2.Qg8+ Kd6/Kf5 3.Q×d5/Sh4‡ (3.S×e7+? B×e7!)

1...Kd6 2.Sd×e5 [3.Qd7,Q×e7‡] Ke6/c4 3.Qd7/Q×e7‡

1...Kf5 2.Sh4+ Kg5/Ke6 3.Qh5/Q×e7‡

Two systems of variations with changed functions of black moves. The first system presents simple change of mates in four phases. The second system involves thematic defences by the bK on the 1<sup>st</sup> move (Country) 4×2 changes after bK flights plus continuations after same bK flights as 1<sup>st</sup> moves (IND) Original and well-matched play, including square vacation for the wQ (MKD) This is a 4×2 Zagoruiko in a relatively heavy construction. Good line-openings for bBa3 and bRh1. In the diagram position, 1...Kf5 is unprovided (NED) 4×2 mates after bK moves, including two different S moves to f8. Black's play is mostly based on line-openings. The dual-free 2×2 mates after bK moves on B1 are a bonus, though not thematic here. Rh7 is only there for the threat; that is a small weakness (SWE) Unconventional scheme with nice square clearances and dual avoidance play (SUI)



8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points, not counting for the country) B50: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.Ba7? [2.Qb5 [3.Qd3,Q×a4,Qc4‡] and 2.Qc8 [3.Qc4,Qe6‡]]

1...R×a7 2.Q×a7 [3.Qd4‡]

1...Rb6 2.Q×b6 [3.Qd4‡]

but 1...Rc6!

1.Qc8? [2.Qe6‡] but 1...Ra8!

1.Qe8! waiting

1...g6 2.Sc6+ K×d5/K×f5 3.e4/Qe6‡

1...Rc6 2.Sg6+ K×d5/K×f5 3.Qe6/e4‡

1...g×f6 2.Sg8+ K×d5/K×f5 3.S×f6/Sh6‡

1...Ra8 2.Sc8+ K×d5/K×f5 3.Sb6/S×d6‡

1...Ra7 2.B×a7 [3.Q×a4‡]

1...Rb6 2.B×b6 [3.Q×a4‡]

White battery play in four variations with Zagoruiko 4×2 (8 thematic mates) including: I) exchange of mates after bicolour play at g6 and c6 on the B1 and W2 moves after 1...g6/Rc6; II) 2 × 2 change of mates by wS from the Siers battery after 1...g×f6/Ra8. Refutations of two tries appear as B1 moves in the solution. The try 1.Ba7? changes two W2 moves in respect to the solution after the defences 1...Ra7/Rb6 (Country) 4×2 changes after Siers battery including reciprocal change (IND) This is a good 4×2 Zagoruiko, reciprocal change of mates included. The tries have no connection with the set theme (NED) 4×2 mates including reciprocal change. Both pairs of variations are quite symmetrical. The two changed variations from the try 1.Ba7? is a plus (SWE)

11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points) B19: Srećko Radović (Serbia)

1.Qb6! [2.Rc4+ Kd3/Ke5 3.Qd4/Qe6‡]

1...Q×f5 2.Rc6+ Kd3/Ke5 3.Q×e3/Qb2‡

1...Qf4 2.Qb4+ Kd3/Ke5 3.Qc3/Q×f4‡

1...Ke5 2.Bb7+ Kd4/Kf4 3.Qd6/Qb4‡

1...Sf8 2.Qb2+ Kd3/K×c5 3.Qc3/B×f8‡

1...Kd3 2.Qb4 [3.Be4,Qc3‡] Rc1/Qf4 3.Be4/Qc3‡

Thematic Zagoruiko with 6 different wQ mates, plus 2 additional wQ mates after 1...Ke5 (Country) 3×2 changes after bK-flights with the thematic black moves also appearing as 1<sup>st</sup> moves with distinct white replies (IND) Zagoruiko 3×2 with a good economy and 6 mates by the wQ (MKD) 3×2 mates without strategy but with great unity in the form of wQ mates throughout, plus two more in a by-variation. Very harmonious and economical, even Bh6 has three or four different functions (SWE) Very harmonious performance of the solo ballerina (SUI)

11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points) B31: Janne Syväniemi, Jorma Paavilainen (Finland)

1.Rg6! [2.Sc2+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Sb4/Sd4‡]

1...Q×d6 2.S3c4+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Rg×d6/S×d6‡ 1...Ra4 2.Sf5+ Kd5/K×f5 3.Se7/B×d7‡

1...b×c5 2.Sd5+ K×d5/Kf5 3.R×c5/Se7‡

1...f×e3 2.Qh4+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Qd4/Qg4‡

1...R×g2 2.S×g2+ Kd5/Kf5 3.S×f4/Sh4‡

Zagoruiko 6×2, Siers battery (Country) 6×2 Zagoruiko using Siers battery and wQ checks (IND) A familiar concept, surpassed by some earlier tasks (MKD) A 6×2 Zagoruiko is quite an achievement, but the mates are familiar and the composition is partially anticipated (NED) 6×2 mates with Siers type variations. Well done, in a heavy position but with only Bc8 under-utilized. The whole concept is not very original considering that the comparison problems B31b/B31c have 7×2 and 8×2 mates (SWE)



13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points, not counting for the country) B29: Dragan Stojni**ć** (Serbia)

1.Q×b7! [2.Be4+ K×e3/K×c4 3.d×e5/Qd5‡]

1...e×d4 2.Be4+ K×e3/K×c4 3.B×d4/Qd5‡

1...e4 2.Rb3 K×e3/K×c4 3.R×c3/Qb5‡

1...e×f4 2.Bf3 K×e3/K×c4/f×e3 3.Qe4/Be2/Be2‡

1...K×e3 2.Qh7 [3.Qh3,Qe4,d×e5‡] e×f4 3.Qe4‡

(1...K×c4 2.Be4,Bb5+,K×c2,d×e5)

3 Bristol clearances after 3 different moves by a single bP. Zagoruiko (Country) 3×2 changes for bK flights after wB/R Bristol clearances for the wQ (IND) Rich play with Bristol clearances, but 1...e×d4 maintains the W2 move of the threat. The dual after 1...K×c4 detracts (MKD) This is almost a 4×2 Zagoruiko with good Bristol variations. But some wood is needed and there are unprovided flights in the diagram position (NED) Ambitious content: 3×2 Bristol clearances after three moves by Pe5. It is a pity about the duals after 1...K×c4, and the key activating the offside wQ is weak (SWE) Difficult to implement combination of themes, but suffers from the many pawns and weak secondary play (SUI)

13th-14th Place (8 points) B38: Paz Einat, Ofer Comay (Israel)

1.f7! [2.f8=S [3.Sfg6‡]]

1...c3 2.Bd4+ K×d4/Kd6 3.Rd5/Be5‡

1...Rc7 2.Bd6+ Kd4/K×d6 3.Be5/Rd5‡

1...Sd~ 2.Sg8+ Kd5/K×f5 3.B×e4/Sh6‡

1...Sg4 2.Sc6+ Kd5/K×f5 3.Sb4/Sd4‡

1...d6 2.Bb4+ Kd4/a×b5/d5 3.Sc6,Rd5/Bc3/R×d5‡

1...d5 2.f8=Q [3.Sc6,Sg6,Qf6,Qg7,Qh8‡]

(1...Shf3 2.f8=Q,f8=B)

Reciprocal changes in one pair of black defences and change of mates in the other pair. Distant blocks in three sub-variations (Country)  $2\times2$  changes doubled with two separate pairs of bK flights. Reciprocal change after the first pair. R/B and R/S Siers batteries (IND) Rich content, but both pairs of variations are familiar in themselves (MKD) This is another fine  $4\times2$  Zagoruiko with reciprocal change of mates. But this exchange of mates has already been shown by Sovík. The quiet threat is good (NED)  $2\times2 + 2\times2$  mates including reciprocal change, with two Siers-type batteries. The reciprocal change mechanism is already known (comparison problem B38a), but the combination with another pair of thematic variations is very good. The white economy is good too (SWE)

15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) B07: Mikael Grönroos (Finland)

1.Qf2? [2.Sed1+,Sf5+] but 1...Sg4!

1.Qg1! waiting

- 1...c6 2.Sec4+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Sb6/S×d6‡
- 1...g4 2.Sg2+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Sf4/Sh4‡
- 1...Rg7,Rg8 2.Sg4+ Kd5/Kf5 3.S×f6/S×h6‡
- 1...c4 2.Sc2+ Kd5/Kf5 3.Qd4/Sd4‡
- 1...d5,Rd5 2.Sf1+ Kf5 3.Sg3‡
- 1...f5,Rf5 2.Sed1+ Kd5 3.Sc3‡
- 1...Kd4 2.Sf5+ Kd5 3.Se7‡
- 1...Kf4 2.Sd5+ Kf5 3.Se7‡
- 1...f2 2.Qg2+ Kd4/Kf4 3.Sc2/Sd3‡

Zagoruiko 4×2, Siers battery × 11, knight wheel (Country) 4×2 changes after 1...Kd5/Kf5. Siers battery. WS wheel. Flight giving key. 9 variations. This has a full knight wheel which differentiates it from the claims (IND) A good key, but the familiar Siers battery play decreases the score (MKD) This  $4\times2$  Zagoruiko is partially anticipated. The flight giving key offers some compensation, as does the complete knight wheel (NED)  $4\times2$  variations of the Siers type. A special feature here is that all thematic defences enable both thematic mates (logically, one such error would be sufficient to determine the play, but this feature consistently used is a bonus). There is a complete knight wheel, and the flight-giving key is fine. But the matrix is symmetric, and the originality is limited. The problem pales beside Sammelius's comparison B05a (SWE)



15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) B40: Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands)

1.Re3! [2.Sa7+ Kd4/Kd6 3.Sc6/Sc8‡]

1...Bf3 2.Sa3+ Kd4/Kd6 3.Sc2/S×c4‡

1...Ba4 2.Sc3+ Kd4/Kd6 3.Se2/Se4‡

1...Qg2,Qh1 2.Sc7+ Kd4/Kd6 3.S×e6/Se8‡

1...c×d3 2.Sd6+ Kd4/K×d6 3.Re4/R×d3‡

5×2 Zagoruiko (Country) 5×2 changes after bK flights using a Siers battery (IND) A familiar concept, but the lateral Siers battery here operates in the context of orthogonal (as opposed to often explored diagonal) bK flights (MKD) 5×2 mates with Siers type variations. The white economy is fine, and the two defences by the same bB make the play well unified. The fifth variation 2.Sd6+ breaks the symmetry and is a valuable addition (SWE) Economical and without frills (SUI)

15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) B61: C.G.S. Narayanan (India)

1.Qb6! [2.Qb4+ Sd4/Bd4/Rd4 3.Bh7/Sf6/Bd5‡]

1...R×a4 2.R×a4+ Sd4/Bd4/Rd4 3.Qg6/Qe6/Q×b7‡

1...Sd4 2.Bh7+ Sf5 3.B×f5‡

1...Bd4 2.Qe6+ Be5 3.Q×e5‡ (3.R×e5?, 3.Sf6?)

1...Rd4 2.Q×b7+ Rd5 3.Q×d5‡ (3.B×d5?)

1...Bf3+ 2.e×f3+ Kd3 3.Bc4‡

1...Rd6 2.Sc×d6+ (2.Se×d6+?) S×d6/B×d6 3.Bd5/Sf6‡

1...Bg7,Bh8 2.Qe6+ Kd4/Be5 3.Qc4/Q×e5‡

1...S×e7 2.Bh7+ Sf5/Sg6 3.B×f5/B×g6‡

Three Visserman changes after the self-pins on d4 in the sub-variations after the threat and after the black defence 1...Rxa4. When played as B1 1...Bd4/Rd4/Sd4 are followed by three entirely new mates. Unique form of 3×3 Zagoruiko. Babushka theme. Dual avoidance play after 1...Bd4/Rd4/Rd6 (Country) Attractive triplet of pin-mates, but the capturing W2 move after 1...R×a4 is unpleasant. Shift of the thematic defences from B2 to B1 moves increases the general (rather than the thematic) value (MKD) Good content: Three changed mates after black self-pins on the same square (NED) 2×3 mates where the thematic defences are also playable already at B1 - with the same continuations as when they are played at B2, only prolonged with one move. Considering the repeated white moves, you need a lot of imagination to call this a time-split 3×3 Zagoruiko. Anyway, a good problem (SWE) Three changed mates after self-pins (SUI)

18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points, not counting for the country) B70: Mikhail Marandyuk (Ukraine) 1.Qa1! [2.Sf6+ Kd3/Kf3 3.Qd1/Qf1‡]

1...R×e8 2.Qb1 [3.Rf2‡] Kd3/Kf3/e2 3.Rc1/B×d5/Rc3‡

1...B×e8 2.Qh1 [3.Rd2‡] Kd3/Kf3/e2 3.B×f5/Rg1/Rg3‡

1...Kd3 2.Qd1+ Ke4 3.Sf6‡

1...Kf3 2.Qd1+ Ke4/e2 3.Sf6/Q×e2‡

1...e2 2.Qe1 [3.Q×e2‡]

A complex consisting of 6 variations. Three thematic variations with 8 sub-variations plus a second system of variations with thematic defences on the 1<sup>st</sup> move (Country) 3×2 Zagoruiko. Additional change for 1...e2. Two wQ/R batteries on the second move. Two W2 replies to the three thematic defences when played on B1 (IND) Interesting and matching black and white play including white battery creation (in spite of the inherent symmetry) (MKD) 3×2 mates, with only a variation for 1...e2 in the threat missing for a full 3×3. The matrix is very symmetric. It is an advantage that Black's thematic defences also work in B1, although there is a repetition of 2.Qd1 (SWE)



18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) B35: Ján Dučák, Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic)

1.S×f7? [2.S×f6+ Kc6 3.Sd8‡]

1...Ke4 2.Sd6+ Kd5,Kf3 3.Bb7‡

1...Kc6 2.Ba7+ Kd5/Sc5 3.S×f6/R×c5‡

1...S×c5 2.Rc×d4+ Kc6 3.Rd6‡

but 1...B×c7! 1.Qh7! [2.S×f6+ K×e5 3.S×f7‡]

1...Ke4 2.Bb7+ d5 3.e×d6 e.p.‡

1...f3 2.b3 [3.Bb7‡] Ke4/S×e5/S×c5 3.R×d4/S×f6/Rc×d4‡

1...f×g5 2.Bd6 [3.Sf6‡] Ke4/S×e5 3.Bb7/Rc×d4‡

Thematic change 5×2, defenses a-e, 5 × switchback, change function move, Shedey cycle (Country) 2×2 changes after S×e5/Ke4 plus Shedey theme involving moves Bb7/Rc×d4/Sf6. Underused wQ (IND) Only 2 thematic mates, but nicely packed within Dombro-Lačný (MKD) This is a good Dombro-Lačný with unity in the thematic variations, because the quiet B1 moves create a flight for the bK to parry the threat. The try has no connection with the set theme (NED) A Shedey cycle (Dombro-Lačný) with the mates Bb7/Rc×d4/Sf6, but from the point of view of this tourney it is just the minimum 2×2 change. In addition to one third of the Shedey cycle (the threat), the colourful enpassant capture and the rich play of the try fall outside the stipulated theme, so the problem would have been valued more highly in another tourney. The construction with Rd2+Rd1 is a heavy price to secure the mate Rc×d4‡ (SWE) Lačný with heavy material (SUI)

20<sup>th</sup> Place (7 points) B58: Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) 1.Qa1? [2.Qa5 [3.d×e6‡] Ke5/e5/e×d5 3.d6/Qc5/Q×d5‡] 1...B×g2 2.c4 [3.c5‡] e×d5 3.Qf6‡ 1...e×d5 2.Qa8 [3.Q×d5‡] Be6 3.Qb8‡ 1...Ke5 2.c4+ Kf5/Kd6 3.Qf6/c5‡ but 1...Bg4! 1.Qe2! [2.Qb5 [3.d×e6‡] Ke5/e5/e×d5 3.d6/Qc5/Q×d5‡] 1...Bg4 2.Q×g4 Ke5/e5/e×d5 3.Qf4/Qg6/R×d5‡ 1...B×g2 2.d×e6+ Ke5 3.Qh5‡ 1...e×d5 2.Qc4 [3.Q×d5‡] Be6 3.Qc7‡

1...Ke5 2.d6 [3.Rc5,Qb5‡] Kf5 3.Qh5‡

Thematic change after 2...e5 a 2×, 2...Be6 d 2×, 2...Kf5 e 2× (2×3 divided into two phases), thematic change after 2...e×d5 b 3× and 2...Ke5 c 3× (3×2 divided into two phases), change function move, exchange order moves, exchange of three variations (Country) 2×3 changes after king flight and two pawn moves. Simple and additional changes when B1 is played. Good try 1.Qa1? Good construction

(IND) A nice scheme, but the capturing W2 after 1...Bg4 is a drawback. The non-thematic changes do not add much to the overall impression (MKD) 2×3 variations with quiet play and neat mates, plus three by-variations which are changed from an unthematical try. The economy is very good, but one of the thematic variations has a crude capture (Q×Bg4) in W2 (SWE)

21<sup>st</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place

- B05 (6,8 points): Gérard Doukhan (France) Zagoruiko 5×2 after king flights on B2. 5 variations with Siers battery, with the front piece delivering 8 different mates. Flight-giving key (Country) The familiarity of the Siers battery play decreases the score (MKD) A not so original 5×2 Zagoruiko, but there is enough difference between B05 and the Sammelius's problem. The flight giving key is a bonus (NED) The flight-giving key is a bonus. Like B07, this pales in comparison to the earlier problem B05a (SWE)
- B27 (6,8 points): Mark Erenburg (Israel) Three changes in two variations after bR corrections. Flight-giving key (Country) 2×3 changes after bR random and correction moves. The bK selfunpins the thematic rook. Flight-giving key. But no other content (IND) Excellent key and good triplets of mates after bR-correction (MKD)

23<sup>rd</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> Place

- B08 (6,6 points): Michael Barth, Sven Trommler, Peter Sickinger, Michael Schreckenbach (Germany) Kiss cycle. 3 changed mates in two variations. Additional changed mate after 2...K×b3 (Country) 2×2 changes after Kd3/Kd5 plus the Kiss theme: 1.A x/y 2.B/C and 1.B x/y 2.C/A. Additional change after 1...Kb3. Simple mechanism (IND) A good ‡2-pattern with symmetry and without striking strategy (MKD) 2×3 mates, one of them (Qf7) repeated between two subvariations. The composer's idea is in the Kiss cycle, of which one third (the W2 moves) fall outside the stipulated theme. The play is fairly symmetric, but the extra change after K×b3 is good to have. The comparison twomover B08a uses exactly the same mechanism, which must influence the score of B08 (SWE)
- B12 (6,6 points): Jan Rusinek (Poland) 2×2 changes after interference unpins of the wQ. Black's first move pins the wQ and his two second moves unpin it (IND) Nice unpins, but there are only two thematic variations (MKD) Only the minimum of 2×2 variations, but there is quality in every detail: B1 pins the wQ; B2 unpins it again 2×2 times; there is perfect harmony with the same pieces active in B1 and in W2; even the threat and the by-variation 1...Ke5 are handled with no extra force (SWE)
- B23 (6,6 points): Stefano Mariani (Italy) 2×3 changes after random move by Se5 and corrections Sc6/S×f3. But crude short threat which also makes the thematic white continuations as threats. Black's defences are also plain unguards (IND) Short threat, but good content and interesting logical tries (MKD) Good quiet W2 moves. There is unity in the thematic variations with the different white threats on e5 followed by black correction. Unfortunately, the threat is short (NED)
- B30 (6,6 points): C.G.S. Narayanan (India) Reciprocal changes of mates (Visserman) after K-flights. New second move continuations when Black defends by moving to the flights on the first move (Country) Good reciprocal change and nice by-play (MKD) Reciprocal change (2×2 mates) with mates on the same square and dual avoidance effects. The clean variations when the bK moves already in B1, giving more use to Rb3 and Sd7, is a plus. Nicely open construction; only Sh1 is somewhat underused (SWE)
- B66 (6,6 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Zagoruiko, Visserman changes, knight options (Country) 3×2 changes using a twomover wS try matrix. The short threat is a weakness (IND) Good changes, but the short threat detracts much. The try adds little value, because they are all refuted by 1...Sd2 (MKD) 3×2 mates after quiet W2 moves by the same piece Se4. The short threat and the limited role of the wQ are drawbacks (SWE)

28th-29th Place

- B36 (6,4 points, not counting for the country): Michael Schreckenbach, Peter Sickinger (Germany) Zagoruiko 4×2; Siers battery; thematic tries (Country) 4×2 changes after Kd5/Kf5. Siers battery. 3 thematic tries (IND) A familiar concept, which might be more convincing than B36a as it avoids the symmetry and introduces some non-thematic elements, but yet insufficient for a high score (MKD) Good tries in relation with the solution, but B36 is largely anticipated by Marandyuk (NED) The wK tries are outside the thematic play, but give a special character to this 4×2 of the Siers type (SWE)
- B44 (6,4 points): Aleksandr Kryuchkov (Slovenia) Zagoruiko, 5-fold Siers battery (Country) 3×2 changes after bK flights. In three more variations, one change each (IND) Unusual lateral bK-flights follow diagonal Siers battery play (MKD)

30<sup>th</sup> Place

B46 (6,3 points, not counting for the country): C.G.S. Narayanan (India) Zagoruiko. Different mates after the same two black moves when played as first move defences. Diagonal-orthogonal battery formation (Country) Rendering of a familiar scheme (cf. B46a), with some improvements (MKD) 3×2 thematic mates after quiet W2 continuations (including the threat). Two of the three variations create echo-like white batteries. An added bonus is the fact that there are full-length variations when the thematic moves are played already at B1. Good economy, apart from Bg1 which is only active in one variation. The comparison problem B46a has some similarities but is far from an anticipation; this B46 is much better (SWE)

31<sup>st</sup>-32<sup>nd</sup> Place

- B53 (6,2 points, not counting for the country): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) 2×3 changes after two rook moves and c×b4 (IND) Good triplets of mates. The by-play does not match the main one (MKD)
- B68 (6,2 points, not counting for the country): Ofer Comay, Paz Einat (Israel) Reciprocal changes. Distant self-blocks (Country) 2×2 changes including reciprocal change after bK flights and bQ remote self-blocks (IND) Good rendering of a popular idea after bQ's self-blocks (MKD)

33<sup>rd</sup> Place

 B04 (6 points): Jean-Marc Loustau, Michel Caillaud, Gérard Doukhan (France) Reciprocal changes after black correction. Diagonal-orthogonal correspondence. Anti-critical white moves (Country) 2×2 changes after random and correction moves of bSd4 including reciprocal change plus critical/bi-colour Bristol moves with ODT. But a crude short threat, defences and W2 moves (IND) Good strategy, but short threat and ugly W2 moves (MKD)

34<sup>th</sup> Place

B39 (5,8 points): John Rice (Great Britain) All thematic variations end in promotion-mates, with wPd5 ultimately promoting on 3 different squares (Country) 2×2 changes. WQ/WP battery on sixth rank. All mates by promotion. White continuations after black thematic defences on 1<sup>st</sup> move (IND) Good content "on paper", but the ugly W2 moves and the dual promotion mates detract from the overall impression (MKD)

35<sup>th</sup>-36<sup>th</sup> Place

- B09 (5,4 points): Pablo Ricardi (Argentina) Zagoruiko 5×2, Siers battery (Country) 5×2 changes after bK flights using a Siers battery. In contrast to B05, here there is a flight taking key! (IND) A familiar Siers battery play after K-flights. The key is bad (MKD) A rather familiar 5×2 Zagoruiko, partially anticipated by Sammelius. There is an unprovided flight in the diagram position (NED)
- B18 (5,4 points): Bogusz Piliczewski (Poland) Cyclic permutation of mating units and captured units, white sacrifices, reciprocal captures, dual avoidance, changed mates (Country) 2×2 changes. Simple mechanism involving unguard of d4 by the bQ and dual avoidance by capture of wQ/wB (IND) Unpleasant captures at W2, familiar concept and good by-play (MKD)
2×2 thematic mates (plus almost another 2×2, but 3.Ba4‡ is repeated). The mechanism is logical: 1...Q~ gives up d4; S~×d4+ has two mates ready for R×d4 (Se5,Qe6‡) and another two for B×d4 (Sb4,Ba4‡); Q×g8 and Q×d1 eliminate one of those mates (dual avoidance), so White must avoid sacrificing the knight that can mate instead. It is a weakness that Rd3 is used only in the threat. The comparison problem B18a has similarities but has different logic, so this B18 can be regarded as an independent problem (SWE)

## 37<sup>th</sup>-39<sup>th</sup> Place

- B13 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Gérard Doukhan (France) Reciprocal changes of mates. Pure Fleck theme, enhanced with a single waiting move showing the 3 thematic threats (Country) 2×2 reciprocal change after bK flights. W2 moves are threats which are separated by 1...Kd4 and 1...b2. Double flight give-and-take key (IND) Only two of the Fleck W2 moves lead to thematic play (MKD)
- B67 (5,2 points): Grigory Atayants (Armenia) Three thematic mate changes in two variations (Country) 2×3 changes with two of the changes utilising the half-battery. The main content is anticipated (IND) The pair of battery shut-off mates are the problem's asset, but also its weakness because of similarity with B67a (the latter lacks the third change of mate and has an inferior construction) (MKD) 2×3 mates based on the white half-battery with an added change after d4-d3. The value is reduced by the crude continuation 2.B×Sf4, and Bh7 only serves in the threat (SWE)
- B71 (5,2 points): Daniele Gatti, Antonio Garofalo (Italy) 2×2 changes with a R/B and R/S battery. The short threat is a weakness (IND) A nice pair of battery shut-off mates after battery creation by means of capturing the bSe6. The short threat detracts much (MKD)

### 40<sup>th</sup> Place

B65 (4,8 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Two Q-defences lead to Nowotnys on b3 (Country) 2×2 changes with Nowotnys on b3 (IND) Only two thematic variations with matched black and white play, but the concept involving Nowotny is in general familiar. Moreover, such changes are not genuine, because the thematic mates are already threatened after the W2 moves (MKD) 2×2 mates after decoys of the bQ followed by Nowotnys, separated by dual avoidance effects (guard of e6, unguard of c5). The unity suffers somewhat as one Nowotny is quiet, the other checking. The wQ is almost only used for the threat; apart from that, the economy is good (SWE)

### 41<sup>st</sup> Place

 B75 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Pauli Perkonoja (Finland) 2×2 changes after selfblock and unguard. Flight-giving key (IND) An excellent key, the quiet W2 moves and the "airy" setting are enjoyable, but there are only two thematic variations (MKD)

## 42<sup>nd</sup>-46<sup>th</sup> Place

- B32 (4,2 points): Kabe Moen (United States) Quiet threat. Four thematic variations. Multiple Fleck with complete separation in each thematic variation. Tries on the key and second move. Meredith (Country) 5×2 changes using a RBB half-battery and Fleck style dual separation (IND) There is no genuine change of mates owing to multiple threats, mates by the wBs are somewhat "concurrent" and far from impressive (MKD)
- B41 (4,2 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Critical square g4. In the two thematic variations, the wQ/wB play to it and the queen should not prevent the bishop from getting there (Country) 2×2 changes after 1...K×e5/Sf5 (IND) Only two dull lines of play. The tries do not add much (MKD)
- B43 (4,2 points): Indrek Aunver, Kjell Widlert (Sweden) Two S-mates in one variation and two B-mates in another. One more changed mate in the variation 1...Sa6 (Country) In 4 phases, after the two bK flights, white mates follow as ab/cb/db/ae which thematically only counts as 2×2 (IND) An airy setting, but with modest content and far from interesting (MKD)

- B62 (4,2 points): Martin Hoffmann (Switzerland) Lačný with Visserman changes. After a ±2 by Valentin Rudenko: <a href="https://www.yacpdb.org/#21942">https://www.yacpdb.org/#21942</a> (Country) 3×2 changes. Lacny. Converted twomover (IND) Transfer of a familiar twomover mechanism to a ±3 (MKD) A 2×3 Lačný, which would be worth a high score if the mechanism were original. But as the country notes, the whole matrix is taken from a ±2 by Rudenko. Here five technical pieces have been added in order to turn Rudenko's try and solution into two variations in a ±3. The lack of originality has caused a clear reduction of the score (SWE)
- B73 (4,2 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Changed mates, Kharkov 2 double, Vladimirov effect, Visserman changes (Country) 2×2 changes after unguards. Too heavy (IND) The tries add charm, but the crowded position and the capturing W1 move by an out-of-play wR do not have such effect (MKD) 2×2 mates with a clear logical structure, but a weak key (SWE)

47<sup>th</sup>-50<sup>th</sup> Place

- B06 (4 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) 2×2 changes after S×d6/c×d6 between threat and 1...Sd3. All other variations have no value. There is also a dual after 1...c×b4 2.S×b4+/Rgc6 (IND) Poor content and out-of-play key piece (MKD)
- B25 (4 points, not counting for the country): Daniele Gatti, Antonio Garofalo, Valerio Agostini, Marco Guida (Italy) Thematic variations triggered by defences on the same square e5; All thematic mates exploit self-block on square e5, plus: in the first pair of sub-variations both mates exploit also clearing of lines and in the second pair both mates exploit also the pin of bPd4. Additional changed play after thematic defences Be5 and e5 vs. setplay. A mate is provided after K-flight in setplay. The K-flight takes place on square e5 (the same square involved in thematic variations) and it triggers additional, non-thematic changed play in a further sub-variation (2...Kd5) vs. setplay (Country) 2×2 changes. Short threat, heavy construction. Changes from set play are not thematic (IND) Short threat and ugly W2 moves, but nice thematic play (MKD)
- B47 (4 points, not counting for the country): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) BK-star. Change of three mates in two variations (Country) Siers battery but only two distinct changes (IND) Familiar concept of 3 bK-flights, shown earlier in better settings (MKD) 2×3 variations of the Siers type. The problem has striking similarities to the comparison problem B47a, which is a much better work (SWE)
- B54 (4 points): Rauf Aliovsadzade (United States) Main variations: two defences by the same pawn leading to two variations by the same rook. Side variations: two defences by the same rook (Country) Two changes after two rook moves. Not much content (IND) Only two thematic variations after bR's self-blocks (MKD)

51<sup>st</sup> Place

• B34 (3,9 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) 2×2 changes after bK flights. Too simple (IND) A light setting without good strategy. Only two pairs of mates (MKD)

52<sup>nd</sup>-55<sup>th</sup> Place

- B11 (3,8 points): Charles Ouellet (Canada) 3×2 changes. Flight giving key, which however also pins the bQ. The changed mates are of the simple concurrent/same-square-different piece type. This version is better than B10 (IND) The pinning key grants a flight to the bK. Ugly W2 moves (MKD)
- B16 (3,8 points): Elmar Abdullayev (Azerbaijan) 2×2 changes after 1...Ke8/Kf6 (IND) Poor content and lack of good strategy. The minor dual detracts (MKD)
- B20 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Thematic K-flights in a block setting, with two different units mating on e4 after 1...c5, and likewise on b3 after 1...f5 (Country) 2×2 changes after bK flights. Too simple (IND) Only two variations without any notable strategy (MKD)
- B72 (3,8 points): Tibor Érsek (Hungary) 2×2 changes. Simple. The short threat is a weakness (IND) A good play after B2 moves on f6, but the short threat is bad (MKD)

56<sup>th</sup>-59<sup>th</sup> Place

- B28 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Rauf Aliovsadzade (United States) Two queen sacrifices (Country) 2×2 changes after 2...Rc1/Rc5 (IND) Good W2 moves, but modest in terms of quantity and strategy (MKD)
- B49 (3,6 points): Ovidiu Crăciun (Romania) 2×2 changes. Too heavy for the content (IND) Two changed mates with Bikos theme. The out-of-play key piece, the awkward construction and the minor dual in the sub-variation after 1...R×c6 detract (MKD)
- B59 (3,6 points): Charles Ouellet (Canada) 2×2 changes with Siers battery. Symmetrical (IND) Only two pairs of thematic variations in a familiar matrix, slightly embellished by the reciprocal dual avoidance. The checking tries are unconvincing (MKD)
- B60 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Miguel Uris (Spain) Visserman changes. Grimshaw. Transferred mate (Country) 2×2 changes, self-blocks and Grimshaw, but the short threat is a weakness (IND) Good quality changed mates after defence on the same square and additional transfer of mates, but achieved with a short threat (MKD)

60<sup>th</sup> Place

• B02 (3,3 points): Henk le Grand (Netherlands) 2×2 changes after unguards. Black's 1st moves are also unguards (IND) Poor content and unpleasant captures at W1 and W2 (MKD)

61<sup>st</sup>-63<sup>rd</sup> Place

- B14 (3,2 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) 2×2 changes. But very crude flight-taking key with short threat, two unprovided checks and heavy position. Changes are nothing special (IND) Matched W2 and two triplets of thematic mates after a short threat (MKD)
- B17 (3,2 points): Pablo Ricardi (Argentina) The theme is shown in the variations 1...S~ and 1...e5. The repetition of mates in the threat does not matter (Country) 2×2 changes after 1...Kc6/Ke6, plus one more change after 1...Kc6 (IND) Poor content with familiar Siers battery play (MKD)
- B52 (3,2 points, not counting for the country): Stefan Milewski (Poland) Somov B2, changed mates, self-blocks, sacrificial key (Country) 2×2 changes, two unguards, one line opening, one self-block (IND) Poor content after an obvious key by an out-of-play piece (MKD)

64<sup>th</sup> Place

 B22 (2,8 points, not counting for the country): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) 2×2 changes after 1...R/Q×g7 between threat and a black defence which does not prevent the threat but changes the final mates by White (IND) Only two pairs of mates. The repeated W2 move 2.Q×g7+ detracts (MKD)

65<sup>th</sup> Place

• B48 (2,6 points): Elmar Abdullayev (Azerbaijan) Does not fulfill the required theme. There is no set of two sub-variations with changed mates (IND) Only two pairs of variations after a key by an out-of-play piece (MKD)

66<sup>th</sup> Place

B74 (2 points, not counting for the country): Pablo Ricardi (Argentina) Fleck effect (Country) 2×2 changes. Symmetrical, simple and with only dual separated threats using a Siers battery (IND) The B1 moves do not really defend against the threat (MKD)

# Section B: Threemovers

Place	Country	No	IND	MKD	NED	SUI	SWE	Total
1	SVK	B57	4,0	3,2	3,8	3,6	4,0	11,4
2	SVK	B03	3,8	3,6	3,2	3,8	3,2	10,6
3	GER	B42	3,4	3,4	3,2	3,6	3,6	10,4
4-5	SRB	B24	3,6	2,8	4,0	3,4	3,2	10,2
4-5	SVK	B51	3,4	2,8	4,0	3,4	3,4	10,2
6	UKR	B69	3,4	2,6	3,2	2,4	3,6	9,2
7	MKD	B55	3,2		2,8	2,4	3,4	9,0
8-10	MKD	B64	3,0		2,2	2,6	3,0	8,4
8-10	UKR	B37	3,4	2,8	2,4	2,8	2,8	8,4
8-10	MKD	B50	2,8		3,0	2,6	2,8	8,4
11-12	SRB	B19	3,0	2,2	2,0	3,0	3,2	8,2
11-12	FIN	B31	3,2	2,0	3,4	2,4	2,6	8,2
13-14	SRB	B29	3,2	2,6	2,2	2,6	2,8	8,0
13-14	ISR	B38	2,8	2,4	2,8	2,4	3,2	8,0
15-17	FIN	B07	2,6	1,6	2,6	2,8	2,6	7,8
15-17	NED	B40	3,0	2,4		2,8	2,4	7,8
15-17	IND	B61		2,6	2,4	2,6	2,8	7,8
18-19	UKR	B70	2,8	2,6	2,0	2,4	2,4	7,4
18-19	CZE	B35	2,4	2,2	2,6	3,0	2,4	7,4
20	CZE	B58	2,8	1,8	2,0	2,4	2,6	7,0
21-22	FRA	B05	2,6	1,8	3,2	1,0	2,4	6,8
21-22	ISR	B27	3,0	2,2	2,0	2,4	2,2	6,8
23-27	POL	B12	2,4	1,8	1,6	2,4	3,6	6,6
23-27	IND	B30		2,4	1,6	2,0	2,8	6,6
23-27	GER	B08	3,0	1,8	0,0	2,8	2,0	6,6
23-27	ITA	B23	2,2	2,0	2,2	2,4	2,2	6,6
23-27	ESP	B66	2,6	2,0	1,8	2,0	2,6	6,6
28-29	GER	B36	2,8	1,6	2,2	2,0	2,2	6,4
28-29	SLO	B44	2,6	2,4	1,8	2,2	1,6	6,4
30	IND	B46		2,0	2,0	2,2	3,0	6,3
31-32	CZE	B53	2,4	2,0	2,0	1,6	2,2	6,2
31-32	ISR	B68	1,8	2,4	2,0	2,4	1,8	6,2
33	FRA	B04	2,6	1,8	1,6	2,4	1,8	6,0
34	GBR	B39	2,4	1,4	1,2	2,4	2,0	5,8
35-36	ARG	B09	2,4	1,4	2,6	1,4	1,6	5,4
35-36	POL	B18	2,4	1,6	1,6	1,2	2,2	5,4
37-39	FRA	B13	2,0	1,0	1,2	2,0	2,0	5,2
37-39	ARM	B67	1,4	1,8	2,0	1,2	2,6	5,2
37-39	ITA	B71	2,0	1,4	1,0	1,8	2,0	5,2
40	GBR	B65	1,4	1,8	1,0	1,6	2,4	4,8
41	FIN	B75	1,4	2,0	0,8	1,2	1,8	4,4

42-46	SWF	B43	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.4		4.2
42-46	SUI	B62	1,6	1,2	0,0	.,.	1,6	4,2
42-46	ESP	B73	1,0	2,0	0,8	1,2	2,0	4,2
42-46	USA	B32	2,6	0,8	1,6	1,8	0,8	4,2
42-46	ARM	B41	1,4	1,0	1,4	1,4	1,4	4,2
47-50	GRE	B06	1,6	0,4	0,8	2,0	1,6	4,0
47-50	ITA	B25	1,4	0,6	1,6	1,0	1,8	4,0
47-50	ARM	B47	1,2	1,4	1,2	1,6	1,4	4,0
47-50	USA	B54	1,0	1,8	1,0	1,2	1,8	4,0
51	SWE	B34	1,4	1,0	1,2	1,6		3,9
52-55	CAN	B11	2,4	0,8	0,6	1,8	1,2	3,8
52-55	AZE	B16	2,0	0,6	1,4	1,2	1,2	3,8
52-55	GBR	B20	1,8	1,0	1,4	1,2	1,2	3,8
52-55	HUN	B72	1,0	1,2	0,8	1,6	2,2	3,8
56-59	USA	B28	1,6	1,2	1,2	1,0	1,2	3,6
56-59	CAN	B59	1,2	1,4	0,0	1,2	1,2	3,6
56-59	ROU	B49	1,0	1,2	1,4	1,0	1,8	3,6
56-59	ESP	B60	1,2	1,2	1,0	1,2	1,2	3,6
60	NED	B02	1,0	1,0		1,4	1,2	3,3
61-63	ARG	B17	2,0	1,2	1,0	1,0	0,8	3,2
61-63	POL	B52	1,2	1,0	1,0	1,0	1,8	3,2
61-63	GRE	B14	1,0	0,8	2,0	1,4	0,6	3,2
64	GRE	B22	1,4	0,8	1,0	1,0	0,6	2,8
65	AZE	B48	0,0	1,2	0,6	1,0	1,0	2,6
66	ARG	B74	1,2	0,4	0,6	0,8	0,6	2,0
	CAN	B10	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
	SUI	B01	0,0	0,2	0,0		1,8	0,0
	HUN	B15	0,0	0,8	0,2	0,0	0,6	0,0

The original points of B10 are: IND = 0.0 - MKD = 1.0 - NED = 0.6 - SUI = 1.8 - SWE = 1.0. The country submitted B10 and B11 as versions. According to the rules, only the highest-graded version is kept in the award and may score points for that country.

## SECTION C: MOREMOVERS

Judging countries: Finland, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Theme (proposed by Switzerland): In the try Black has a weak move A, which allows White to deliver mate. The try may appear on any white move (not necessarily the first). So Black makes a preliminary move or a sequence of moves (B), and if White continues with the original plan, then move A later refutes it. Move A at any stage must not be a response to check. In the solution White overcomes this obstacle by any means.



1<sup>st</sup> Place (9,6 points) C59: Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemani**č** (Slovakia) 1.Kh4? [2.S×d6‡] Ra6 A 2.Kg3 [3.Sd4‡] h4+ D 3.Kf3 [4.Sd4‡] Sb3 C 4.B×c2‡ but 1...g5+! B 2.K×h5 Ra6! A

1.Kg3? [2.Sd4‡] Sb3 C 2.Kh4 [3.S×d6‡] g5+ B 3.K×h5 [4.S×d6‡] Ra6 A 4.B×c2‡ but 1...h4+! D 2.Kf3 Sb3! C

1.Re3! [2.Sd4+ Kf4 3.Se6+ Kf5 4.S×d6‡] 1...Sb3 C 2.Kh4 [3.S×d6‡] g5+ B 3.K×h5 [4.S×d6‡] Ra6 A 4.B×c2‡ 1...Ra6 A 2.Kg3 [3.Sd4‡] h4+ D 3.Kf3 [4.Sd4‡] Sb3 C 4.B×c2‡

Exchange of W1/W2 moves and cycle of B1/B2 moves (AD-DC-CB-BA) in the thematic tries. Double rendering of the theme, where A and C are weak thematic moves and B and D are preliminary thematic moves. In the end, there is a mate transference between two variations (Country) Not spectacular, but a convincing and balanced presentation of the theme (FIN) Double rendering of the theme with two tries from the king and exchange of moves (GER) A harmonious setting of two interwoven thematical attacks. The black foreplans forces the wK to move out of reach of g3 or h4, so the last defender of c2 cannot be forced away. White's foreplan (with a fine full-length threat) forces one of the defenders of c2 to move already at B1, so White can choose the attack that forces the other defender to move, leading to B×c2‡. The only technical drawback is the meagre - but essential - role of Rh6 (SWE) The best problem of the tournament with a double setting of the theme, cyclic exchange of the thematic moves and full-move threat (SUI) Two variations with white king's play in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> moves (UKR)

2<sup>nd</sup> Place (9,3 points) C06: Igor Yarmonov, Mikhail Marandyuk (Ukraine) 1.Sbd6? [2.Se4‡] c×d5? A 2.Sb5‡ but 1...Qa6+! B (2.B×a6 c×d5! A 3.Sb5+ Kd3 4.S×a3+ Ke4!)

1.Sg3? [2.Se4‡] but 1...c×d5! A

1.Sfd6! [2.Se4‡] f5 2.Se4+ f×e4 3.Sd6 [4.S×e4‡] Qa6+ 4.B×a6 [5.S×e4‡] c×d5 5.Sb5+ Kd3 6.S×a3+ K×e3 7.Sc2+ Kf3 8.Be2‡

Critical move by a white bishop, sacrifice of a knight, distant square-block, formation and play of a Siers battery, finale with bishop's move back along the same diagonal and model mate (Country) One thematic line but clearly shown. The thematic weak move is answered with mate. Critical move, check provocation, sacrifice, Siers battery play and model mate (GER) Black's foreplan Qa6+ forces a critical decoy of Bf1 across b5, which after Sb5+ lets the bK escape to e4. White counters this with a sacrifice forcing a self-block on e4, interestingly by playing the same type of piece (wS) to the same square (d6) as in the try, only it's another wS! Another good point is that only the thematic defence c×d5 forces Sf5 to go to d6 rather than g3. The foreplan has the negative effect of unguarding e3, which lengthens the play by one move but leads to a fine model mate (SWE) No double setting but original. The critical move is not prevented in the solution but exploited for a battery and distant square block (SUI)

3<sup>rd</sup> Place (9,2 points) C48: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.Be3? [2.Sd4‡] R×e3? A1 2.Sd4‡ but 1...c×b5! B2 (2.Rd4? [3.Be4‡] R×e3! A1)

1.Re3? [2.Be4‡] B×e3? A2 2.Be4‡ but 1...c×d5! B1 (2.B4~? [3.Sd4‡] B×e3! A2)

1.Kg8? [2.Be6+ f×e6 3.Rf8+ Sf7 4.R×f7‡] but 1...Ra8!

1.Kg7! [2.Be6+ f×e6 3.Rf8+ Sf7 4.R×f7‡] 1...c×b5 2.Re3 [3.Be4‡] R×e3 3.B×e3 [4.Be4‡] 1...c×d5 2.Be3 [3.Sd4‡] B×e3 3.R×e3 [4.Sd4‡] 1...Ra8 2.B×c6 [3.Bd7‡] Ra6 3.Sd6+ c×d6 4.Bd7‡

The moves A1 and A2 are weak defences on the B1 move after 1.Be3? and 1.Re3? respectively, but effective on the B2 move after 1...B2!/B1! Banny theme, Nowotny interferences on e3 and vacation of e4 or d4 on W1 moves of the logical tries and W2 moves of the solution. Exchanged W2/W3 moves in the thematic variations (Country) An interesting idea and a reasonable execution, though with plenty of material (FIN) Two thematic Nowotny tries with refutation from a pawn, which captures an officer right or left. Interferences and square vacations. Good full-move threat with a king key-move (GER) Two Nowotny tries originally carry only single threats because both mating squares are obstructed in the diagram, so Black can easily defend by capturing the threatening piece and then, if White tries to vacate the other mating square, by capturing the white Nowotny piece. A white foreplan with a fine full-length threat induces Black to capture one of White's mating pieces immediately, losing the other capture, so that a Nowotny now works. There is also an excellent byvariation which determines the key and enhances the problem considerably. - But it is doubtful whether the problem is thematic for this tourney. For example, after 1.Re3? the move B×e3 is very weak as it has no effect on the threat Be4‡; after 1...c×d5 2.Bc3 the move B×e3 defends - not because it has been strengthened by a black foreplan, but simply because White now has a different threat. So, the requirement that "White continues with the original plan" after Black's foreplan does not seem to be fulfilled. On the other hand, you might argue that White's original plan is to use the

Nowotny on e3, and in that sense White does continue with his plan. So, the problem can be accepted with some reservations (SWE) Double setting with Banny theme and Nowotny interferences. Only the heavy position leads to slight deductions (SUI) Two variations in this problem, which has the largest number of pieces among all entries in the section. In the tries 1.Be3? and 1.Re3? the moves 1...R×e3 and 1...B×e3 are not defences, as they fail to prevent the mate (UKR)

4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place C03 Jorma Paavilainen Finland 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place C10 Michael Barth Germany 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place C34 Ralf Krätschmer Germany



‡4

(9+13) ‡4

(12+11) ‡7

(9+13)

4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) C03: Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) 1.Rb2? [2.Rc2‡] 1...Se2? A1 but 1...R×f2 B1 2.R×f2 Se2! A1

1.B×c5? [2.Bb4‡] 1...Sd6? A2 but 1...Bf8 B2 2.B×f8 Sd6! A2

1.Bh7! [2.Rb3+ c×b3 3.Rd3+ Kc4 4.Sa5‡] 1...R×h7 2.Rb2 [3.Rc2‡] R×f2 B1 3.R×f2 [4.Rc2‡] Se2 A1 4.R×f3‡ 1...e4 2.B×c5 [3.Bb4‡] Bf8 B2 3.B×f8 [4.Bb4‡] Sd6 A2 4.Bg7‡ (2...Bd4 3.Rxd4 [4.Bb4‡])

Theme doubled with a long threat (GER) In the two thematic tries, the white attacker (wR or wB) is decoyed across a critical square, so that a black defence that was previously without effect is now effective. The white foreplan (with a full-length threat) forces another black defender to give up a guard (Rh3) or open a line (Pe5), allowing the decoy of a white attacker to be used for a new mate on another line. The logic is excellent, but the construction is not quite harmonious: the thematic Rb7 and Bf8 are passive in one thematic variation each, and Bh7 & Sc6 are only used for the threat (SWE) Double realization (orthogonal/diagonal) with critical moves in the tries which recur in the solution but are not sufficient. It is good that the pieces delivering the mates in the tries also do so in the solution (SUI) Ordinary logical problem. In the tries 1.Rb2? and 1.B×c5? the moves 1...Se2? and 1...Sd6? are not defences and so it makes no sense to consider them – they fail to prevent the mate (UKR)

4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) C10: Michael Barth (Germany) 1.Ka7? [2.Rb8‡] 1...Rb4 2.a×b4 [3.Rb8‡] but 1...Qb1! (2.R×b1 Rb4! 3.R×b4 a×b4!)

1.Rb7? [2.Rc×c7‡] 1...Rc4 2.d×c4 [3.Rc×c7‡] but 1...Qc1! (2.R×c1 Rc4! 3.R×c4 d×c4!)

1.Bh4! [2.Sd6+ Kd8 3.f7+ Sf6 4.B×f6‡] 1...Qh3 2.Ka7 [3.Rb8‡] Rb4 3.a×b4 [4.Rb8‡] (2.Rb7? Q×d3+!) 1...Q×f2 2.Rb7 [3.Rc×c7‡] Rc4 3.d×c4 [4.Rc×c7‡] (2.Ka7? Q×d4!)

WCCT theme × 2 (Country) The W3 moves are not very exciting and leave Black with no defence. It is a pity that 2.Ka7? has two refutations, 2...Rb4/Q×d4 (FIN) A clear doubling of the theme, on the adjacent b and c files. A direct guard by the bR is not enough as the bR can be captured by a wP, but the bQ can decoy the threatening wR critically across b4/c4 so that the bR defences work. The foreplan (with a full-length threat) decoys the bQ away, which seems to allow both tries and continuations, but there are dual avoidance effects separating the variations. (The fact that 1...Qxf2 2.Ka7? is refuted not only by Q×d4 but also by Rb4 is immaterial, as Black must play Q×d4 on the next move anyway.) It is a pity that Bg3 is used only for the threat, but apart from that, the construction is good (SWE) The key is not good (the bishop is under attack, and where else should it go?) but there is a full-length threat. Since 2...Rb4 3.a×b4 only extends the threat, it is not a defence, but the problem would be nicer without this. We rate the dual avoidance highly (SUI) Two variations. In the solution, the dualistic refutation of the try on the 2<sup>nd</sup> move (1.Bh4! Q×f2 2.Ka7? Q×d4/Rb4!) is unpleasant (UKR)

4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) C34: Ralf Krätschmer (Germany) 1.Rf3? [2.h5,Sf8‡] 1...e×f3?? (no defence) but 1...Be5+! (preliminary defence) 2.K×e5 e×f3+ (defence) 3.Kd6 f×g2! 4.Bc6? Rf7 5.Be8 Qc5+! (4...Sc7? 5.Bf3 Sce8+ 6.Ke7 B×f3/R×f3 7.Sf8/h5‡)

1.Bc6! [2.Be8+ Rf7 3.Sf8,B×f7‡] Sc7 2.Rf3 [3.Sf8,h5‡] Be5+ 3.K×e5 [4.Sf8,h5‡] e×f3+ 4.Kd6 [5.Sf8,h5‡] f×g2 5.Bf3 [6.Sf8,h5‡] Sce8+ 6.Ke7 [7.Sf8,h5‡] B×f3/R×f3 7.Sf8/h5‡

Successive Nowotnys on the same square (Country) A paradoxical and original way of handling the Nowotny theme. Black obviously cannot defend against the Nowotny on f3 by capturing with another piece (a black P)... except if this capture is done with check, so Black gains time to vacate f3 again by another P capture; this is achieved by Black's foreplan Be5+. The white foreplan to counter this is perfect here: 1.Bc6 Sc7 opens a line for White to counter with a new Nowotny on f3! A further point is that White could play Bc6 also in the try, after the Nowotny Rf3, but then Black has the defence Rf7 followed by Qc5+, as the wR no longer guards c5 (SWE) Same idea as *Ralf Krätschmer*,  $2^{nd}$  *Prize D. Werner-60 JT 2018-19*. Nowotny must be answered with check (here with bishop sacrifice) and a king move, so that e×f3 can be played with tempo and subsequent opening of the Nowotny point by the same pawn (f×g2). Still independent enough. The moves 5...Sce8+ 6.Ke7 [7.Sf8,h5‡] unfortunately prolong the game unnecessarily (SUI)



7<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points) C09: Jan Rusinek (Poland) 1.Bg4? [2.B×d7‡] f5? A1 2.e×f6 e.p. but 1...S×e5! B1 (2.B×e5 f5 A1 3.e×f6 e.p.??)

1.a4? [2.a×b5‡] Scd6? A2 2.Bg4 f5 3.e×f6 e.p. but 1...b×a3 e.p.! B2 (2.Sc2 Be1 B3 3.S×a3 Scd6! A2 4.S×b5 S×b5)

1.Sc2! [2.S×b4‡] Be1 2.S×b4+ B×b4 3.a4 [4.a×b5‡] Scd6 4.Bg4 [5.B×d7‡] f5 5.e×f6 e.p. [6.B×d7‡] S×d4,Sc7+/Sf5,S×b7 6.R(×)c7/a×b5‡

Analogous play on both sides with en passant captures (GER) A fascinating work, built on the fact that a P can capture en passant, but a B cannot. The try cannot be defended by f7-f5 as that allows a white e.p. capture; Black counters this by forcing White to replace Pe5 with a wB, so that en passant is impossible and f7-f5 works. White can try to counter this by decoying Sc4 away to d6 by playing a2-a4, but Black can defend by first playing an e.p. capture and only later (when White has played S-c2-a3) move Sc4-d6. White counters this by playing a foreplan which replaces Pb4 with a black B so that en passant is impossible and a2-a4 works. So, the theme is doubled (with the thematic moves f5/S×e5 and Scd6/b×a3 e.p.), both Black and White using foreplans with the aim of replacing a P with a B to stop en passant - a wonderful form of a bicolour echo. There is a small weakness: when Black has played b×a3 e.p., 3.S×a3 does not exactly repeat "the original plan" (a×b5‡) but threatens more slowly S×b5. So, the desired effect that the black foreplan makes the thematic defence effective against essentially the same threat is somewhat obscure here (SWE) Very original with black and white e.p. captures. The two principal white actors come from very far away (SUI) The theme implementation concept involves e.p. captures (UKR)

8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points, not counting for the country) C41: Frank Richter (Germany) 1.Sfe5,Sh6? [2.S×g4‡] d×c6/f3?? 2.S×g4‡ but 1...Sf6! (2.R×f6/B×f6 d×c6/f3! 3.R×e6+/B×g5+ B×e6/Q×g5!)

1.Ke1! [2.Q×d2‡] 1...Qa5 2.Sfe5 (2.Sh6?) [3.S×g4‡] Sf6 3.B×f6 [4.S×g4‡] f3/Q×e5 4.B×g5/Q×d2‡ 1...Sb3 2.Sh6 (2.Sfe5?) [3.S×g4‡] Sf6 3.R×f6 [4.S×g4‡] d×c6 4.R×e6‡

White Nowotny (Country) Unguard by 1...d×c6 or unblock by 1...f3 don't work as the wR/B guard d4 & f4. The black foreplan is a white Nowotny on f6, forcing White to choose just one guard to keep,

turning the unguard or the unblock into a real defence. White has possible continuations by the pieces on f6, but those mating squares are guarded by other black units. The white foreplan 1.Ke1 forces Black to give up one of those guards, so the corresponding capture on the Nowotny square f6 will work. An essential point is that the W2 continuations are differentiated: either e6-e3 and h8-d4 must be left open (so 2.Sh6), or a5-g5 must be closed (so 2.Se5) (SWE) Very subtle dual avoidance: 1...Qa5 2.Sfe5! (not 2.Sh6?), which prevents Qa5-g5 and 1...Sb3 2.Sh6 (2.Sfe5?), because e6 must not be blocked for Re6‡ (SUI)

8<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points) C46: Mikhail Marandyuk, Valery Kopyl (Ukraine) 1.Rb4? [2.Rd4‡] c5? A 2.Rb6‡ but 1...Sc4! B1 (2.R×c4 c5! A 3.R×c5 [4.e5‡] Re1! 4.Sh6 [5.Sf5‡] g×h6!) 1.Rb7? [2.Rb×d7‡] c5? A 2.Rb6‡ but 1...Sc7! B2 (2.R×c7 c5! A 3.Sh6 [4.S×f5‡] R×h6! 4.R×c5 [5.e5‡] Sc4!)

1.Sh6! [2.Sf5‡] 1...R×h6 2.Rb4 [3.Rd4‡] Sc4 3.R×c4 [4.Rd4‡] c5 4.R×c5 [5.e5‡] 3...Sc7,Sf6 4.Rd4+ Sd5 5.e5‡ 1...g×h6 2.Rb7 [3.Rb×d7‡] Sc7 3.R×c7 [4.Rc×d7‡] c5 4.Kf6 [5.Re×d7‡]

Two logical variations with play of the same wR (Country) Unpinning of a black pawn by the same wR in two variations (GER) A crystal clear doubling of the set theme, using the same "weak move" c6-c5 but with different white attacks and different black foreplans, both decoying the wR away from the b-file. In both cases, White has a plausible continuation after c6-c5, but the bR can defend. White's foreplan forces the bR to give up e1 or the bPg7 to give up f6, allowing one of the tries to work. Very elegant and economical (SWE) Nice doubling of the theme. In both variations, besides the short threats 3.R×c4 (4.Rd4‡) or 3.R×c7 (4.Rd7‡), the endings of both variations are threatened after White's third move; cf. the discussion in the Claims document (SUI)



10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points, not counting for the country) C31: Igor Yarmonov (Ukraine) 1.Ra4? [2.Ra6‡] c4? A 2.R×c4‡ but 1...Qa1! B (2.R×a1 c4! A)

1.d4? [2.R×c5,d5‡] but 1...S×d4! (2.Ra4 c4? A 3.R×c4‡; but 2...Qa1! B 3.R×a1 c4! A 4.Ra6+ Kc5 5.Bd6??)

1.Se6! [2.R×c5,Sd8‡] d×e6 2.d4 [3.R×c5‡] S×d4 3.d7 [4.d8=S‡] Sf7 4.d8=S+ S×d8 5.Ra4 [6.Ra6‡] Qa1 6.R×a1 [7.Ra6‡] c4 7.Ra6+ Kc5 8.Bd6‡ (2.d7? Sf7! 3.d8=S+ S×d8 4.Ra4 c4? A 5.R×a4‡; but 4...Qa1! B 5.R×a1 c4! A 6.d4 c×d3 e.p.!; or 4.d4 Sb7!)

Sacrifices of two knights (including a promoted one) and a pawn, underpromotion to knight, e.p. refutation of try, distant block of two squares, and a finale with model mate (Country) Interesting logical setup with dual avoidance and model mate in a single thematic variation (GER) The way the attacking wR is decoyed away from c4 is seen often in this tourney, but the white foreplan to counter this defence is very ingenious and unexpected: d6 is vacated (!) with the help of two wS sacrifices, and d4 is blocked with the help of a wP sacrifice; this together makes the model mate Ra6+ Kc5 Bd6‡ possible. Another good point is that d2-d4 must be played at the exact right moment: not at move 4 (Sd8 can defend), nor at move 6 (en passant) (SWE) Successive foreplans with knight sacrifices result in d6 being unblocked for the mating move. Good construction (SUI)

11<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) C08: Aleksandr Kryuchkov (Slovenia) 1.b×c6? [2.Bb5‡] B×c6 A 2.Bb3+ Ka3 3.Bd5+ Ka4 4.B×c6‡ but 1...Q×f1! B (2.B×f1 B×c6! A)

1.Bb3+ Ka3 2.Bf7+? Ka4 3.Rff3 [4.Ra3‡] e×f3 4.Bb3+ Ka3 5.Bc4+ Ka4 6.b×c6 [7.Bb5‡] B×c6 A 7.Bb3+ Ka3 8.Bd5+ Ka4 9.B×c6‡, but 6...R×c4! C

1.Bb3+! Ka3 2.Bg8+ Ka4 3.Rc4+ Ka3,Kb3 4.h8=Q [5.Qc3+ K×a2 6.Ra4‡] R×h8 5.Rc3+ Ka4 6.Bb3+ Ka3 7.Bf7+ Ka4 8.Rff3 [9.Ra3‡] e×f3 9.Bb3+ Ka3 10.Bc4+ Ka4 11.b×c6 [12.Bb5‡] B×c6 A (11...Qf1?? B, 11...R×c4?? C) 12.Bb3+ Ka3 13.Bd5+ Ka4 14.B×c6‡

Double preparation of the main plan with line-closing of bQ and quiet sacrifices (Country) Spectacular play based on White's R/B battery. The thematic try 1.b×c6? is refuted by a decoy of the wB to f1, making the R/B battery unusable to deal with 1...B×c6! The way White overcomes this obstacle is complex: after the white battery has closed the line from Qf8, the sacrifice Rf3 e×f3 closes the line f8-f1 stopping the black refutation, but Black gets a new defence R×c4! by the opening of the fourth rank. So, another foreplan is needed, first closing Qf8-h8, then forming a new B/R battery, and then decoying Rh4 to h8 by a Q-promotion. Only then the foreplan with Bf7 and Rf3 works. All in all, the wB visits five squares on the diagonal a2-g8. - Similar R/B batteries with interferences have been used before, of course, but they cannot be regarded as anticipations as the play is quite different here. But it is a small flaw that the first foreplan with Rf3 is refuted not only by e×f3 but also by e3 (the composer probably didn't consider worthwhile to add bPd2 and wPa5 to make R×e3 work), so the score has been slightly reduced (SWE) Very good problem. Good accurate promotion 4.h8=Q! (not h8=B). We don't like that not only e×f3 is possible, but also e3 which leaves the rook unused in the solution. Therefore, the deduction of -0.2 points (SUI) Successive formation and play of a white battery with closure of lines for black pieces and white queen and rook sacrifices (UKR)

12<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points) C05: Dieter Werner, Gerold Schaffner, Anton Baumann, Martin Hoffmann (Switzerland) 1...B×d8 2.Bd1 [3.B×g4‡] Se2 3.B×e2 [4.B×g4‡] Rg2,Rh4 4.B×g4+ R×g4 5.R×f2+ Rf4 6.R×f4‡ 1.Bd1? [2.B×g4‡]

1...Rg2? A1 2.R×f2+ R×f2/B×f2 3.B×g4/Rg5‡

1...Rh3? A2 2.B×g4‡ but 1...Se2! B (2.B×e2 Rg2! A1 3.B×b5?,3.B×g4+? R×g4 4.R×f2+ B×f2!; if 2.R×e2 Rh3! A2 3.R×f2+ Rf3 4.Bb3?)

1.Sf7? [2.Sd6,Sh6‡] but 1...B×f7! (2.R×f7+ Kg6 3.e6 [4.B×e4+ Kh5 5.Rh7‡] Sd3!)

1.Sb7! [2.Sd6‡] 1...Sc8 2.Bd1 [3.B×g4‡] Se2 B 3.B×e2 [4.B×g4‡] Rg2 A1 4.B×b5 [5.Bd7+ Be6 6.B×e6‡] Be6 5.Be8 [6.Bg6‡] g3 6.Bh5 [7.Bg4‡] Bg5 7.R×g5‡ (5...Bf7 6.Bd7+,6.B×f7)

1...B×b7 2.Bd1 [3.B×g4‡] Se2 B 3.R×e2 [4.R×f2+ R×f2/B×f2 5.B×g4/B×g4,Rg5‡] Rh3 A2 4.R×f2+ Rf3 5.Bb3 [6.Be6‡] Bd5 6.B×d5 [7.Be6‡]

5...Bc8 6.Bg8 [7.Bh7‡]

Double realization of the theme: Black has to play B before A1 resp. A2 (Country) A good presentation of the theme, though the variations are not perfectly in balance (FIN) Black refutes a double threat with a white Nowotny, so that previously unsuccessful single-threat defences are now effective. The white foreplan 1.Sb7 decoys Sa7 or Bd5, giving White new attack lines after the Nowotny captures. But the following play is inharmonious and somewhat drawn-out (SWE) Two variations (UKR)

13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place C36 Ilija Serafimovi**ć** Serbia 13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place C57 Zoran Gavrilovski North Macedonia

13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place C50

Mark Erenburg

Israel



13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) C36: Ilija Serafimovi**ć** (Serbia) 1.B×c6? [2.Be4‡] B×c6 A 2.0-0-0+ Ke2 3.Rd2‡ but 1...Rb1+! B (2.R×b1 B×c6 A 3.Rd1+ (3.0-0-0+?? Kc2 4.Rd2+ Kc1 5.B×f4 R×g4 6.Re2+ Kb1 7.0-0??)

1.Be8! [2.B×g6‡] Rh6 2.B×c6 [3.Be4‡] Rb1+ 3.R×b1 [4.Be4‡] B×c6 4.Rd1+ Kc2 5.Rd2+ Kc1 6.B×f4 [7.0-0‡] Ba4 7.0-0+ Bd1 8.Rf×d1‡

Black prevents long castling, but the short one remains (Country) The sole effect of Black's foreplan is to make the white 0-0-0 illegal. White could also mate in a few moves more with the rook part of castling (Rd1+), but bRh4 can stop 0-0. The white foreplan decoys this bR away. That the solution uses the other castling isn't strategically significant, but enhances the unity of the problem. Unfortunately, wSg5 is passive in the last four moves (SWE) Before capturing the bishop, Black must first prevent the queen-side castling and prepare against the king-side castling; this seems original. The short variation after 1...Rb1+ in 7 moves is very dualistic and there are no set mates after 1...Rb1+/Kc2 (SUI)

13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) C57: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.Rb7? [2.R×b4‡] e×f4 A1 2.Re7‡ but 1...Sb6! B1 (2.R×b6? [3.R×b4‡] e×f4! A1)

1.Ba4? [2.Bc2‡] d4 A2 2.Bc6‡ but 1...b3! B2 (2.B×b3? [3.Bc2‡] d4! A2)

1.Se8? [2.S×f6+ R×f6 3.R×e5‡ 2.d7 [3.Sd6‡]] but 1...B×f4!

1.Sh5! [2.S×f6+ R×f6 3.R×e5‡] B×f4 2.Rb7 [3.R×b4‡] Sb6 B1 (2...e×f4?? A1) 3.R×b6 [4.R×b4‡] B×e3 4.R×b4+ Bd4 5.Ba4 (5...d4?? A2) [6.Bc2‡]

A logical problem in which the moves A1 and A2 (by unpinned bPs) are weak defences on the B1 move after 1.Rb7? and 1.Ba4? respectively, but effective on the B2 move after decoy of wR by bS (1...B1!) or decoy of wB by bPb4 (1...B2!) In the solution the moves A1 and A2 are prevented by means of black self-obstruction on f4 or d4 (Country) If only there were a second variation... (FIN) Familiar matrix of unpinning try moves by wR and wB. In the solution the strong moves are no longer possible because the squares are blocked. It is interesting that the two try plays are overcome in one variation (GER) Two thematic tries of the fairly common type where an attacking wR or wB is decoyed away so that a bP can defend by unblocking a bK flight. Here both attacks occur sequentially in the solution: 1.Sh5 forces B×f4 which immobilises Pe5 (not by square obstruction, as the country wrote, but by removal of capture object) so that the Rb7 attack now works. But Black has gained a new defence B×e3, which defends against R×b4+ but lets in the Ba4 attack (not by square obstruction, as the country wrote, as d5-d4 wouldn't defend if it were playable - instead the decisive factor is that the wR captured Pb4). It is nice to see the bB as a sole defender, and it's very good that the play of the bB determines the key (1.Se8? leaves f4 unguarded in the end) (SWE) Moves A1 and A2 (decoys) are not prevented in the solution, but remain ineffective for White after black self-obstructions. However, this requires an immense number of pawns (SUI) Use of a wellknown scheme featuring play by white rook and bishop (UKR)

```
13<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) C50: Mark Erenburg (Israel)

1.Be8? [2.B×h6 [3.Bg6‡] Qc6 3.B×c6‡

2.Bg6+ Sf5 3.B×f5‡]

1...Qc6 A 2.B×c6‡

but 1...Sf7! B (2.B×f7 Qc6 A)
```

1.Bb5! [2.B×d3‡] d1=Q 2.Be8 [3.B×h6 [4.Bg6‡] Qc6 4.B×c6‡ 3.Bg6+ Sf5 4.B×f5‡] Sf7 3.B×f7 [4.Bg6‡] Qc6 4.f3+ g×f3 5.Sh3 [6.Sf2‡] Q×c3 (5...d1=S??) 6.Sf2+ K×d4 7.S×f3‡ 5...Qe6 6.B×e6 [7.Sf2‡] Holst theme in logical design and paradoxical interpretation. White forces the Q-promotion in order to eliminate the defence with the knight promotion (Country) One thematic line with Holst theme to force the promotion to a queen so that Black cannot promote to a knight (GER) The thematic black foreplan is a simple decoy of the wB from control of c6, but White's method of overcoming it is very fine: 1.Bb5 provokes a paradoxical Q-instead-of-S Holst promotion, which together with a vacation sacrifice of Pf2 allows White to use the decoyed wBf7 as a guard of d5+c4 (SWE) Very hidden Holst theme (S/Q). The black queen has a substitute defence (5...Q×e3) which turns out to be a block (SUI) The presence of two threats in the try and the solution is unpleasant (UKR)



16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points) C54: Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) 1.g×f5? [2.Sd2+ Kc5 3.Se4+ Kc4 4.b3‡] 1...d3? A 2.e×d3‡ but 1...Bf3+! B 2.e×f3 d3! A

1.Sa5+! Kc5 2.S×b7+ Kc4 3.Sa5+ Kc5 4.Sb3+ Kc4 5.g×f5 [6.Sd2+ Kc5 7.Se4+ Kc4 8.b3‡] Bf3+ 6.e×f3 [7.Sd2+ Kc5 8.Se4+ Kc4 9.b3‡] d3 A 7.Rc6+ K×d5 8.Rd6+ Kc4 9.Sd2+ Kc5 10.Se4+ Kc4 11.b3‡

Knight pendulum to eliminate a black pawn with a final long play to the mate (GER) Black defends by decoying Pe2 away so that d4-d3 works by giving a flight on d4. White counters this by a wS pendulum eliminating Pb7, followed by a short wR pendulum eliminating Pd5 and thereby guarding d4. A nice point is that White uses the decoy of Pe2 to f3 to his advantage by guarding e4. The pendulum play is very familiar, however (SWE) Preliminary manoeuvres of the white knight and rook with switchback enable the implementation of the main plan (UKR)

16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (6,6 points) C66: Ilija Serafimovi**ć** (Serbia) 1.Rf2? [2.Rf4‡] e5? A 2.f×e6 e.p.+ g6/f5 3.Rf4/Rf4,B×f5‡ but 1...g5! B (2.f×g6 e.p. Bg7+ 3.Kg8 e5 A 4.Rf3 R×e3 5.S×e3 Ba2!; 4.c4? b×c4 5.Q×c4+ Rd4!; 2.c4? b×c3 e.p.! 3.f×g6 e.p.??)

1.c4! [2.Q×d5‡] b×c3 e.p. 2.Rf2 [3.Rf4‡] g5 B 3.f×g6 e.p. [4.Rf4‡] Bg7+ 4.Kg8 [5.Rf4‡] e5 A 5.Rf3 [6.Sf2‡]

4...Bh6 5.g7+ f5 6.B×f5‡

Three thematic en passant captures (Country) Three en passant captures all play an essential part in the thematical play: the defence e7-e5 doesn't suffice because of a white e.p. capture; the black foreplan forces the wP to make another e.p. capture (and blocks it by Bg7+) so e7-e5 now works; White could use it as a self-block by playing Rf3, but R×e3 defends; so a white foreplan forces a black e.p. capture closing the line a3-e3. This combination of e.p. effects is hopefully new. The position is heavy, but the white economy is good (note 1...Rd3 2.e×d3+ K×d3 3.Q×d5‡) (SWE) Original e.p. captures. In the logical try, White is forced to capture e.p. on g5 to prevent him from capturing e.p. on e5. Another e.p. capture in the foreplan, this time by Black. Very heavy position, but tolerable with the many e.p. captures (SUI)

18<sup>th</sup> Place (6,4 points) C53: Štefan Sovík, Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemani**č**, Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia) 1.Rc1? [2.Re1‡] 1...d5? A1 2.Rc6‡ 1...Rd8? A2 2.Re1‡ 1...h1=R 2.Bg2 [3.Bd5‡] f4 3.R×h1 [4.Bh3‡] d5 4.Rc1 Rc8 5.Bh3+ Kd6 6.S×c8‡ but 1...h1=Q! B (2.R×h1 d5! A1 3.Rc1 Rd8! A2 4.Rc6+ Rd6 5.Bg2 f4 C1 6.Bh3‡; 5...R×c6! 6.B×d5+ Kd6!)

1.Bg2! [2.Bd5‡] 1...f4? C1 2.Bh3‡ 1...Rf8? C2 2.Bd5‡ 1...h1=Q,h1=B B 2.B×h1 [3.Bd5‡] f4 C1 3.Bg2 [4.Bh3‡] Rf8 C2 4.Bh3+ Rf5 5.Rc1 [6.Re1‡] d5 A1 6.Rc6‡

Complete diagonal-orthogonal analogy between try and solution, the so-called weak moves inclusive. In the try there is a "long" zig-zag wR Rundlauf and a "short" wB switchback, while in the solution it is exactly reversed. A tiny difference between try and solution is based on the fact that in one phase the pinned bR can move, but in the other it cannot (Country) A very elegant setting with two analogous mechanisms where the black foreplan 1...h1=Q makes the unsuccessful defences d5/f4 effective, combined with Rd8/Rf8 on the next move. The wR attack is very clear; White overcomes Black's defence by playing 1.Bg2 h1=Q 2.B×h1 f4 3.Bg2 Rf8 4.Bh3+ Rf5, a foreplan which has the effect of eliminating Ph2 so that 5.Rc1 works. The wB attack is almost exactly the same, with the difference that a pinned bRd6 can move while a pinned bRf5 cannot. But there is something else: the wB attack doesn't occur in a try, refuted by the black foreplan (which is somehow overcome by White in the solution): it comes in the solution, so the black foreplan doesn't refute a try but instead lets in another continuation (= the thematic wR attack). So strictly speaking, the wB doesn't fulfill the stipulated theme. However, there is a harmonious doubling of the essential "black foreplan to make a defence effective" idea, so this formal flaw has just caused a deduction of a few points (SWE) Good diagonal/orthogonal analogy between try and solution. Economically constructed (SUI) A wellknown scheme is used (UKR)



19<sup>th</sup> Place (6,2 points, not counting for the country) C33: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.f3? [2.Be3,Rh×e2‡] B×d3? A1 2.Be3‡ but 1...Sf2! B (2.R×f2? [3.Rf×e2‡] B×d3! A1

1.f4? [2.Be3,Rh×e2‡] R×d3? A2 2.Rh×e2‡ but 1...Sf2! B (2.B×f2? [3.Be3‡] R×d3! A2

1.Qa4! [2.Sf3‡] 1...B×a4 2.f3 [3.Be3,Rh×e2‡] Sf2 B 3.R×f2 [4.Rf×e2‡] (2.f4? Sf2 3.R×f2 Qh5!) 1...R×a4 2.f4 [3.Be3,Rh×e2‡] Sf2 B 3.B×f2 [4.Be3‡] (2.f3? Sf2 3.B×f2 Qh6!) 1...Qh5 2.Q×b4+ Rc3 3.Q×c3‡

A logical problem in which A1 and A2 are weak defences on the B1 move after 1.f3? and 1.f4? respectively, but effective on the B2 move after 1...B!. In the solution A1 and A2 are eliminated by decoy of bB or bR. Change of functions of three black and two white moves. Play on the same square by both Black and White (a4, f2) or only by Black (d3). The reciprocal dual avoidance after 1...B×a4/R×a4 is based on preventive interference with the bQ-lines (Country) Similarly to C41, Black plays a Nowotny to force White to leave just one attacking piece active - which allows Black to defend the single threat by a Nowotny-like capture on d3. Like C41, the white foreplan decoys one black defender away. And like C41, the W2 moves are differentiated - more thematically here, as White must close one of two lines for the bQ. But unlike C41, White has a double threat and the attacking pieces don't get new mating possibilities by the Nowotny captures, they just reactivate an original threat. The judgment here is influenced by the comparison problem C33a, which has the same logic and partly the same matrix (SWE) The mechanism is not original (UKR)

20<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place (6 points) C64: Dieter Werner, Anton Baumann (Switzerland) 1...S×a3 2.Bc1 [3.B×g5‡] Rg2 3.R×f2+ R×f2/Bf5 4.B×g5/R×f5‡

1.Bc1? [2.B×g5‡] Rg2? A1 2.R×f2+ R×f2/Bf5 3.B×g5/R×f5‡ but 1...Sd2! B1 (2.B×d2 Rg2! A1 3.Bb4 R×a7? A2 4.B×e7‡, but 3...c5! B2 4.B×c5 R×a7! A2)

1.Sc4! [2.B×e5‡] b×c4 2.Bc1 [3.B×g5‡] Sd2 B1 3.B×d2 [4.B×g5‡] Rg2 A1 4.Bb4 [5.B×e7‡] c5 B2 5.B×c5 [6.B×e7‡] R×a7 A2 6.R×a7 [7.B×e7‡]

Two consecutive realizations of the theme: Black has to play B1 before A1, and later B2 before A2. White could use the first thematic defence with a white decoy (*Lenkung*) of the bishop as a deploy (*Führung*). This fails because of the second thematic defence, which must be eliminated in the foreplan (Country) Consecutive realization of the theme, but poor key (GER) The black foreplan is a white Nowotny (similar to C05), decoying the wB to d2 so that Ra2 is cut off from f2. White could use this decoy to his advantage by playing Bb4, but another black foreplan c7-c5 opens a line so that R×a7 defends. White counters this by the foresplan 1.Sc4 b×c4, which opens a2-a7. The theme is doubled, but the final result Ra2×a7 is rather crude, and that wR isn't used further (SWE)

20<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place (6 points) C13: Mark Erenburg (Israel) 1.Re1? [2.Re4‡] d5 A 2.K×b7 [3.Sc6‡] but 1...f5! B (2.e×f6 e.p. d5! A 3.K×b7 Rh7!) 1.Rd1! [2.c3‡] b4 2.Re1 [3.Re4‡] f5 3.e×f6 e.p. [4.Re4‡] d5 4.R×e6 [5.Sf5‡] Rh5 5.Rb6 [6.R×b4‡] a5 6.R×b7 [7.Sc6‡]

Refutation by a pin that is hidden in the initial position. The unsuccessful capture of b7 by the white king is replaced by capture with the white rook (Country) The black foreplan 1.Re1? f5! prepares a pin on the seventh rank that is completely invisible in the diagram; that is the very special feature of the problem. The white foreplan to counter this avoids the pin by preparing a new attack after Black's primary defence d7-d5, an attack where the wR captures Pb7 instead of the wK. This has cost some time, so the ending appears a bit too long (SWE) Original refutation of the try by the nicely prepared pin. Many pawns (SUI) The attempt to capture the bPb7 with the wK is replaced in the solution with its capture by the wR (UKR)

1.Re5? [2.Ra5‡]

20<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place C17 Dieter Werner Switzerland



1...Rh5? A 2.Sf5 [3.Ra5‡] R×f5 3.Re1 [4.Ra1‡] 2...d5 B 3.Re6 [4.Ra6‡] d×c4 4.Ra6+ Kb5 5.Sd6+ K×a6 6.Sb4‡ but 1...d5! B (2.R×d5 [3.Ra5‡] Rh5! A 3.Sf5 R×f5)

1.Sc5+! Kb4 2.Sa6+ Ka4 3.Re5 [4.Ra5‡] Rh5 A 4.Sf5 [5.Ra5‡] d5 B 5.R×d5 [6.Ra5‡] R×f5 6.Rd1 [7.Ra1‡] 3...d5 B 4.R×d5 [5.Ra5‡] Rh5 A 5.Sf5 [6.Ra5‡] R×f5 6.Rd1 [7.Ra1‡]

‡7

(6+8)

20<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> Place (6 points, not counting for the country) C17: Dieter Werner (Switzerland) Reciprocal exchange in the logical play for Black. Analogous decoy by White and Black to prevent access to a1-h1 (Country) Analogous decoy by White and Black in logical form. The foreplan with two checks for line opening is relatively simple (GER) 1.Re5? Rh5? doesn't work as White can decoy the bR away from control of the first rank by 2.Sf5. The black foreplan 1...d5 uses the same tactic against White, by decoying the wR away from control of the first rank. An interesting point is that Black cannot play his two defences in reverse order, as 2.Sf5 d5 allows an unexpected attack over the sixth rank, ending in a model mate. White counters Black's counterplay by an initial pendulum manoeuvre bringing Sd3 to a6, opening the d-file so that Black's manoeuvre brings nothing more than some loss of time for White. Beautiful echoed manoeuvres in the try (SWE) Decoy of the black rook, preventing it from reaching the 1<sup>st</sup> rank (UKR)

#### 23rd-24th Place

- C43 (5,8 points): Andrzej Jasik (Poland) A doubling of the theme where one part occurs as a try at move 1, and the other part as a try at move 2 of the solution which unfortunately obscures the thematic pattern. 1.Bd2? Is defeated by the decoy 1...c1=Q! 2.B×c1 followed by 2...d3. So White plays the foreplan 1.Bb4 c5. Now the second thematic try is 2.Rg1?, defeated by the decoy 1...c1=Q! 2.R×c1 followed by 2...d3. So White plays the foreplan 1.Bb4 c5. Now the second thematic try is 2.Rg1?, defeated by the decoy 1...c1=Q! 2.R×c1 followed by 2...Ra1 (winning time for Black) and 3...f4. So White overcomes this obstacle by choosing instead to play on with the wB, using the self-block on c5 for 2.Bd2 3.B×c1 4.Bf4+ 5.Bd2 and 6.Bc3‡. That isn't all: 1...Rc5 is a correction of 1...c5 (5.Bd2 R×c4!), but lets in the wR attack 2.Rg1 3.R×c1 4.Re1+ 5.Rg1 as Black lost the delaying 3...Ra1. The logic is correct but hard to see through, and the economy is satisfactory (SWE) The play becomes interesting with the second move: 1.Bb4! Rc5 2.Bd2?/Rg1! and 1...c5 2.Bd2!/Rg1? (SUI) Two variations (UKR)
- C62 (5,8 points, not counting for the country): Miodrag Mladenović (Serbia) Two thematic variations (Country) Short threat with a dual mate, duals d×e5/f×e5‡ in the solution (FIN) Two well connected thematic tries with the same threat mate R×f7‡ and line opening defences (GER) White has prepared mates for Black's primary defences, but black foreplans open lines guarding those mates. The white foreplan induces Black to give up one of those rear guards. It is a pity that Sh3 is used only in one variation (Bg1 only works in one thematic variation, but thankfully also in 1...Rb3 2.d5+ R×c3 3.Bd4+). So, we have a clear doubling of the theme with unsatisfactory economy (SWE) Unpleasant duals in the finale of both variations (UKR)

### 25<sup>th</sup> Place

C02 (5,4 points): Michel Caillaud, Bernard Courthiau, Jean-Marc Loustau (France) In the solution, two different ways for overcoming the obstacle in the thematic try: a) in the first variation (1...c1=Q): preventing the preliminary efficient defence B (1...c1=S+), b) in the second variation (1...c1=S+): deviation of the efficient black defender (Sc1) after defence B. Holst theme in pure logical form. Nowotny (Country) The unprovided 1...c1=S+ detracts (FIN) No set play for 1...c1=S+ (GER) Black's foreplan to make B×f3 effective is a knight promotion, guarding one of the two Nowotny mates and winning time by checking. White counters this by forcing the paradoxical Holst promotion c1=Q, which leaves Black with only some harmless Q-checks to delay the mate. This type of Holst promotion to a stronger piece rather than a weaker one is always interesting (SWE) Rare S/Q Holst with Nowotny. Deductions, since after 1.f3 also S~ is threatened and there is no set mate after 1...c1=S+ (SUI) Nowotny and Holst themes (UKR)

### 26<sup>th</sup> Place

 C07 (5 points): Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands) The black foreplan e×f4 is a masked line-opening for the bQ towards c3. White's foreplan decoys the bQ, but unfortunately the decoy away from c3 is not used - only the decoy away from e5 (SWE) No double setting of the theme but double line opening for Qh8-c3 in the try (SUI) The theme features decoy of the black queen (UKR)

### 27<sup>th</sup> Place

C60 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Jan Rusinek (Poland) Seriously anticipated by comparison problems 60a/b/c/d (FIN) White Nowotny against black Nowotny with splitting the double move of key pawn to a single move as the key (GER) A very natural doubling of the theme with a white Nowoty to counter a black Nowotny. But because it is so natural, there are several predecessors as in the comparison problems C60a-d. The limited originality has affected the judgment (SWE) This mechanism has been presented many times by different authors (UKR)

### 28<sup>th</sup> Place

• C58 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemanič (Slovakia) Thematic try on W2 move (main plan 2.Sf8?) is finally refuted on B6 move (6...Bc8!) thanks to the cyclically shifted guards(+)/unguards(-) of 4 mating squares by 4 black units: Sc2-e1(+d3-d4), Sc3e2(+d4-e4), Pf7-f5(+e4-e6), Ba6-c8(+e6-d3). Switchbacks of black bishop (thematic weak move) and white rook (preparatory plan) (Country) An unusual and perhaps original presentation (FIN) The thematic try occurs at move 2 of the solution, with move 1 probably added so as not to have the wK threatened with check in the diagram. The original feature here is the complex nature of Black's foreplan, involving a cyclic shift of guards: Se1+ guarding d3 but unguarding d4, Se2+ guarding d4 but unguarding e4, f5+ guarding e4 but unguarding e6, and finally Bc8 guarding d7+e6 and unguarding d3 but now without harm. The checks give Black time to complete this sophisticated manoeuvre. White counters this with a foreplan (2.Rd×c6+ 3.Rd6+) guarding d6 so that f7-f5+ may be met by an e.p. capture, leaving e4 still unguarded (SWE) Dualistic finale (UKR)

#### 29<sup>th</sup> Place

C37 (4,4 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) Prevention of black chain-defence by deflecting the rook from the 8<sup>th</sup> rank (Country) 1.Sd2? Rf8? is without effect. Black's original foreplan is a chain of defences, finally leading to an opening of the f-file so that Rf8 works. It is almost like a multiple setting of the theme, with the difference that each black defence doesn't make the next one effective - it makes the next one playable. A technical note: Sc7 can be played only when Sc4 is still there, or when Pf4 has moved; otherwise, e×f4 will defend. A drawback of the setting is that the wR is a spectator in the mate (SWE) In the try 1.Sd2? [2.Sf3‡] the weak move 1...Rf8 is not a defense, failing to prevent the mate (UKR)

30<sup>th</sup> Place

• C25 (4,2 points): Henk le Grand (Netherlands) Unpin, pin, line-opening (Country) Good combination of unpin, pin and line-opening, but too many pawns (SUI)

31<sup>st</sup> Place

• C51 (4 points): José Antonio Garzón (Spain)

32<sup>nd</sup>-33<sup>rd</sup> Place

- C15 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Henk le Grand, Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands) Move reversal between the try (1.Sh2? 2.Sb4?) and the solution (1.Sb4! 2.Sh2!), but simple setting in heavy construction (SUI)
- C40 (3,8 points): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) The main content lies outside the stipulated theme: in the try, a black foreplan 1...Sf3 opens e1-c3; in the solution, White controls e5 differently and 1...Sxf3 can now be met by a new attack 2.B×c7 followed by repeated battery play. That seems to be the real point of the problem (SWE) Successive creation and play of a battery (UKR)

34<sup>th</sup>-37<sup>th</sup> Place

- C23 (3,6 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) A direct attack on a3 fails, and in deflecting the bR White must prevent the zwischenzug ...Rd4. Model mate with bK away from the corner (Country) The theme occurs at move 2 in the solution. Black's foreplan is of the very unusual type of losing a tempo by playing 1.Bf4? R×g4 2.Bd6 Rd4! rather than 2...Ra4? immediately, so he does not get in a zugzwang position after 2.Sf2. White counters this by starting 1.Bb6, guarding d4 and thereby preventing Black's defence. The problem is strategically somewhat diffuse, but the tempo-losing motif is agreeable (SWE) Duel of white bishop against black rook, model mate in the finale (UKR)
- C30 (3,6 points): Atsuo Hara (Japan) Simple but very clear (SUI)
- C32 (3,6 points): Richard Becker (United States) The unprovided bR checks devalue the whole mechanism (GER) In the try, the bR turns Sc5 into an effective defence by sacrificing itself to the wK on a square where Sc5 checks. Note that White cannot avoid this by playing 2.Kc1 Ra1+ 3.Kb2 because of 3...Rd1! The point is that Bg6 guards d3 but not d1. White counters the defence by choosing to attack from the other side, so that the wK can walk to f4 using the fact that Bc6 guards both a4 and f3. The problem impresses with the interplay of wB, wK, and bR,

hiding the symmetry of the mating arrangement (SWE) A mechanism featuring pinning of black knights (UKR)

C35 (3,6 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) 1.Rd7? g6? is without effect, so Black plays 1...Sd5! 2.R×d5 e6 which partially opens rank 7 so that 3.Rd7 g6! defends. White's foreplan decoys the defender Rh7 away; the new black defence 4...Rd4 is easily handled by Bb6 in a somewhat drawn-out finale (SWE) The theme is not presented; there is no A move (UKR)

## 38th-42nd Place

- C04 (3,2 points): Jordi Breu (Spain) No set play for 1...Ke4, no reasonable plan to overcome an obstacle (GER) In the try, Black decoys the white R so that Bd7 is bound to the guard of e6 and can no longer mate. White overcomes this simply by attacking from another direction. That is clearly allowed in the tourney, but settings where the try play recurs in the solution are more satisfactory (SWE) One variation with repetition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> move of the threat (UKR)
- C21 (3,2 points): Bernard Courthiau (France) Indian theme (white critical move), switchback by the white rook (Country) Ka2 is the thematic move in two tries, many pawns, known mechanism (GER) 1.Ra3! makes sure that R×b3-a3-a8 can be carried out before Black's tempos are out. Formally it is a correct setting of the theme, but the zugzwang construction makes it less than obvious that one black move (3...g3! and 2...h5! respectively) makes another move (Ka2) effective (SWE) Indian theme, white rook switchback and nothing new at all (UKR)
- C52 (3,2 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) The wB must remain on a6 until Black's first move is known; otherwise Black's stalemate plan, forcing capture of his free pieces in the right order, will prevail (Country) A Meredith mutate with a not quite convincing setting of the theme. Black's foreplan 1.Bb7? b4! makes 2.Ba6 Sc8 strong just by having the bP closer to b1, not by any effect on the Sc8 move itself. Probably no one would notice the motif outside of this tournament. The fine key avoids stalemate after 4...b2 5.Bb1, and prepares a new, shorter line for 1...b4 (SWE) In the try 1.Bb7? Sc8 2.B×c8 b4 3.Ba6 b3 the variation is shorter: 4.Bd3 b2 5.Bf5 [6.Sf3‡] (UKR)
- C61 (3,2 points, not counting for the country): Bernard Courthiau (France) The key prevents the defence B at first move, and delays it at third move, when it is no more efficient. Indian theme (white critical move). White king walk including a switchback. White king and Pf3 exchange their places (f5/f3). Model mate (Country) The Indian manoeuvre followed by a wK staircase is not very original, but the choice between 1.Bb6? and 1.Bg5! fits the set theme well (SWE)
- C65 (3,2 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Holst (Country) Very debatable if the try is thematic, as White changes his plan from 2.Be2<sup>‡</sup> to 3.f3<sup>+</sup> (c1=S is not a Holst promotion) (SWE)

43<sup>rd</sup>-44<sup>th</sup> Place

- C39 (3 points): Marko Klasinc (Slovenia) Variation with Black's long castling (UKR)
- C67 (3 points): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) The white rook makes all seven moves, mating on the starting square (Country) Not thematic: the move A (1...g5) does not refute 1...Ra1 2.R×a1 g5 3.Rh1 Kg6 4.Bh5+ Kh6 5.Bf7‡, but 1...Ra1 R×a1 Rb1 3.R×b1 Bd5!, analogous 1.Rc3? Ra3 2.R×a3 Rb3!, also overcoming obstacle not seen (GER) In the tries, Ra2 decoys the wR away from access to c7 so that Rb7 can defend (2...g5? doesn't work because of 3.Rh1/Rh3+ Kg6 4.Bh5+). So in the solution, White uses the fourth rank instead. This gives Black the opportunity to make g5 a strong defence by playing 1...Rb4! 2.R×b4? g5! (the set theme again), so White has to play 2.R×c7 as in the tries. When White returns to c4, Rb7-b4 doesn't work anymore as Pc7 is now gone (5...g5 6.Rb6+) (SWE)

45<sup>th</sup> Place

• C29 (2,8 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) The theme is not presented; there is no A move; moreover, duals 1.Ra4 Bc2 2.Bb3,Rd4 (UKR)

46<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Place

• C20 (2,4 points): Rolf Uppström (Sweden) Repetition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> move of the short threat (UKR)

• C24 (2,4 points): Gabriele Brunori, Daniele Gatti (Italy) Thematic move A: Bd5, overcoming obstacle not shown (GER) The theme is not presented; there is no A move, only a threat without variations (UKR)

#### 48<sup>th</sup>-49<sup>th</sup> Place

- C11 (2,2 points, not counting for the country): John Nunn (Great Britain) In the try Black must first deflect the R before promoting, thus forcing White to take the Q and delay the mate. White overcomes the defence by choosing the correct B-check, which refutes the ...Kb5 defence. Then ...Ka5 leads to mate after White's sacrifices of his R and S on the same square (Country) The play after 4...c4 is dualistic. Weak black move not seen (GER) The setting of the stipulated theme is very diffuse, as 1.Se2 c5 2.Bf2+? Kb5 3.Kb7 g1=Q? is without effect, and 3...Bf6! 4.R×f6 g1=Q does not have White continue with his original plan, but rather start a completely new attack on b6. The real merits of the problem are elsewhere, in the sacrifices 4.Rb4 and 6.Sb4. So, the problem would certainly have done better in another tourney (SWE) Unclear and dualistic (UKR)
- C55 (2,2 points): Valerio Agostini, Gabriele Brunori, Daniele Gatti (Italy) Moves A and B formal, no reasonable plan to overcome an obstacle (GER) The theme is not presented; the solution is unrelated to the try (UKR)

50<sup>th</sup> Place

• C42 (2,1 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden)

#### 51<sup>st</sup>-53<sup>rd</sup> Place

- C14 (1,8 points): Mike Prcic (United States) White counters Black's thematic defence by attacking from a different direction, so the relation between try and solution is weak. The claimed duals when Black plays Bb6 already at move 2 are without importance; Black's strongest play is to save Bb6 for one move later (SWE) Dualistic (UKR)
- C26 (1,8 points, not counting for the country): Jorma Paavilainen, Henry Tanner (Finland) Excelsior with minor promotion. The thematic move B does not appear in the solution after the key, but its appearance is not required by the theme (though all the four examples show it); instead here Black's defences are analogous to the basic idea of the move B in the try (2...Bd6!, 3...Be7! and 5...Be7!) (Country) Dualistic (GER) The thematic try Be1? first occurs at move 2 of the solution, when e3-e2 works only after the wB has been decoyed away to b4. So White chooses another continuation, and the same situation (with the same try and refutation) is repeated at moves 3, 4, 5, and 6 which shouldn't count as a full five-fold setting of the theme, but is nice to see anyway. The black defences against the varying white threats in the real play echo that in the thematic try: the wB cannot capture the bB because of e3-e2. The icing on the cake is the fact that the white attacks add up to an Excelsior, which leads to a decisive S promotion (a Q isn't enough). All this in Meredith form makes a very artistic impression. (The claimed duals after weaker black moves are unimportant.) (SWE) Dualistic (UKR)
- C56 (1,8 points, not counting for the country): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Unthematical: there is no Black foreplan B making another defence A effective (SWE) Displeasing capture of the black queen and a dualistic finale (UKR)

54<sup>th</sup>-55<sup>th</sup> Place

- C01 (1,6 points, not counting for the country): Luis Gómez Palazón (Spain) Main plan not obvious (Bc3,Bb4?), refutation of weak move not seen (GER) Unthematical: there is no black defence B making another defence A effective (SWE) Only a presentation of the theme in miniature form (UKR)
- C44 (1,6 points, not counting for the country): Richard Becker (United States) Dualistic (FIN), (GER) Who would have thought that the theme could be correctly set with only six pieces?
   1.Kf2? Kh2? is insufficient as White has 2.Qb8+ Kh1 3.Qb1+ (and a dual after 3...Kh2). The black foreplan is to step by step advance the bP to a2 where it guards b1 so that after 4.Kg3 a2 5.Kf2 Kh2 6.Qb8+ Kh1 the move 7.Qb1+ doesn't work. White overcomes this obstacle by choosing to

start with 1.Kg3 instead: the corresponding 1...Kg1? is met by 2.Qa7+ Kh1 3.Qh7+, which square cannot be guarded by the bP. But the P has a role to play anyway: after 5...Kg1 6.Qa7+ Kh1 7.Qh7+ Kg1, it stops the dual 8.Qb1+ leaving only 8.Qh2+. That this all works is almost miraculous. The drawback of the setting is that neither White nor Black really has much choice, so the play flows almost automatically (SWE) Dualistic (UKR)

56<sup>th</sup> Place

• C28 (1,5 points, not counting for the country): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) No original plan available, just waiting, only move A&B in original position available (GER)

57<sup>th</sup> Place

• C12 (1,4 points, not counting for the country): Sergey Kasparyan (Armenia) Dual on move 5; 1...c6 obvious strong move without set play (GER, UKR)

# Section C: Moremovers

Place	Country	No	FIN	GER	SUI	SWE	UKR	Total
1	SVK	C59	3,4	2,8	4,0	3,4	2,0	9,6
2	UKR	C06	2,2	3,2	3,0	3,6		9,3
3	MKD	C48	3,4	3,2	3,6	2,6	1,4	9,2
4-6	FIN	C03		2,8	3,6	3,2	1,6	9,0
4-6	GER	C10	2,6		3,6	3,4	1,4	9,0
4-6	GER	C34	2,6		3,0	3,8	3,0	9,0
7	POL	C09	2,6	2,8	3,4	3,6	2,0	8,8
8-9	GER	C41	2,6		3,6	3,2	1,0	8,7
8-9	UKR	C46	2,4	2,6	3,2	3,6		8,7
10	UKR	C31	2,2	2,6	3,0	3,4		8,4
11	SLO	C08	2,0	2,0	3,8	3,8	1,4	7,8
12	SUI	C05	2,6	2,4		2,6	1,4	7,5
13-15	SRB	C36	2,4	0,6	2,6	2,4	2,6	7,4
13-15	MKD	C57	2,0	2,6	2,8	3,2	0,8	7,4
13-15	ISR	C50	1,8	2,8	2,8	3,4	0,8	7,4
16-17	FIN	C54		2,4	2,0	3,0	1,8	6,6
16-17	SRB	C66	1,4	2,4	2,8	3,4	0,8	6,6
18	SVK	C53	1,6	1,8	3,0	3,4	0,8	6,4
19	MKD	C33	1,4	2,8	2,0	3,0	0,8	6,2
20-22	SUI	C64	1,6	2,4		2,4	0,8	6,0
20-22	ISR	C13	1,8	2,0	2,0	2,8	2,0	6,0
20-22	SUI	C17	1,4	2,6		3,6	1,0	6,0
23-24	SRB	C62	1,8	3,0	1,6	2,4	0,8	5,8
23-24	POL	C43	1,8	1,4	2,6	3,2	1,4	5,8
25	FRA	C02	2,0	0,6	2,8	2,8	0,6	5,4
26	NED	C07	1,4	1,6	2,4	2,0	1,2	5,0
27	POL	C60	1,0	3,2	2,0	1,8	0,6	4,8
28	SVK	C58	1,4	1,4	1,8	3,6	0,4	4,6
29	DEN	C37	1,4	0,4	2,0	2,6	1,0	4,4
30	NED	C25	1,0	1,4	2,6	1,8	1,0	4,2
31	ESP	C51	1,4	1,2	1,6	1,4	0,8	4,0
32-33	NED	C15	1,2	0,6	2,0	1,6	1,0	3,8
32-33	CZE	C40	0,8	0,4	2,0	2,0	1,0	3,8
34-37	USA	C32	1,2	0,2	1,6	3,4	0,8	3,6
34-37	JPN	C30	0,8	1,0	2,2	1,8	0,6	3,6
34-37	ARM	C35	0,8	0,8	2,0	2,0	0,0	3,6
34-37	GBR	C23	1,8	0,6	1,2	2,0	0,6	3,6
38-42	GBR	C52	1,0	0,6	1,6	2,2	0,4	3,2
38-42	ESP	C04	1,2	0,2	1,6	2,2	0,4	3,2
38-42	FRA	C21	1,2	0,2	1,6	2,0	0,4	3,2
38-42	ARM	C65	1,0	1,4	1,6	0,8	0,6	3,2
38-42	FRA	C61	1,0	0,4	1,6	1,8	0,6	3,2

43-44	CZE	C67	0,8	0,2	1,6	2,2	0,6	3,0
43-44	SLO	C39	0,8	0,4	1,6	1,2	1,0	3,0
45	DEN	C29	1,0	0,6	1,6	1,2	0,0	2,8
46-47	SWE	C20	0,8	0,8	1,6		0,4	2,4
46-47	ITA	C24	0,8	0,2	1,6	1,4	0,0	2,4
48-49	ITA	C55	1,0	0,2	1,0	1,4	0,0	2,2
48-49	GBR	C11	1,4	0,2	0,6	1,6	0,0	2,2
50	SWE	C42	1,0	0,4	1,6		0,4	2,1
51-53	USA	C14	0,8	0,4	0,6	1,8	0,0	1,8
51-53	CZE	C56	1,0	0,4	1,0	0,0	0,4	1,8
51-53	FIN	C26		0,2	1,0	3,6	0,0	1,8
54-55	USA	C44	0,8	0,2	0,6	3,2	0,0	1,6
54-55	ESP	C01	0,4	0,6	1,0	0,0	0,6	1,6
56	SWE	C28	0,6	0,2	1,0		0,4	1,5
57	ARM	C12	0,6	0,2	0,6	1,2	0,0	1,4
	SLO	C38	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
	LTU	C16	1,6	0,6	1,6	0,0	0,0	0,0
	MGL	C19	0,8	0,2	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,0
	GRE	C27	0,4	0,2	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0

The original points of C38 are: FIN = 1,0 - GER = 0,4 - SUI = 1,6 - SWE = 1,4 - UKR = 0,0. The country submitted C38 and C39 as versions. According to the rules, only the highest-graded version is kept in the award and may score points for that country.

## SECTION D: ENDGAME STUDIES

Judging countries: Denmark, Finland, Great Britain, Israel, Romania

Theme (proposed by Israel): During the solution, in the same position, White has two ways to make an active sacrifice of a unit; one is a try, the other is the solution. Any type of unit (including pawn) may be sacrificed and it is allowable to sacrifice different units in try and solution. The sacrifices must be pure: the sacrificed white unit(s) must not be guarded (protected) by another white unit after the sacrifice move and the thematic white moves must not capture a black unit. The sacrifice may or may not be accepted by Black.

1<sup>st</sup> Place D50 Sergiy Didukh Ukraine



+ D50 (9 points) (8+9)

Impressive far-sighted sacrifices (FIN) Excellent rook checks. Some lines after h8=Q+ are hard to follow. Many thematic sacrifices. White forces Black to cut a hole for the White rook to retreat through. Several switchbacks - both Black's and White's rooks do so. Some claimed thematic tries are not tries (GBR) 1.Ra8! [1.Ra7+? Kc6 2.Nb2 Rxe2 3.h7 f3 4.Nd3 Rd2 5.Re7 Rxd3 6.Nc2 Rd1+ 7.Re1 Rd2 8.Nxd4+ Kb6! 9.Rc1 f2+ 10.Kxg2 f1Q+ 11.Kxf1 Rh2=]

1...Rxe2 2.h7 f3 3.Rd8+! [Theme] [Thematic try 3.Nc2? Rxc2 Position X with Pa2.]

3...Kc7 [3...Kxd8 4.h8Q+ Kc7 5.Qg7+! (5.Qh7+? Kb8! 6.Qg8+ Ka7! 7.Nc2 bxc4 8.bxc4 Rd2 9.Qe6 Rd1+ 10.Ne1 d3=) 5...Kc6 (5...Kb8 6.Qf8+ Ka7 7.Nc2 bxc4 8.Qxd6 Rxc2 9.Qxc5+ Ka6 10.Qc8+ Ka5 11.Qf5+) 6.Nc2! Rxc2 (6...bxc4 7.Qxg4) 7.Ne5+! dxe5 (7...Kb6 8.Qh6) 8.Qq6++-]

4.Rc8+ Kb7 [4...Kd7 5.Nb6+ Ke6 6.Re8+; 4...Kxc8 5.h8Q+ Kb7 6.Nxd6+!]

5.Re8! [Theme] [Try 5.Rb8+? Kxb8 (5...Kc7? 6.Rc8++-) 6.h8Q+ Ka7! 7.Nc2 bxc4 8.bxc4 Rd2 9.Qe8 Rd1+ 10.Ne1 Kb6=] 5...Rxa2 [5...Rxe8 6.Nxd6+] 6.Rb8+! Kc6 [6...Kxb8 7.h8Q+ Ka7 8.Nc2! (8.Qh7+ Kb8 9.Qb1 Re2=) 8...bxc4 (8...Rxc2 9.Qh7+) 9.bxc4 Rb2 10.Na3! Re2 11.Nb5+ Kb6 12.Qd8++-] 7.Rc8+ Kd7 [7...Kd5 8.Ne3+! Theme (Thematic try 8.Ra8? Re2! 9.Nc2 Rxc2 10.Ra1 f2+ 11.Kxg2 f1Q+ 12.Kxf1 Rh2-+ Position X2 with Kd5.) 8...dxe3 9.h8Q Rf2 10.Qg8+ Kd4 11.Nc2+! Rxc2 12.Qxg4+ Kc3 13.Qxf3+-; 7...Kb7 8.Na5+! Kb6 (8...Rxa5 9.Nc2) 9.Rb8+ Ka6 (9...Kc7 10.Rb7+) 10.Ra8+ Kb6 11.Nc4++-] 8.Ra8! [Theme] [Try 8.Rd8+? Ke6-+ (8...Kc6? 9.Rc8++-); 8.Nb6+? Ke6 9.Ra8 Rb2] 8...Re2 [8...Rxa8 9.Nb6+]

9.Nc2! [Theme] [Try 9.Rd8+? Kxd8 10.h8Q+ Kc7 11.Qg7+ Kc6 12.Nc2 bxc4 13.Qxg4 Kb6 14.Qxf3 Rxc2=]

9...Rxc2 [Position X without Pa2.]

10.Ra1! [10.Ne5+? dxe5 11.Ra1 f2+ 12.Kxg2 f1Q+ 13.Kxf1 Rh2 14.Ra8 c4=]

10...f2+ 11.Kxg2 f1Q+ 12.Kxf1 Rh2 [Position X2 with Kd7.] 13.Ra8! Rxh7 14.Ra7+

1–0



2<sup>nd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place D21

Ladislav Salai Jr

= D21 (8,6 points)

1.Kb7+ Kd3 2.Bxd4! Bg2+! [2...Kxd4 3.Nc6+ Kc5 4.Nb4+! Kxb4 (4...Kd6 5.Rc6+=) 5.Re4+=]

3.f3!! [3.Nc6? Bxc6+ 4.Rxc6 Kxd4 5.Rd6+ Kc5 6.Rc6+ Kd5! (6...Rxc6? 7.Rxa8 Rb6+ 8.Kc7 Rb2 9.f4= (9.f3=)) 7.Rd8+ Ke4 8.Re8+ Kf3 9.Rf8+ Kg2 (9...Ke2 10.Re8+ Kd1 11.Rd8+ Rxd8? 12.Rxa6 Rd2 13.h4=) 10.Rg8+ Kxf2 I.: 11.Rf6+ (II.: 11.Rf8+ Ke1 12.Re8+ (12.Rc1+ Kd2 13.Rxa8 Rxa8-+; 12.Re6+ Rxe6 13.Rxa8 Re2-+) 12...Kd1! (12...Rxe8? 13.Rxa6 Re2 14.h4=) 13.Rd8+ Rxd8 14.Rxa6 Rd2-+) 11...Ke3 12.Re8+ Kd4 13.Rd6+ Kc5 14.Rc6+ Rxc6 15.Rxa8 Rb6+ 16.Kc7 Rb2-+] 3...Bxf3+ 4.Nc6 Bxc6+ 5.Rxc6 Kxd4 6.Rd8+ [Thematic try 6.Rd6+? Kc5-+ etc.] 6...Ke5 7.Re8+ [Thematic try 7.Re6+?? Kxe6-+] 7...Kf5 8.Rf8+ [Thematic try 8.Rf6+?? Kxf6-+] 8...Kg5 9.Rg8+ [Thematic try 9.Rg6+?? Kxg6-+] 9...Kh5 10.Rh8+ [Thematic try 10.Rh6+?? Kxh6-+] 10...Kg4 11.Rg8+ [Thematic try 11.Rg6+? Kf5-+] 11...Kf3 [11...Kh3 12.Rh6+ (Thematic try 12.Rh8+? Kg2! *13.Rq8+ Kf2*-+ etc.) 12...Rxh6 13.Rxa8=] 12.Rf8+ [Thematic try 12.Rf6+? Ke4-+] 12...Ke4 [12...Kg2 13.Rg6+ (Thematic try 13.Rg8+? Kf2-+ etc.) 13...Kh3 14.Rh8+ (Thematic try 14.Rh6+?Kg4-+) 14...Rxh8 15.Rxa6=] 13.Re8+ [Thematic try 13.Re6+? Kd5-+] 13...Kd4 14.Rd8+ Ke3 15.Re8+ [15.Re6+? Kf4-+] 15...Kd2 [15...Kf2 16.Rf6+! (Thematic try 16.Rf8+? Ke1!-+ etc.) 16...Kg2 17.Rg8+ (Thematic try 17.Rg6+? Kf3-+) 17...Kh3 18.Rh6+ (Thematic try 18.Rh8+? Kg4-+) 18...Rxh6 19.Rxa8=] 16.Rd6+! [Thematic try 16.Rd8+? Ke2! 17.Re6+ (17.Re8+ Kd1!-+ etc.) 17...Kf3 18.Rf8+ Kq4 19.Rq6+ Kh5-+] 16...Kc2 17.Rc8+ [17.Rc6+? Kd1!-+] 17...Kb2 18.Rd2+ Kb3 19.Rd3+ [19.Rxa2? R8a7+!-+] 19...Kb4 20.Rd4+ Kb5 21.Rd5+ Kb4 22.Rd4+

1/2-1/2

(7+6)

A long-term foresight proves why White needs to sacrifice the pawn 3.f3!! otherwise the black king would march to g2 and would capture the pawn from the right side (see lines I. and II.). Without the f-pawn, the magnetic rooks need to choose from two thematic checks repeatedly. The king cannot hide on either the h-file (where he has to accept the exchange of rooks), or the b-file (where he gets under perpetual check) (Country) Good foresight with 3.f3! but the study lacks a climax (DEN) Thematically convincing, though with rather forcing play consisting mainly of checks. White must choose correctly his rook sacrifices depending on the location of the bK and 3.f3! is a nice touch (FIN) A new idea and an enjoyable one. 3.f3 is a fine move. One expects the checks from the eighth rank to continue, so 16.Rd6+ is a pleasing surprise. Thematic many times over. The only significant demerit is the absence of a "big finish". The composer's reply to Claims is quite convincing (GBR)



Model mate after five consecutive sacrifices; different refutations by Black aiming at h7 square. 2×3 thematic moves. White sacrifices its knights closing two potential lines for queen defence moves (Country) A complicated solution with several thematic phases (FIN) A superb "slow-burner": White's plan to mate seems impossibly long... and yet it works. Excellent study: very rich, some very lovely lines (Bc5, Bxd6, Be7), multiply thematic, surprise moves to start, model mate climax. Only slight imperfection is the need for the b4 pawn to stop some Ra4/b4 sidelines (GBR)

#### 2<sup>nd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place D05 Ľuboš Kekely, Michal Hlinka Slovakia



= D05 (8,6 points) (7+8)

Two main lines with different White's strategies. In one of them White draws by reaching a stalemate, in the other one by positional draw. Eight thematic tries, distributed equally between both main lines (Country) Two thematic variations with several thematic parts is an impressive achievement (FIN) Numerous examples of theme. Cook-stopping pawns are unappealing (GBR) 1.b7 [1.Ra2? Kc8 2.b7+ Kb8 3.Kb6 Rg6+ 4.d6 Rxd6+ 5.Kxc5 Kc7 6.b8Q+ Kxb8 7.Kxd6 Rd4+ 8.Ke7 Ng6+ 9.Kd8 Rb4 10.Kxd7 Rxb5 11.a7+ Ka8-+]

1...Kc7 2.d6+ Kb8 3.Kb6 Ra4 [main A]

[3...Ra3 main B 4.Rf2! (4.Rh3? Raa4 5.Rf3 Ne6 6.Rg3 Rg4-+) 4...Re8 (4...Ng6 5.Rf6=; 4...Ne6 5.Rg2=) 5.Rf3! (thematic try 5.Ra2? Rxa2 6.a7+ Rxa7-+ no stalemate) 5...Ra4 6.Rf4! (thematic try 6.Ra3? Rxa3 7.a7+ Rxa7-+ no stalemate) 6...Ra2 7.Rf2! (thematic try 7.Ra4? Rxa4 8.a7+ Rxa7-+ no stalemate) 7...Ra1 8.Rf1! positional draw (thematic try 8.Ra2? Rxa2 9.a7+ Rxa7-+ no stalemate)]

4.Re2! [4.Rf2? Ne6 5.Ra2 Rd3!-+] 4...Ne6 [4...Rxa6+ 5.bxa6 Rb3+ 6.Ka5 Ne6 7.Rg2 Ra3+ 8.Kb6 Rb3+ 9.Ka5=]

5.Re3! [thematic try 5.Ra2? Rd3!-+]

- 5...Rg1 6.Re1! [thematic try 6.Ra3? Rd1!-+]
- 6...Rg2 7.Re2! [thematic try 7.Ra1? Rd2!-+]

7...Rg6 [main A1]

[7...Rg8 main A2 8.Ra2! (try 8.Re4? Nd4-+) 8...Rxa2 9.a7+ Rxa7 stalemate; 7...Rgg4 8.Re4! c4

a) 8...Ra5 9.Kxa5 Rxe4 10.Kb6 Ra4 11.a7+ Rxa7 stalemate;

b) 8...Ng7 9.Re7 Rg6 (9...*Rgd4 10.Rxg7 Rxd6+ 11.Kxc5 Rdxa6 12.bxa6=*) 10.Rxd7 Ne6 11.Re7=;

- 9.Rxc4! Rgxc4 10.a7+ Rxa7 stalemate]
- 8.Ra2! [thematic try 8.Re4? c4! 9.Rxc4 Nc5!-+]
- 8...Rxa2 [8...Nc7 9.Rxa4 Rxd6+ 10.Kxc5 Rd5+ 11.Kc4=]
- 9.a7+ Rxa7 [stalemate]



#### 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> Place D63 Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen Denmark



1.Be2 Qe5 2.Ra1+ [Thematic try 2.f4? Qxf4! 3.Ra1+? (3.Rg2=) 3...Bc1-+] 2...Qxa1 3.f4 Rxf4 4.f8Q!! [4.a8Q?? Qxa8 5.h8Q Qxh8-+; 4.h8Q?? Qxh8 5.a8Q Rf2-+ (5...Qxa8) ] 4...Rxf8 5.a8Q [Keller paradox. The sacrifice takes place on a square, which Black has just additionally covered.] [Thematic try (also Keller paradox) 5.h8Q? Qxh8 6.a8Q Rf2! and White cannot cover h2.] 5...Qxa8 6.h8Q Rf2! [6...Rxh8 7.Bf3#] 7.Qe5 [7.Qxa8? Rh2#] 7...Qa4 [White threatened 8. Qe4+] 8.Ra6 [8.Rg2? Rxg2 9.Bf3 Qf4!=; 8.c4?! Qc2=; 8.Qxe3?? Rh2#] 8...Qxc2 9.Qe4+! [Try 9.Ra1+? Bc1 10.Qe4+ Kg1! 11.Qg6+ (11.Qxc2?? Rh2#) 11...Kh1!=] 9...Qxe4 10.Ra1+ Rf1 11.Rxf1+ Bg1 12.Bf3+ Qxf3+ 13.Rxf3

## + D63 (8,4 points) (11+7) <sup>1–0</sup>

An original interpretation with queen promotions (FIN) All the heaviness of the initial position disappears during the solution (e.g. the queen, the three pawns on the seventh). Plachutta-like play. All corners in action. Good use of the Keller 1 Paradox. A nice hanging queen sideline (Qg6+/Qe4+). Intro is very short. Fewer thematic moves relative to other strong entries (GBR)

5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> Place D74 Volodimir Samilo Vladislav Tarasyuk Ukraine



= D74 (8,4 points) (9+7)

1.Nd3! exd3 [1...Bxe2 2.Nxf4 Kxf4 3.b4 Bq4 4.Nb3 e3 5.Nxd4 Ke5 6.c3 e2 7.Nc2! Bf5 (7...Kd6 8.Ba2 Be6 9.c7=) 8.c7 Kd6 9.g4!=] 2.Re5+ Kg6! [2...Kh6 3.Re6+ Bg6 4.Kg8! d2 5.c7 d1Q 6.c8Q Qq4 7.Qe8! Kh5 8.Re5+ Kh6 (8...Kh4 9.Qe7+ Kq3 10.Rq5+-) 9.Re6 pos. draw; 2...Kf6 3.Rxh5 Kq6 4.Kq8=] 3.Re6+ Kf7 4.c7 Bg6! 5.g4! [Thematic Pawn move.] [Try 5.Re7+? Kxe7 6.c8Q Rf8+ 7.Qxf8+ Kxf8 8.cxd3 b4!-+ Pos. A with pg2] 5...Rf1 [5...Rxq4 6.Re7+! Kxe7 7.c8Q+-] 6.Re7+! [Thematic Rook move.] [Try 6.Rf6+? Kxf6 7.c8Q Rh1+ 8.Kq8 Bf7+ 9.Kf8 Rh8#] 6...Kxe7 7.c8Q Rf8+ 8.Qxf8+ Kxf8 9.cxd3 b4! [Pos. A with pq4] 10.g5! [10.Bc2? a2 11.g5 Kf7 12.Bd1 Bxd3 13.Bh5+ Bg6-+; 10.Nc2? Bxd3 11.Nxa3 bxa3 12.Bxd3 a2-+] 10...a2! [10...Kf7 11.Nc2! Bxd3 12.Nxa3=] 11.Bxa2 Bxd3 12.Nc2! [Thematic Knight move.] [Try 12.Bb1? Bxb1 13.g6 Bxg6 14.Nc2 d3!-+ (14...Bxc2? stalemate)] 12...Bxc2 13.Bb1! [Thematic Bishop move.] [Try 13.g6? Bxg6 no stalemate 14.Bb1 Kf7-+] 13...Bxb1 14.g6 Bxg6 [stalemate]

#### 1⁄2-1⁄2

Ambitious foresight, but unpleasant starting position (DEN) An exciting struggle with many thematic phases (FIN) Unusual ideas, fascinating! Surprisingly rich range of theme illustrations. Very complicated sidelines, such 1...Bxe2 2.Nf4 Kxf4 3.b4 Ke5 4.c7 Bg4 5.Nb3 e3 6.Kg7 d3 7.cxd3 e2 8.Nd2! Kd4! 9.Nf3+ Kc3 10.Ba2 - astonishing sequence of only moves from 7.cxd3. The foresight theme is part of this study: the need to get the g2 pawn further up the board in preparation for the distant stalemate (GBR)

#### 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> Place D02 Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen Denmark



+ D02 (8,4 points) (9+9)

A visually impressive Plachutta with a try is a sacrifice to the black Plachutta on another square. The refutations of the tries are easy to find, which is a slight drawback (FIN) Very rich composition. Heavy, but a double Plachutta requires that. Analytically very hard but seems to be (probably) correct (GBR)

1.c7 Qg4 [1...Bxd5+ 2.Ka3 Qg4 eg 3.Ne6; 1...Qh3 eg 2.Qh1 (2.Ne6) ] 2.Qd1! [Too early is 2.Ne6? Kd7 3.Qb1 d3 and Black comes first.; 2.Qh1? threat 3. Qe4+ 2...Ke7!-+; 2.Qf1? d3!-+; 2.Qb1? d3!] 2...Bxd5+ [2...Qxd1 3.c8Q++-; 2...Qc8 3.Qe2+ Be3 4.Ne6 Bxe6 5.dxe6 Qxe6+ 6.Ka1 Kd7 eq 7.Qh2 Bh6 8.Qxh6 Qe1+ 9.Ka2 Qe6+ 10.Kb1 Qb6+ 11.Kc1 Qb2+ 12.Kd1 Qb1+ 13.Qc1 Qa2 14.Qf4] 3.Ka3 Bg3 [3...Qc8 4.Nh7 Qxc7 5.Nxf6+ Kd8 6.Nxd5+-; 3...Qxd1 4.c8Q+ Ke7 5.Qd7#; 3...d3 4.Qxg4 (4.Ne6) 4...Bc5+ 5.Qb4+-] 4.Qe2+ [4.Qxq4?? Bd6#; 4.Qxd4?? Bd6+-+] 4...Be5 [4...Qxe2 5.c8Q++-] 5.Ne6! [Preparatory Plachutta. Unpin of Be5.] [5.Qxe5+ fxe5 6.Ne6 Bxe6 (6...Qxe6-+); Thematic sacrificial try 5.Qe4? Bg8! (5...Bc4? 6.Ne6 Bd6+ 7.Nc5+ Be7 8.Kb4!+-; 5...Bxe4? 6.g8Q+-; 5...Qxe4 6.c8Q++-) 6.Qxq4 (6.Nh7 Ke7-+ (6...Qxe4 7.c8Q+ Ke7)) 6...Bd6#; 5.a5? Qc8-+; 5.Nh7? Ke7-+ (5...Qxe2=)] 5...Bd6+ [5...Bxe6 6.c8Q+ Bxc8 7.q8Q++-; 5...Qxe6 6.q8Q+ Qxq8 7.c8Q++-] 6.Nc5+ Be7 [6...Be5 eq 7.Qxq4] 7.Qe6! [Main Plachutta] [Thematic sacrificial try 7.Qe4? Bg8! (7...Bxe4 8.g8Q+; 7...Qxe4 8.c8Q+; 7...Bc4 8.Kb4!) 8.Kb4 (8.Qxq4 Bxc5#) 8...Qc8!] 7...Qxe6 [7...Bxe6 8.c8Q+ Bxc8 9.g8Q+ Bf8 10.Qf7+ Kd8 11.Qxf8+ Kc7 eq 12.q7+-] 8.q8Q+ Qxq8 9.c8Q+ Bd8 10.Qd7+ Kf8 11.q7+! [11.Qxd8+? Kq7=] 11...Qxq7 12.Qxd8+ Kf7 13.Qxd5+



8<sup>th</sup> Place D61 Helmut Waelzel Martin Minski Jan Sprenger Germany



+ D61 (8,2 points) (4+4)

1.Ng2! [logical try: 1.Kxg3? Kxe1 2.Bd5 Kd2! 3.Kh2 position X with wBd5 (3.b6 e3! 4.b7 e2=) 3...e3!=; 1.b6? e3=] 1...Nf5! [compare with the logical try: 1...Bxg2+ 2.Kxg3! (2.Kxg2? Nf5 3.b6 Nd4 /Nd6=) 2...Bh1 3.Bh5+! Kd2 4.Kh2 position X with wBh5 4...Bf3 (4...e3 5.Kxh1 e2 6.Bxe2+-) 5.b6! Bxh5 6.b7 e3 7.b8Q e2 8.Qd8+ Kc2 9.Qa5+-] 2.Ne3+! Nxe3 [2...Ke2 3.Nxf5+-] 3.b6 Bg2+! 4.Kh2 [4.Kg3? Nf5+ 5.Kxg2 Nd4 /Nd6=] 4...Ng4+ 5.Kxg2 Nf6 [thematic move:] [5...Ne5 6.Be8 e3 7.b7 e2 8.b8Q e1Q 9.Qb1+ Kd2 10.Qb4+ Ke2 11.Bh5++-]

6.Bh5+! [main A:]

[thematic try: 6.Be8? e3! 7.Ba4+ Kd2 8.b7 e2 9.b8Q e1Q 10.Qb4+ Ke2 11.Bb5+ Kd1 12.Ba4+ Ke2=; 6.Bb3+? Kd2 7.Ba4 (7.b7 Nd7 8.Ba4 Nb8=) 7...e3 8.b7 e2 9.b8Q e1Q 10.Qb4+ Ke2 11.Bb5+ Kd1 12.Ba4+ Ke2=; 6.Be6? e3 7.b7 e2 8.b8Q e1Q=; 6.b7? Nd7 7.Be6 Nb8=]

6...Kc2 [thematic move:]

[main B: 6...Kd2 thematic move: 7.Bg4! (thematic try: 7.Be8? e3! 8.b7 e2 9.b8Q e1Q 10.Qb4+ Kd1/Ke2 11.Ba4+ Ke2 12.Bb5+ Kd1 13.Ba4+ Ke2=) 7...e3 (7...Nxg4 8.b7 e3 9.b8Q+-) 8.b7 e2 (8...Nd7 9.Bxd7 e2 10.b8Q e1Q 11.Qb4+ Kd1/Ke2 12.Bg4++-) 9.b8Q e1Q 10.Qb4++- skewer; 6...Nxh5 7.b7 e3 8.b8Q+-]

7.Be8! [thematic try: 7.Bg4? e3! 8.Bf5+ Kd2 9.b7 e2 10.b8Q e1Q 11.Qb4+ Ke2 12.Bd3+ Kd1 13.Bc2+ Ke2 14.Bd3+ Kd1=] 7...e3 [7...Nxe8 8.b7+–] 8.Kf3! Kd3 [8...Kd2 9.b7 e2 10.b8Q e1Q 11.Qb2+ /Qb4++–] 9.b7 [or 9.Bb5+ Kd2 10.b7 e2 11.Bxe2] 9...e2 10.Bb5+ Kd2 11.Bxe2 Nd7 12.Bb5 [e.g.] 12...Nb8 13.Ke4 Kc3 14.Kd5 Kb4 15.Bf1 Ka5 16.Kc5 Nd7+ 17.Kc6 Nb8+ 18.Kc7

#### 1–0

3 thematic moves; reciprocal change of Bg4/Be8 as try/solution in main A and B (Country) The bishop is elegantly sacrificed on different squares in different lines. A real find and great economy (DEN) The small dual on the 9<sup>th</sup> move is a pity, but the preceding play offers ample compensation (FIN) Nice thematic tries, though Be8 fails twice for the same reason. Drawback is the dual after 7.Kf3 Kd3 8.Bb5+ or b7. Elegant change of Bg4/Be8 after Kc2/d2 (GBR)

9<sup>th</sup> Place D07 Jan Sprenger, Martin Minski Germany



[thematic move:] 1.Nf4! [thematic try: 1.Bd5+? Kb8! 2.h8Q Qd6+ 3.Kb5 a6+ 4.Ka5 Qxd5+ 5.Nc5 Rxh8 6.Rxh8+ Ka7! 7.Rh7+ Ka8! 8.Ne3 Qd8+=; 1.Nb6+? axb6 (1...Kb8? 2.h8Q+-) 2.Bd5+ (2.Nf4?? *Qa3+-+*) 2...Kb8!=; 1.h8Q? Qd6+ 2.Ka5 Qc7+=] 1...Qxf4 2.Nb6+! [2.Bd5+? Kb8!=] 2...axb6 [thematic move:] [2...Kb8 3.h8Q+-] 3.Rd1! [thematic try: 3.Bd5+? Kb8! (3...Rxd5? 4.h8Q+ Qb8 5.Rh7! Rd8 6.Qa1!+-) 4.h8Q Rxh8 5.Rxh8+ Kc7=; 3.h8Q? Qd6! 4.Qc3 b5+ 5.Ka5 Rxg8 6.Qf3+ Kb8 7.Rh7 Qd8+=] 3...Rxd1 [3...Qc7 4.Rxd8+ Qxd8 5.h8Q+-; 3...Rc8 4.h8Q+-] 4.h8Q [(threatens 5.Bd5#) main A:] 4...Qb8 [thematic move:] [main B: 4...Qf8 thematic move: 5.Bd5+! (thematic try: 5.Qh1+?? Rxh1 6.Bd5+ Kb8-+) 5...Rxd5 6.Qxf8++-] 5.Qh1+!! [thematic try: 5.Bd5+?? Rxd5-+] 5...Rxh1 6.Bd5+ Qb7+ 7.Bxb7+ Kb8 8.Bxh1

#### 1–0

4 thematic moves; reciprocal change of Qh1+/Bd5+ as try/solution in main A and B (Country) Two thematic variations after White's 4<sup>th</sup> move, but 4...Qf8 5.Qh1+? is a very artificial sacrifice (FIN) Enjoyable tactical battle, with multiple surprise moves, and a fun finish (5.Qh1+) (GBR)





1.Nf7! Rc5+! 2.Kb4! [2.Kd4? Rc7! 3.Nxg5+ Kh4 4.Ne4 Rd7+ 5.Kc3 (5.Ke3 b4 6.Bc4 Bd1 7.Nc5 Rd8 8.Bf7 Bc2-+) 5...b4+ 6.Kd2-+] 2...Rd5 3.Be4 Rd4+ 4.Kc5!! [4.Kxb5 Be2+ 5.Kc5 Rc4+-+]

4...Rc4+ 5.Kxb5 [5.Kd5?? Be6+ and (5...Kh4)]

5...Be2! 6.Nxg5+ Kh4 7.Nf3+! [7.Bf3? Bf1? (7...Bd3-+) 8.Bg2 Bd3 9.Nf3+=]

7...Kh5 8.Bg6+! [8.Bd3?? Bxd3 9.Ne5 Rd4+ 10.Kc5 Rd8-+]

8...Kh6 9.Bd3!! [9.Ng1? Bf1-+]

9...Bxd3 10.Ne5 Rd4+ 11.Kc5

1/2-1/2

Great. A shame that the f2 pawn is not necessary in the end (DEN) A simple-looking position conceals a nice idea, though the theme is not very prominent (FIN) Light and game-like. Readily understandable, but plenty of unexpected moves. Neat finish. A fine study. Thematic, on move eight, where interposing 8.Bg6+!, instead of the immediate 8.Bd3?, drives the bK to an inferior square. This thematic try both meets the tourney theme and enhances the study (GBR)



+

4 thematic moves; rook promotion (Country) A very good presentation with two interesting variations. The thematic rook sacrifices are analogous in both variations and 3...Qe8 yields two additional thematic sacrifices (FIN) The final stages are pleasing. The intro is complex but doesn't add much. This study is mildly anticipated (GBR)

12<sup>th</sup> Place D30 Luis Miguel González Spain



= D30 (7,2 points) (6+4)

1.Nc4 [\$1 Theme]

[1.Nc6+ \$2 Plachutta 1...Rcxc6! 2.Rxa2 Rf3! 3.Ng1 Rf1 4.Ne2 Kb3! 5.Ra8 Rc2+ 6.Kd3 Rd1+ 7.Ke3 Re1-+; Thematic try 2: 1.Nb7? Rxb7! 2.Rxa2 Rh7! 3.Ng1 Rf2+ 4.Ne2 Rxe2+! 5.Kxe2 Rxh2+-+]

1...Kxc4 [1...Rxc4 2.Rxa2 Rf3 3.Ng1 \$1 \$11] 2.Rxa2 Kb3! 3.Ra8! [3.Ra5? Rc2+ 4.Ke1 Rh6! 5.Nf2 Rg6! 6.Kf1 Rf6-+] 3...Rc2+ 4.Ke1 Rg2! [4...Rxh2 5.Ng1! Re6+ 6.Kf1 \$1 \$11] 5.Ra5! [5.d5? Rf3! 6.Rh8 *(6.d6 Rxh3! 7.d7 Rhxh2-+)* 6...Rxh2 7.Rb8+ Kc2 8.Rc8+ Kd3 9.Ng1 Rg3 10.Kf1 Rh1-+]

5...Kc4! [5...Rc6 6.Rb5+! Ka4 7.Rc5 Rb6 8.Rc4+! Ka5 (8...Kb3 9.Nf4! Rxh2 10.Rc8 Ra6 11.Rb8+ Kc4 12.Rc8+ Kxd4 13.Ne2+=) 9.Rc5+ Ka6 10.Rc1 Rbb2 11.d5! Rxh2 12.Ng1 Rbg2 13.Kf1 \$1 \$11; 5...Kb4 6.Re5! Rf3 7.Ng5 Rb3 8.Kf1 Rxh2 9.Kg1 Rc2

10.Rf5! Rb1+ 11.Rf1 Rbb2 12.Nf3=; 5...Rf3 6.Rg5! Rxh2 7.Ng1 Re3+ 8.Kf1 \$1 \$11]

6.Ra4+! [6.d5? Kb4 7.Ra8 Rf3! 8.d6 Rxh3 9.d7 Rhxh2-+; 6.Ng5? Rxh2-+ or (6...Rff2-+)] 6...Kd5! [6...Kc3 7.Ra3+ Kb4 8.Re3! Rxh2 9.Ng1! Rh1 10.Rg3=]

7.Ra6! [7.Ra5+? Ke4! 8.Re5+ Kd3 \$1 \$19; 7.Ng5? Rxh2-+ or (7...*Rb6-+)*] 7...Rf7 8.Ra7 [\$1 Theme] [8.Ng5? Rb7! (8...*Rff2*? 9.*Nh3* \$1 \$11) 9.Kf1 Rbb2! (9...*Rxh2*? 10.*Ra5+* \$1 \$11) 10.Ra5+! Kc4! 11.Rf5! (11.*Rc5+ Kd3* \$1 \$19) 11...Rxh2 12.Kg1 Rhg2+! (12...*Rbg2+*? 13.*Kf1 Rb2* 14.*Kg1 Rhg2+* loss of time) 13.Kh1! Kxd4! 14.Nf3+ Ke4! (14...*Ke3*? 15.*Ne1! Rg3* 16.*Ng2+! Rbxg2* 17.*Re5+=*) 15.Re5+ Kf4 \$1 \$19 e. g. 16.Ne1 Kxe5 17.Nxg2 Ke4! 18.Kg1 Kf3 19.Nh4+ Kg3 20.Nf5+ Kg4 21.Nd4 Rd2 22.Nb3 Rd3 \$19 and White loses the knight]

8...Rf8 9.Ra8! [9.Ra5+? Kc4! 10.Ra4+ Kb3! 11.Ra5 Rc8! 12.Rb5+ Ka4 13.Rc5 Rb8 14.Rc4+ Kb3! 15.Rc5 Ra8 16.Kf1 Rxh2 17.Nf2 Rf8-+; 9.Re7? Rf3! 10.Re5+ Kc4! 11.Ng5 Rb3 12.Kf1 Rxh2 13.Kg1 Ra2 14.Rf5 Rg3+ 15.Kf1 Kxd4-+; 9.Ng5? Rxh2-+ or (9...Rb8-+)] 9...Rf7 10.Ra7 [\$1 Theme]

[10.Ng5? Rb7! (10...Rff2? 11.Nh3 \$1 \$11) 11.Kf1 Rbb2! 12.Ra5+ Kc4 \$1 \$19 as thematic try 3] 10...Rf6 11.Ra6! [11.Re7? Rf3! 12.Re5+ Kc4 \$1 \$19; 11.Ng5? Rxh2-+ or (11...Rb6-+)] 11...Rf3 12.Ra3 [\$1 Theme]

[12.Ng5? Rb3 \$1 \$19 eg. (12...Rff2? 13.Nh3 \$1 \$11) 13.Kf1 Rbb2-+ or (13...Rxh2-+)]

12...Rxa3 13.Nf4+ Ke4 14.Nxg2 Kf3 15.Nh4+! [15.Kf1? Ra1+! 16.Ne1+ Ke3 17.d5 Kd2-+]

1⁄2-1⁄2

Good technical accomplishment, but difficult sidelines (DEN) A complicated struggle with thematic sacrifices by two different white pieces (FIN) The main play is of little artistic interest - looks like an OTB game. The finish is unexciting. The composer comments, about 1.Nc6+, "Plachutta", but to be a Plachutta, it needs to cause interference and this does not. Thematic both on move one and later (GBR)



1.Kd2 [1.0–0? Nxc2=] 1...Nc3 2.Rxb1 [2.Nxb4? Rxh1 3.Kxc3 hxq4=] 2...Nxb1+ 3.Kc1 [3.Kd1? Nxa2 4.gxh5 Nbc3+ 5.Ke1 Ke6=] 3...Nxa2+! [first knight sacrifice] [3...hxg4 4.Nxb4 g3 5.Nc4+ Kc5 6.Ne5 g2 7.Nf3+-] 4.Kxb1 Nc3+ 5.Kb2 [5.Kc1? hxg4=] 5...Nd1+ 6.Kc1 Nxe3 [second knight sacrifice, declined] 7.gxh5 Ng4 [thematic line 7...Nf5 8.Ne3! (A) (8.Nd5? (B) thematic try 8...Kxd5 9.Ne3+ Ke5=) 8...Nxe3 9.h6+-] 8.Nd5! [(B) third knight sacrifice, designed solely to draw the black king into position for a further sacrifice] [thematic try 8.Ne3? (A) 8...Nf6! 9.h6 Ke6! (9...Ke5? 10.Nd7+) 10.Nbd5 (10.Ng4 Kf7!) 10...Nh7! 11.Kd2 Ng5! 12.Kd3 Kf7=] 8...Kxd5 [8...Ke6 9.Nce3! Nh6 here the knight cannot move to f6 10.Kd2 Ke5 11.Ke2+-] 9.Ne3+ [fourth knight sacrifice; on g4 the black knight is too

9.Ne3+ [fourth knight sacrifice; on g4 the black knight is too far away to be protected by the king] 9...Nxe3 10.h6

1–0

During the course of play, all four knights are sacrificed. Reciprocal change between correct and incorrect knight sacrifices in two lines (Country) 8.Nd5! is a nice sacrifice in this battle of knights (FIN)



Queen sacrifices with simple motivations (FIN) Thematic Qb1/c1/d1 with two tries: a good display of the theme. Later, the mating net with g3 mate and the lateral pin is not original. The dual on move 12 is significant (GBR)


Inspired by the game V. Kramnik - M. Illescas Cordoba, Dos Hermanas 1997 (Country) The main quality of this study is how b4-b5 opens the diagonal for the queen that is not yet on the board (DEN) The reason for the correct sacrifice on W4 move is well hidden; made apparent at W10 (FIN) Surprising tactic to finish; the unexpected 4.b5 is a foresight move, clearing the a-file for the eventual Qa3+. The intro feels like a needless addition (GBR)



1.Rb8! [thematic sacrifice, pin] [thematic try: 1.Ra7? Qb6! = (1...Qxa7? 2.Nxc6+ +- fork) for example: 2.Ra6 Qc5! 3.Nxc6+! Kc3! (3...Ka3? 4.e7! +-) 4.e7 Qxe7 5.Nxe7 Kxd3 6.Rxa4 b2 =] 1...Qxb8 2.Nxc6+ [fork] 2...Kc5 [2...Kc3 3.Nxb8 Kxd3 4.e7 b2 5.e8Q b1Q 6.Qq6+ +diagonal skewer] 3.Nxb8 Kd6 4.Na6! [4.Nd7? a3! (4...Kxe6? 5.Nc5+ +- fork) 5.Nc5 sacrifice 5...Kxc5! 6.e7 a2 7.e8Q a1Q =; 4.Nc6? sacrifice 4...Kxe6! = (4...Kxc6? 5.Kq6 + -)] 4...a3! [4...Kxe6 5.Nc5+ +– fork] 5.e7! [thematic sacrifice] [thematic try: 5.Nc5? Kxc5 6.e7 a2 7.e8Q a1Q 8.Qe5+ Kb4! (8...Kc6? 9.Be4+! Kb6 10.Qd6+! Ka5 11.Qc5+! Ka6 12.Qc6+ Ka5 13.Qa8+ +- vertical skewer) 9.Qd6+ Kc3! = (9...Ka4? 10.Qa6+ +- vertical skewer)]

5...Kxe7 6.Nc5 b2 7.Bb1 Kd6 8.Nb3! [try with thematic black play: 8.Ne4+? Ke5! (8...Kd5? 9.Nd2 +main line) 9.Nd2 Kf4! 10.Nc4 d3! thematic sacrifice (10...a2? thematic try 11.Bxa2 +-) 11.Nxa3 d2! =] 8...Kd5 [8...Ke5 9.Kg5 (try with thematic black play: 9.Nd2? see the play after 8.Ne4+? Ke5!) 9...d3! sacrifice 10.Nd2! (10.Kg4? Ke4 11.Nd2+ Ke3 =) 10...Kd4 11.Kf4 +- main line] 9.Nd2! [9.Kg5? Kc4! 10.Nd2+ Kc3! =] 9...d3! [sacrifice] 10.Kg5! [10.Bxd3? Kd4 11.Bb1 Kc3 = (11...Ke3? 12.Nc4+ +- fork) ] 10...Kd4 11.Kf4! Kc3 12.Ke3! [mutual Zugzwang, White wins] [12.Ne4+? Kb3 13.Nd2+ Kc3 14.Ke3 loss of time] 1-0

Mutual thematic sacrifices (Country) A promising start does not lead to exciting play (FIN) Nice coordination of bishop and knight. Intro doesn't add value; finishing reciprocal Zugzwang is reasonably good. Very solid, nothing spectacular (GBR)

16 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> Place D04	1.Kb3 [1.Kxa5? Ra1]
Ilham Aliev	1a4+ 2.Ka2 Ra1+ [2Kf6 3.Bxc1]
Azerbaijan	3.Kxa1 Bd4+ 4.Ka2 Kf6 [4b4 5.Nf7+]
	5.Bb2 [5.Bc1? b4]
	5c1Q 6.Bxc1 Kg7 7.Nf7! [Thematic]
	[Thematic try: 7.Ng6? Kxg6 8.Be3 (8.Ka3 Bc5+! 9.Ka2 Kxh7-+)
	8Bf6 9.h8Q Bxh8 10.Ka3 Bc3!-+]
	7Kxf7 8.Be3! [8.Ka3 Bc5+ 9.Ka2 Kg7-+]
	8Be5 9.Bf4 Bf6 10.Bg5 Bc3 [10Bg7 11.Ka3 Kg6 12.Be7!
	Kxh7 13.Kb4=]
	11.Bd2 Bg7 12.Ka3! [12.Bh6? Kg6!; 12.h8Q? Bxh8 13.Ka3 Ke6
	14.Kb4 Kd5–+]
	12Bf8+ 13.Ka2 [13.Kb2]
	13Kg7 [13Bg7 14.Ka3]
	14.Bh6+! Kxh7 15.Bxf8
= D04 (6,4 points) (4+6)	
	$V_{2} - V_{2}$

The theme is not very prominent, but still an important part of the solution (FIN) Initial moves seem unrelated. Additional bishop battle is attractive. White king in check detracts somewhat (GBR)

16<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> Place D66 Ladislav Salai Jr Emil Klemani**č** Slovakia



D66 (6,4 points) (not counting for the country)

+

1.Bg8+! [thematic try 1.Bc7? Rxb3! 2.Rh8+ Kxh8 3.a8Q+ Kh7 4.Bxh2 Rdd3=]

1...Kxg8 [1...Kh8 2.Bc7! Ra3 (2...Bxc7 3.Bd5+! Kh7 4.Rh8+ Kxh8 5.a8Q+ Kh7 6.Qg8#+-; 2...Ra1 3.Ba2+! Kh7 4.Rh8++-) 3.Bxh2! (3.Bc4+ Kh7 4.Bxh2? Rxh3+! 5.Kxh3 Rd3+=) 3...Rd8 (3...Rxh3+ 4.Kxh3+-) 4.Rb8 Rxg8 (4...Rxb8 5.axb8N!+-) 5.Rxb6 Kh7 6.Ra6 Rb3 7.Bg3! Ra8 8.b6 Kg8 9.Bd6! (z) 9...Kf7 10.Bb8 (z) 10...Kg8 11.b7 Rxb7 12.Rxg6+-]

2.Bf6+! [2.Bc7+? Kh7 3.Rh8+ Kxh8 4.a8Q+ Kh7 5.Bxh2 Rdd3=] 2...Kh7 3.Rh8+! [3.Bxc3? Rd8 4.Rxd8 Bg3+ 5.Kxg3=] 3...Kxh8 4.a8Q+ Rd8! [4...Kh7 5.Bxc3 Rg1 6.Qf3+–]

5.Qxd8+ Kh7 6.Qb8!! [thematic try 6.Qh8+? Kxh8 7.Bxc3 Kg8! 8.Bd4 Kf7 9.Bxb6 Ke6 10.Bf2 Kd5 11.b6 Kc6 12.Bg3 Bg1!=; 6.Bxc3? Bg3+ 7.Kxg3=]

6...Bxb8 [6...Rxh3+ 7.Kxh3 Bxb8 8.Bd8+– e.g. 8...Kg8 9.Bxb6 Kf7 10.Bf2 Ke6 11.b6 Kd5 12.Bg3 Bxg3 13.Kxg3 Kc6 14.Kf4 Kxb6 15.Ke5 Kc7 16.Ke6 Kd8 17.Kf7+–]

(9+7) KXD6 15.Ke5 KC7 16.Ke6 Kd8 17.Kt7+--]
7.Bxc3 Kg8 8.Bd4 Kf7 [8...Bc7 9.Bf2 Kf7 10.Bg3 Bd8 11.Bf4 Ke6 12.Kg3+- e.g. 12...Kd5 13.Kf3 Be7 14.h4 Bb4 15.h5]
9.Bxb6 Ke6 10.Bf2 Kd5 11.b6! Kc6 [11...Bd6 12.Bg3 (12.b7 Bb8 13.Bg3) 12...Bc5 13.b7 Ba7 14.b8Q Bxb8 15.Bxb8 Ke4 16.Kg3!+-]
12.Bg3 Bxg3+ [12...Ba7 13.bxa7+-]
13.Kxg3 Kxb6 14.h4! [14.Kf4? Kc7 15.Ke5 Kd7=]
14...Kc7 15.h5 gxh5 16.gxh5 Kd7 17.h6 gxh6 18.gxh6 Ke7

1–0

19.h7

At the very beginning, in the first thematic position, a quiet sacrifice is wrong while the checking one is correct. Later, in the second thematic position, a checking queen sacrifice is wrong: after 6.Qh8+? Black prevents to exchange the bishops 12...Bg1! and draws by nailing the wK to h4. On the contrary, the quiet queen sacrifice is then correct: 6.Qb8!! transfers the bB to b8 from where after 11.b6! it has no access to a7-g1, so Black is forced to exchange the bishops and White finally wins by the last pawn (Country) Ambitious concept, but the stuck position of both kings is an issue (DEN) The spectacular 6.Qb8! is the star move (FIN) The ideas here are clever but are mostly known. Qb8 is a fine move. The finish is anticlimactic (GBR)



[Due to threatened position of the king, White has to play very decisively and divert the black queen.]

1.Bg5+! [Thematic try: 1.Rg6? Qxg6? (But: 1...Qxe2+ 2.Rg2 Nf3+ with mate in 2 moves) 2.a8Q Qg3+ 3.Kh1 Qh3+ 4.Kg1 Qg4+ 5.Kh1! =; It would also be wrong: 1.a8Q? Qxe2+ 2.Kg1 Nf3+-+; or 1.Nxd4? Qg3+ 2.Kh1 Kh3-+; or 1.Rc3? Qxe2+ 2.Kg1 Nf3+ 3.Rxf3 Qxf3-+]

1...Qxg5 [1...Kxg5 2.Nxd4 =]

2.a8Q [2.Nxd4? Qg3+ 3.Kh1 Kh3 with mate in maximum 7 moves.]

2...Qg3+ 3.Kh1 Qh3+ 4.Kg1 Qg4+ 5.Kh1! [5.Kf1? or Kh2? 5...Qxe2+ 6.Kg1 Nf3+ with mate]

5...Nxe2! [White is threatened with two mates: Qg1# and Qh3#; he has to give away his rook with a tempo, so as to

(6+4) Qh3#; he has to give away his bring the queen into action.]

6.Rc4! [Correct is the sacrifice without check!]

[Thematic try: 6.Rh6+? Nxh6 Lomonosov tablebase shows mate in 32 moves 7.Qg2 Ng3+ 8.Kh2 (8.Kg1 Qd1+-+) 8...Nhf5! 9.Ne1 Nd4! zugzwang 10.Kg1 Qf5 11.Kh2 Ne4 12.Kh1 Ne2 13.Nf3+ Kh5 14.Kh2 Qf4+ 15.Kh1 Qc1+ 16.Kh2 Nf4 17.Qg7 Qc2+! 18.Kh1 Qd1+ 19.Ng1 Nf2+ 20.Kh2 Ng4+ Black win]

6...Qxc4 7.Ne1! [7.Ne3? Qc1+!-+]

7...Qg4! 8.Qg2! [8.Ng2+? Kh3 9.Qd5 Ne5! Black wins; 8.Nf3+? Kh3 Black win]

8...Ng3+ 9.Kg1! [The last subtlety - White has to drop tempo]

[It would be wrong: 9.Kh2? Ng5! Mutual Zugzwang with Black's move - Lomonosov tablebase shows mate in 12 moves 10.Kg1 after any Q move 10... Qh3+; and after any Knight move 10... Nf3+ 10...Qf4! 11.Nd3 Qe3+-+]

9...Ng5 10.Kh2! [Mutual Zugzwang with Black's move - draw; after any move by knight g3: 11. Qxg4+ (10...Nf1+ 11.Qxf1 =); after any move by knight g5: 11. Nf3+; and after any queen move: 11. Qxg3+ or 11. Qh3+!; and after 10... Kh5 11. Qxg3 =]

#### 1⁄2-1⁄2

Two thematic sacrifices; the first one is a bit artificial using two different pieces, but the second one is worthier (FIN) 1.Rg6?? is not a try as both Qxe2 and Qh3+ win. Only 6.Rh6+/Rc4 survives. The preamble is somewhat routine. Final mutual Zugzwang is good, but... (GBR)

#### 20<sup>th</sup> Place D57 Sergiy Didukh, Vladislav Tarasyuk Ukraine



1.Nc4+ Ke2! [1...Ke1 2.Ng4! fxg4 (2...c2 3.Nce5 Kf1 4.Nh2+! Ke2 5.Nd3! Kxd3 6.Bxf5+) 3.fxg3 f3 4.Ne3 f2 (4...hxg3 5.Kg1 *Ke2 6.Nf1*) 5.Nc2+ Ke2 6.Nd4+ Ke3 7.Nc2+ positional draw] 2.Nxf5 c2 [2...qxf2 3.Nd4+] 3.Nxq3+! [3.Nd4+? Kxf2 4.Bxc2 q2+] 3...fxq3 [Main: 3...hxq3 4.Bxc2 qxf2 5.Bd3+! (thematic sacrifice B) (5.Nd2? (sacrifice A) 5...f3! 6.Ba4 Kxd2 7.Bb5 Ke1) 5...Kxd3 6.Kg2 Ke2 7.Nd2! Kxd2 8.Kxf2 draw] 4.Bxc2 gxf2 5.Nd2! [(thematic sacrifice A)] [5.Bd3+? (sacrifice B) 5...Kxd3 6.Kg2 Ke2 7.Nd2 h3+! 8.Kg3 h2; 5.Ne3? (thematic) 5...Kxe3 6.Kg2 h3+! 7.Kf1 h2] 5...Kxd2 6.Kg2 Ke2 7.Bd3+! [(thematic)] [7.Bd1+? Ke1] 7...Kxd3 8.Kxf2 [draw]

(5+6) D57 (6,2 points) (not counting

1/2-1/2 for the country) Two nice variations with economical means (FIN) Cycle of solution and try moves. The later play shows the theme very well and with economy too. Somehow, leaves one impressed by the theme demonstration, but wanting more sparkle (GBR)

21<sup>st</sup>-26<sup>th</sup> Place

- D41 (6 points): John Nunn (Great Britain) Reciprocal change between correct and incorrect bishop sacrifices (Be4 and Bd5) between two lines (Country) Good harmony between the two lines (DEN) Not artistic, but two nice thematic variations (FIN)
- D44 (6 points): Gady Costeff (Israel) Perpetuum mobile realization of the theme (Country) An ambitious concept, but heavy position (DEN) An original Perpetuum Mobile with stalemate motivation for the sacrifices (FIN) Only 3 of 4 knight moves are thematic, but this is impressive. The knight cycle is very good, with cyclic follow-my-leader play to finish - very nice. Black to move isn't a big weakness, but the move Black plays is obvious and uninteresting (GBR)
- D48 (6 points): Daniele Gatti, Mario Micaloni (Italy) Seems somewhat original (FIN) Very nice exchange of thematic moves in two lines. (In effect, two main lines, with the solution/try reversed in the second one.) Many similar lines with Black Re3/e2/e1 is not ideal (GBR)
- D55 (6 points): Gady Costeff (Israel) Knight's wheel of thematic sacrifices (Country) Ingenious and original, though a bit schematic (FIN) Impressive knight wheel, wonderfully illustrating the theme. If there had been more to this study, it could have been a masterpiece, but in essence it's a one-mover (GBR)
- D72 (6 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Refusal to capture the Pd7, in favor of exchanging knights in order to create a passed pawn 'g', leads to the goal. The sacrifices of pawn 'd', of a knight and in the finale also of the promoted queen lead to an ideal stalemate (Country) The theme is shown on the 4<sup>th</sup> move, leading to a sharp battle with a nice ideal stalemate (FIN) 4.c6/g7+ thematic (just, because Kf8 stops Kxg7). 4.c6 is neat. The stalemate is pleasing (but predictable) (GBR)
- D73 (6 points): Daniele Gatti (Italy) The study shows the set theme 3 times (Country) An interesting way of prolonging the sacrifice Bd4 (FIN) Stalemate threat not very novel. Main line and tries are often the only sensible moves. Lengthy but interesting preamble followed by lengthy but interesting queen battle (GBR)

27<sup>th</sup>-29<sup>th</sup> Place

- D12 (5,8 points): Luis Miguel González (Spain) The Danish judges disagreed a great deal on this
  one. Ambitious and difficult (DEN) Every white move is a check. The theme is not shown very
  prominently (FIN) Multiply thematic. Surprising and impressive that the white sequence is
  unique. The play is not easy to understand and there isn't an interesting dénouement, but there
  is much excitement earlier (GBR)
- D22 (5,8 points): Jaroslav Polášek, Emil Vlasák (Czech Republic) The theme is shown on several occasions after a rather forceful introduction (FIN) The play is not interesting enough for this much material. Multiply thematic, although all for the same reason. There are obtrusive 'cook-stoppers' on d and g2; the pawn on g2 prevents 2.Kb6? Mildly anticipated (GBR)
- D43 (5,8 points): Andrzej Jasik (Poland) Foresight and good play, but heavy economy (DEN) The thematic part is played immediately and is rather short. On the other hand, the refutation is not evident at once (FIN) Thematic sacrifices not fundamental to the study. Paralysis after cxd5 is attractive. Intro is exciting and surprising; knight endgame is not very pretty (GBR)

30<sup>th</sup>-34<sup>th</sup> Place

- D03 (5,4 points): Vidmantas Satkus (Lithuania) Two thematic sacrifices on successive moves, first of a single piece, then with the choice of two pawns. Not very exciting, but nicely done (FIN) Illustration of theme with knight and pawn on consecutive moves. Solution ends after 7.Qe4+ (GBR)
- D15 (5,4 points): Emil Vlasák, Jaroslav Polášek (Czech Republic) Short, eventful and amusing (DEN) Short but pleasing. In the try we get b8=Q+ and b8=B+, and we also get those as options in the solution with the stronger try (b8=Q+) failing in the solution (GBR)
- D26 (5,4 points): Mikhail Croitor (Romania) Looks as if White should be winning relatively easily, e.g. by 1.Rh7+, so the solution's key move is especially surprising. The early play is excellent; the finish, sadly, is prosaic (GBR)
- D27 (5,4 points, not counting for the country): Ilija Serafimović, Darko Hlebec, Branislav Djurašević (Serbia) An economical and interesting struggle, in which the theme is not very strongly presented (FIN) The six-man TB finish is nice, but sadly it's well-known. This study may be sound, but the engines are not certain and the composer has not submitted adequate analysis (GBR)
- D59 (5,4 points): Jorma Paavilainen, Terho Marlo (Finland) Nice idea of trapping the knight, but nothing spectacular (GBR)

35<sup>th</sup> Place

• D08 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Marco Campioli (†) (Italy) Very forcing play with the wK in a stalemate position and White sacrificing all his heavy pieces in the correct order, leading to several thematic moves. Not artistic at all (FIN) The rampaging rook theme is rather tedious, has been done (far) too often; on the other hand, it's wholly appropriate for this tournament (GBR)

36<sup>th</sup> Place

 D31 (5,1 points): Árpád Rusz (Romania) An ingenious idea of a symmetrical position and an antisymmetrical solution. The play is rather simple (FIN) Outstanding! Delightful diagram position. Short and simple, but the solution moves are surprising, the theme is shown in ideal style, and it's understandable, free of irritatingly-complex sidelines, free of irrelevant pieces, and even displays the problemists' 'Asymmetry Theme'. Four legal knight moves at move one, three being tries. Simplicity and complexity beautifully blended (GBR) 37<sup>th</sup> Place

 D53 (5 points): Sergey Kasparyan, Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) In a natural starting position Black has a seemingly decisive material advantage. White's attempt to create a mating threat with 1.Ng6?! does not work. An unexpected rook sacrifice leads to the goal. Black is forced to give up the queen in order to maintain winning chances, but White is saved thanks to the heroism of the miraculous surviving knight (Country) The thematic part is too small (FIN) The positional draw is good. The preceding is too forcing and seems to be there merely to make the study thematic. 1.Ng6? is a neat idea but has a single move refutation (GBR)

38th-40th Place

- D17 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Paul Rāican (Romania) Quite interesting, and the refutation of 1.g6 is clever. 1.b6 makes the b6 square available for the eventual queen: 4.e8=Q d1=Q?? 5.Qe3+ Kb1 6.Qxb6+ (GBR)
- D18 (4,8 points): János Mikitovics (Hungary) It's Lomo after 4.Nxe5+; the following play isn't very interesting. It may be unique white moves, but not much more than that (GBR)
- D23 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Amatzia Avni (Israel) Standard idea, but not a very interesting version of it (GBR)

41<sup>st</sup>-44<sup>th</sup> Place

- D36 (4,6 points): Christopher Yoo (United States) An unusual theme presentation, but not very convincing (FIN) Qe5+ is an elegant move, the others look like an OTB game (GBR)
- D38 (4,6 points): Daniel Keith (France) Tough to solve and analyse, but not a good example of the theme (FIN) Phoenix knight. Both W and B promote to knight. Sidelines with queen checks detract (GBR)
- D49 (4,6 points): Ben Smolkin (Canada) A short and sharp solution, in which the thematic part seems accidental (FIN) 4.Rh8+ and 5.f4 is a nice line. Bb4 is a fairly tame try, compared to Bc3 (GBR)
- D56 (4,6 points): Richard Becker (United States) Elegant play throughout (DEN) A selfstalemating study, but that's about all, although 7.Qa8+ is a nice touch (GBR)

45<sup>th</sup> Place

• D09 (4,5 points, not counting for the country): Poul Rewitz (Denmark) Exact play with little material. The first thematic try has unfortunately a double refutation (FIN) Thematic, but... in this tournament, the thematic tries are an integral part of the composition, so the reason they fail should be humanly understandable. That is not the case in this study (2.Ne3? and Black wins in 88 moves - Nalimov) (GBR)

46<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Place

- D67 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Luis Gómez Palazón (Spain) The second thematic phase 17.Sb5? is not convincing at all and the whole play does not offer any highlights (FIN) This type of study has been explored for over a century (NPvP or NPvNP) and this one feels rather hackneyed (GBR)
- D71 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Jaroslav Polášek (Czech Republic) Instead of two
  variations we see a twin, and why not? (FIN) Clause 5 of the General Rules disallows twins unless
  specifically allowed in the theme description, so (with regret) we are compelled to give this
  study a zero (GBR)

48<sup>th</sup> Place

• D06 (4,2 points): Ben Smolkin (Canada) Queen sacrifices, but essentially rather simple ones and the solution is bland (FIN) The position is reminiscent of Mitrofanov's Qg5 study, but the play is too short and too analytically-complex to be a worthy homage (GBR)

49<sup>th</sup> Place

• D64 (3,8 points): Vidmantas Satkus (Lithuania) White sacrifices on e3/e5/d6/c7/g7/b8 are pleasant, but that's all. 3.Nc7 is not a try (c1=Q is a draw) (GBR)

#### 50<sup>th</sup>-53<sup>rd</sup> Place

- D20 (3,6 points): Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Forced play, but the theme is shown three times (FIN) Too heavy for the content. Also rather programmatic, mechanical and too easy to solve. Thematic, though (GBR)
- D52 (3,6 points): Pauli Perkonoja (Finland) A tactical skirmish, but light on interest, and heavy for its content. The thematic try is trivially defeated (GBR)
- D65 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) A violent attempt to displace the black knight at the cost of sacrificing the white knight does not lead to the goal. The white king successfully copes with this problem after the bishop's sacrifice (Country) Nowotny on move three which is also the theme move, but Bc6 is so much nicer a move than Nd1+. Start and finish are not appealing (GBR)
- D69 (3,6 points): David Bergkwist, Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Some development of the standard smothered mate mechanism, but well short of enough originality for a good score (GBR) This checkmate is known long time ago (ROU)

#### 54<sup>th</sup>-55<sup>th</sup> Place

- D32 (3,4 points, not counting for the country): Marcel Dore (France) The theme plays a too small part (FIN) Not thematic: the purported try on move one is defeated by two replies (Nb5 and Nd5) (GBR)
- D39 (3,4 points): Klemen Šivic (Slovenia) This seems to exist only to meet the theme requirement. Most moves are just trying to avoid (or give) mate (GBR)

56<sup>th</sup> Place

• D40 (2,8 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) Dual 7.Ke5 (DEN) Economical and without an interesting introduction, the solution is rather short (FIN) The thematic move 2.Rc7 and the later 4.Nf1 are pleasing. Later, Kf6 and Kf5 both win in 25, so there is a non-trivial dual (GBR)

57<sup>th</sup> Place

• D37 (2,7 points, not counting for the country): Pauli Perkonoja (Finland) Thematic move (and others) are pretty-much forced (GBR)

58th-59th Place

- D14 (2,4 points): Ljubomir Ugren, Marko Klasinc (Slovenia) Duals on move 9 (DEN) Opening of a line for the wB, an idea often shown in moremovers. The play is rather simple and Black plays only with his queen (FIN) Multiply thematic, but the position is too heavy for the play. There are errors in the composer's later analysis (GBR)
- D58 (2,4 points): David Bergkwist (Sweden) This isn't so much a study as a section of a routine game (GBR)

60<sup>th</sup> Place

D24 (2 points): Velmurugan Nallusamy (India) Both 1.Ba6 and 1.g6 sacrifices are immediately possible, but White has to choose the correct order. After the key 1.g6, on W2 move again the sacrifices 2.Ba6, 2.Na4 and 2.Nd5 are possible. But only 2.Ba6 works (Country) Duals on move 6 (DEN) Similar to D23, and the same comment applies. 2.Na4 is not a try (2...Rb1/c1). Later duals (GBR)

61<sup>st</sup> Place

• D01 (1,8 points, not counting for the country): Jeff Coakley (Canada) Very modest without highlights and largely spoiled by duals (FIN) Clean illustration of the theme, but uniqueness ends very early (after move 3) (GBR)

Place	Country	No	DEN	FIN	GBR	ISR	ROU	Total
1	UKR	D50	2,2	3,8	3,0	3,0	3,0	9,0
2-4	SVK	D21	2,8	2,4	3,4	1,4	3,6	8,6
2-4	SRB	D70	2,4	2,6	3,6	2,2	3,6	8,6
2-4	SVK	D05	2,4	3,6	2,6	2,0	3,8	8,6
5-7	DEN	D63		2,6	3,2	1,4	3,0	8,4
5-7	UKR	D74	3,0	2,4	3,0	3,0	1,8	8,4
5-7	DEN	D02		2,6	3,0	3,6	0,0	8,4
8	GER	D61	3,2	2,4	2,6	3,2	2,0	8,2
9	GER	D07	2,4	2,6	3,0	2,0	3,6	8,0
10	MGL	D19	3,4	2,2	3,4	2,2	2,0	7,8
11	GER	D10	2,0	3,2	2,4	1,8	3,0	7,4
12	ESP	D30	2,6	2,6	1,8	2,6	2,0	7,2
13	GBR	D35	2,0	2,4		2,2	2,8	6,9
14-15	SRB	D45	2,4	1,6	2,6	2,2	2,0	6,6
14-15	FRA	D33	2,6	1,6	2,4	1,4	3,0	6,6
16-19	HUN	D68	2,2	1,2	2,4	1,8	2,6	6,4
16-19	AZE	D04	1,6	2,4	2,4	1,6	2,8	6,4
16-19	SVK	D66	3,0	2,0	2,4	2,0	1,6	6,4
16-19	POL	D60	2,4	2,2	1,8	2,4	1,6	6,4
20	UKR	D57	2,0	2,0	3,0	2,2	1,0	6,2
21-26	ITA	D48	2,2	1,6	2,8	2,2	0,6	6,0
21-26	ISR	D44	2,6	1,4	3,0		1,0	6,0
21-26	ISR	D55	2,0	1,6	3,0		2,0	6,0
21-26	ITA	D73	2,4	1,8	2,4	1,8	0,6	6,0
21-26	GBR	D41	2,6	1,6		2,4	1,0	6,0
21-26	ARM	D72	1,8	2,2	2,0	2,2	0,0	6,0
27-29	ESP	D12	2,8	1,6	3,0	1,4	1,0	5,8
27-29	CZE	D22	2,2	2,0	1,6	1,4	2,4	5,8
27-29	POL	D43	2,6	1,4	2,2	2,2	1,0	5,8
30-34	ROU	D26	2,0	1,0	2,8	1,6		5,4
30-34	SRB	D27	2,2	1,2	1,4	2,0	2,0	5,4
30-34	FIN	D59	2,2		2,0	1,6	1,0	5,4
30-34	LTU	D03	1,4	2,2	2,0	2,0	0,0	5,4
30-34	CZE	D15	2,8	1,0	2,2	2,2	1,0	5,4
35	ITA	D08	1,2	1,2	2,8	1,0	3,0	5,2
36	ROU	D31	2,0	1,4	3,8	1,0		5,1

## Section D: Endgame studies

37	ARM	D53	1,6	1,0	2,4	1,8	1,6	5,0
38-40	HUN	D18	1,8	1,4	1,8	1,6	0,0	4,8
38-40	ISR	D23	1,8	2,0	1,0		1,4	4,8
38-40	ROU	D17	1,6	1,2	2,4	1,6		4,8
41-44	USA	D36	1,4	1,6	1,2	1,6	2,0	4,6
41-44	FRA	D38	2,0	1,2	1,8	1,6	1,0	4,6
41-44	CAN	D49	1,6	1,6	2,4	1,4	1,0	4,6
41-44	USA	D56	2,6	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,0	4,6
45	DEN	D09		2,4	2,0	1,0	1,0	4,5
46-47	ESP	D67	2,2	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,6	4,4
46-47	CZE	D71	1,6	1,2	0,0	1,6	2,0	4,4
48	CAN	D06	2,0	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,0	4,2
49	LTU	D64	1,4	1,0	2,2	1,4	1,0	3,8
50-53	MKD	D20	1,6	1,6	1,0	1,0	0,8	3,6
50-53	ARM	D65	1,6	1,0	1,6	1,0	1,0	3,6
50-53	FIN	D52	1,4		1,6	1,0	0,0	3,6
50-53	SWE	D69	2,0	1,0	1,6	1,0	1,0	3,6
54-55	FRA	D32	1,6	1,0	0,0	0,8	1,6	3,4
54-55	SLO	D39	1,2	0,8	1,4	1,4	0,6	3,4
56	GRE	D40	0,2	1,0	2,2	1,6	0,0	2,8
57	FIN	D37	1,0		0,8	1,0	0,6	2,7
58-59	SWE	D58	1,2	0,8	0,6	1,0	0,6	2,4
58-59	SLO	D14	0,4	1,4	1,0	1,0	0,0	2,4
60	IND	D24	0,4	0,6	1,0	1,6	0,0	2,0
61	CAN	D01	1,2	0,4	1,6	0,2	0,0	1,8
	IND	D11	0,2	0,4	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0
	MGL	D13	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,0	0,0	0,0
	MKD	D16	0,0	0,6	0,6	1,0	0,0	0,0
	USA	D25	1,4	0,0	0,2	1,4	0,0	0,0
	SLO	D34	1,6	0,6	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0
	POL	D47	0,8	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,0	0,0
	GRE	D62	1,2	0,0	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,0

## SECTION E: HELPMATES

Judging countries: Finland, Great Britain, Israel, Slovenia, Ukraine

Theme (proposed by Israel): Helpmates in 3,5-n moves. During the solution White moves a piece or a pawn to a square where it is going to be captured by Black, but not immediately. Set play, multi-solutions and twins are allowed, but not duplex, Polish-type twins (all pieces change colour) or zero-positions.

#### Slovenia's general remarks

The main criterion for evaluating problems with doubling of the theme in each solution (13 examples) was how the white sacrifices were justified. The simplest way was by capturing two black pieces to allow the black king to reach the final square (six examples), but mostly without any additional content. Two problems (E46, E89) used cages on opposite sides of the chessboard, which lowered the value. E56 presented additional content but for the price of a heavy construction. Three (E48, E83, E88) were very similar in economic positions with model mates. In all three, knights and pawns were sacrificed in Zilahi form; the only minor difference between them was the number of captured black officers. Thematically, E04 was better, since Black had to occupy the thematic square first to enable the second white sacrifice, but in an imperfect position. E14 was even better thematically, as White had to sacrifice on an empty square after having no way to escape. The cost is a compromise in the position and especially in the twinning. Two problems (E35, E58) presented one sacrifice for moving the black king to the mating square, and another for enabling the block of a square around the black king; the latter was the only one with three solutions, but only with pawn sacrifices, and severe cost in economy, in addition to moving the white king in the twins. Thematically best was E31, the only one with a strategic element in the thematic play - a critical black move and white interference for the white king to move on the line. Moving a thematic white pawn in the twin and the heavy construction are a shame. E51 and E92 used mixed motives for sacrifices and did not reach the quality of others. For these reasons, no problem fulfilled the general criteria for awarding the highest scores. In problems with only one thematic sacrifice in each solution, the additional thematic content and the construction/economy were decisive.



1<sup>st</sup> Place (10 points) E56: Marek Kolčák (Slovakia)

1...B×d3 2.Q×d6 B×d4 3.K×d3 Rf6 4.K×d4 R×d6‡

1...S×e3 2.Q×g5 R×f4 3.K×e3 Bf6 4.K×f4 B×g5‡

Fourfold rendering of the required theme (two delayed sacrifices of white officers in each solution). The bQ is imitating the idea and is also being captured with a delay. Diagonal-orthogonal correspondence, extended Zilahi (Country) Excellent problem with precise analogy (FIN) Good additional content. The wBe2 could be replaced with a pawn and consequently bBh2 could be saved. Obviously, the author's aim was to arrange sacrifices of officers only (SLO) Two thematic moves in each solution (UKR)

2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Place (9 points) E14: Misha Shapiro (Israel)

a) 1.Kf6 B×d5 (Rc4?) 2.Ke5 Rc4 3.K×d5 e4+ 4.K×c4 b3‡

b) 1.Ke7 R×c5 (Bc4?) 2.Kd6 Bc4 3.K×c5 b4+ 4.K×c4 e×d3‡

Two thematic moves in each solution. Grimshaw on c4 defines the order of W1/W2 moves. Two different paths from f7 to c4. Exchange of functions between three pairs of units: a2/c2, b2/e2, c5/d5 (Country) In the twin Se7 is moved to prevent a dual, but it consequently prevents the king to play in the second solution (SLO) Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's moves are made only by the king (UKR)

2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Place (9 points) E86: Mikola Kolesnik, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine)

a) 1.Bh4 B×c3 2.Rd4 Rd6 3.K×c3 Rb6 4.K×c4 Rc8‡

b) 1.Rc7 R×d3 2.Bd4 Be5 3.K×d3 Bf4 4.K×e4 Bh7‡

Exchange of functions of black pieces (Rd7, Bf6): line opening – line closing + blocking of d4 square. Exchange of functions of white pieces (Rd8, Bg7): delayed sacrifice – Bristol move + closing of a black line (Country) Although only two thematic moves, the analogy is clean and the content is strong. Clear delay because the bK could capture immediately (FIN)



4<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points) E55: Marjan Kovačević (Serbia)

1...Sc4 2.Re7+ f×e7 3.Sd8 e×d8=Q 4.R×c4 Qb6‡ (2.Sg7+? f×g7 3.Rh8+ g×h8=Q 4.R×b5 Qc3?) 1...Sb5 2.Sg7+ f×g7 3.Rh8+ g×h8=Q 4.R×b5 Qc3‡ (2.Re7+? f×e7 3.Sd8 e×d8=Q 4.R×c4 Qb6?) Anticipatory self-interferences on W1 lead to dual avoidance on B2. Cyclically changed roles of Rb7, Se6 and Rh4 (Country) The best of those compositions with only one thematic sacrifice in each solution. Perfect motive for sacrifice, light position (SLO) Quiet tempo-motivated officer-to-officer sacrifices (UKR)

5<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points) E49: Mikola Kolesnik, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine)

1...c×d5 2.c5 Rb7 3.Rc6 Rb4+ 4.K×d5 e4‡

1...e3 2.Sf5 Rg7 3.d4 R×g5 4.d×e3 Rg4‡

1...R×e6 2.Se8 K×e8 3.Kf5 e4+ 4.K×e6 c×d5‡

Probably the first-ever presentation of cyclic Zilahi with active sacrifices of the white pieces delayed by two moves (W1-B4). Three model mates (Country) Complete cyclic Zilahi in perfect white economy, but the Pc4 guards without moving in one solution (SLO)

6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> Place (8,6 points) E31: Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands)

a) 1...d×e3 2.R8d3 Sd4+ 3.K×e3 Kd6 4.K×d4 Sc2‡

b) 1...d×e4 2.R8d4 Sd5 3.K×e4 Kd7 4.K×d5 S×c3‡

Two thematic moves in each solution. Exchange of functions of the white knights. Zilahi (Country) Analogy is good, but the composition is a bit mechanical and requires many idle pawns and black pieces (FIN) Two thematic moves in each solution. Echoed mates. In the twin, the thematic pawn is shifted (UKR)



6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> Place (8,6 points) E83:

Silvio Baier, Rolf Wiehagen, Eberhard Schulze, Frank Fiedler (Germany)

1...d×e4 2.Kd3 g×f4 3.K×e4 Sd2+ 4.K×f4 Sg2‡

1...S×e5 2.Kd4 S×f5+ 3.K×e5 d4+ 4.K×f5 g4‡

Fourfold presentation of the theme, Zilahi, change of functions (Sf3/Pd3), 4 × Chumakov (Bf5, Se5 / Pe4, Pf4), one model mate, one ideal mate (Country) Economical and with good analogy, however sort of ordinary and the black play is poor. Delayed moves just because the bK is not there yet (FIN) Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's moves are made only by the king (UKR)

8<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) E54: Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemani**č** (Slovakia)

1.Qc6 S×d4 2.K×c3 e×d3 3.K×d4 f×e3+ 4.Kc5 d4‡

1.Sg4 f4 2.Ke3 S×d4 3.K×f4 e3+ 4.Kg5 Sf3‡

1.Bf3 e×f3 2.Ke2 h×g3 3.K×f3 S×d4+ 4.Ke4 f3‡

The three white thematic units (Sb5, Pe2, Pf2) change cyclically their roles in the solutions: 1) one is being captured by bK with a delay, 2) the other one is mating the bK, 3) another one is guarding a bK flight square. The thematic knight plays to d4 on W1, W2 and W3 move, while the two thematic pawns perform a 3/4 of an Albino each. Probably the first-ever cyclic active Zilahi in a non-twinning helpmate fourmover, here presented with delayed captures (Country) Complete cyclic Zilahi in loaded construction, all three thematic pieces play and change their roles (SLO) Cyclic active Zilahi in a non-twinning helpmate. Inferior to E49, since technical white pawns are used, there are no model mates and the acceptance of the sacrifices is delayed by one move (UKR)

9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points, not counting for the country) E04:

Emil Klemanič, Ladislav Salai Jr, Ladislav Packa, Peter Gvozdják, Zoltán Labai (Slovakia)

1...S×e4 2.d5 c×d5 3.K×e4 f3+ 4.K×d5 Se3‡ (2.Rd5? ... 5.Kd4!)

1...S×e5 2.Rd6 c×d6 3.K×e5 f4+ 4.K×d6 Se8‡ (2.d6? ... 5.Kd7!)

Two thematic moves in each solution; double Kniest (on e4/e5 in checking form, and on d5/d6 in mating form); exchanged functions between white knights and also between black Rd4 and Pd7; dual avoidance due to unblock, model mates (Country) Analogy is quite good including black sacrifices, but it does not startle in the end. Many black cook-stoppers are needed (FIN) Two thematic moves in each solution. Kniest, Zajic, choice of play (UKR)



10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,1 points) E35: Klemen Šivic (Slovenia)

a) 1...B×e4 2.Sd3 Sf4 3.K×e4 Ke2 4.g×f4 c×d3‡

b) 1...S×d4 2.Qc5 Bc4 3.K×d4 K×d2 4.b×c4 c3‡

Double presentation of the theme. Combination of Kniest and Feather 2 themes (Country) Two thematic moves in each solution. Not quite homogeneous. Unattractive twinning (UKR)

11<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points) E34: S.K. Balasubramanian, S. Manikumar (India)

1...Sc1 2.Be7 (Re7?) f×e7 3.b×c1=B (=Q?) e8=Q (=S?) 4.Bg5 Qe2‡

1...Sg1 2.Re7 (Be7?) f×e7 3.f×g1=R (=Q?) e8=S (=Q?) 4.Rg5 Sf6‡

Dual avoidance play on B2, B3 and W3 moves. The captured piece at e7 is reborn on the next move (Phoenix theme). Mixed AUW. Two different black pieces captured by the same wP on e7. Two different promotions by the same wP on e8. Two different self-blocks on g5. Exchange of functions between Rb7/Bd6 (static self-interference / active sacrifice). Model mates on squares vacated by a white piece. White economy with only the mating units in the diagram (Country) Simple sacrifices, but with mixed AUW and dual avoidance in the line opening (FIN) AUW. Repetition of move. Compare to *Roman Zalokotsky & Mikola Kolesnik, Shakhmatnaya Poeziya 2002*, 4n3/p3p2K/r1p1P3/ kr2p3/p7/1n6/3pppqb/3b3R, h‡4, b)  $\blacksquare$  b5 $\rightarrow$ b6: a) 1.Qd5 (Sc5?) Rg1 2.Qd7 (Sd7?) e×d7 3.f×g1=B (=Q?) d8=S (=Q?) 4.Bb6 S×c6‡, b) 1.Sc5 (Qd5?) Rf1 2.Sd7 (Qd7?) e×d7 3.e×f1=B (=Q?) d8=Q (=S?) 4.Bb5 Q×d2‡ (UKR)

12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points, not counting for the country) E24:

Mikola Kolesnik, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine)

a) 1...Rd2 2.Q×c2 S×c2 3.e×d2 Sb4 4.Ke3 Sd5‡

b) 1...Rd3 2.Q×a3 R×a3 3.e×d3 R×a4 4.Ke4 Kc5‡

c) 1...Rd4 2.Q×c3+ B×c3 3.e×d4 Ba5 4.Ke5 Bc7‡

Three delayed capture-free wR sacrifices on empty squares. Three active bQ sacrifices (Country)



12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) E58: Christopher Tylor (Great Britain)

a) 1...e×f4 2.Ke3 g4 3.K×f4 Kf2 4.h×g4 Bg5‡

b) 1...c×d4 2.Bd5 e4 3.K×d4 Kc2 4.f×e4 B×b6‡

c) 1...c×b4 2.Kc3 a5 3.K×b4 Kb2 4.b×a5 Be7‡

Two thematic moves in each solution (Country) 6 thematic moves with clean analogy, but not deep strategy. Quite economically done, although there are no model mates. Choice of move in B2 (FIN) Two thematic moves in each phase. The thematic pawns are not needed in the other phases (UKR)

14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points) E39: Menachem Witztum (Israel)

1...Sf3+ 2.K×h5 Ke4 3.B×f3+ Kf5 4.Bg4+ h×g4‡

1...Se2 2.Kf6 K×e3 3.R×e2+ Kf4 4.Re5 d×e5‡

White and black active sacrifices. Black sacrifices the piece that captures the sacrificed white piece. Model mates (Country) Capture-free sacrifices of the thematic piece (UKR)

14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points, not counting for the country) E66: Shaul Shamir, Jean Haymann (Israel) 1.Se4 (1.Be4?) Bf6 2.c3 B×d4 3.Kc4 b3+ 4.K×d4 Sf3‡

1.Bd7 (1.Sd7?) Sf5 2.Rc6 S×d6 3.Kc5 b4+ 4.K×d6 Bf4‡

Zilahi, Kniest, dual avoidance, follow-my-leader, distant self-blocks, model mates (Country) Mate positions are built, good analogy with dual avoidance (FIN) Zilahi, Kniest, choice of move (UKR)



16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) E29: Marjan Kovačević (Serbia)

1...e8=B 2.Bg6 S×c7+ 3.Kf6 Kd6 4.R×e8 S×e8‡

1...e8=S 2.Sb5+ K×b5 3.Kd7 b7 4.K×e8 b×c8=Q‡

Double presentation of Schnoebelen theme. Rc8 and Sc7 exchange their roles (active/passive sacrifices) (Country) Promotion is the only possible white move (SLO) Schnoebelen theme (UKR)

16<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) E48: Michel Caillaud (France)

 $1...f \times e5 2.Kf4 S \times d6 3.K \times e5 Sf3 + 4.K \times d6 e5$ 

1...e×f5 2.Ke4 S×e6 3.K×f5 Sh6+ 4.K×e6 f5‡

Follow-my-leader, Kniest, extended Zilahi, Chumakov, chameleon echo model mates (Country) Good analogy and economical setting, but boring black play (FIN) Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's moves are made only by the king (UKR)

18th Place (7,2 points) E65: Udo Degener, Rolf Wiehagen (Germany)

a) 1...S×c4 2.Kd3 Ke5 3.K×c4 Sa5+ 4.Kc5 e×d4‡

b) 1...e×d4 2.Ke3 Sd3 3.K×d4 Sb5+ 4.K×d5 f×e4‡

c) 1...f×e4 2.Kf3 Kg6 3.K×e4 Sf6+ 4.Ke5 S×c4‡

Active cyclic Zilahi, cycle of W1/W4 moves, Kniest at W1, black Durbar (analogy of the 3×3 bK-moves), uniform twinning (Country) Cyclic Zilahi, but only a cycle of sacrifices and mates (SLO) Cycle of W1/W4 moves. Drawback: in a) the thematic wPf3 is not needed (UKR)



19th-20th Place (7 points) E88: George P. Sphicas, Kostas Prentos (United States)

1...f×g4 2.Kf3 S×h5 3.K×g4 K×g7 4.K×h5 Sf6‡

1...e×f4 2.Ke3 S×g5 3.K×f4 Sd5+ 4.K×g5 f4‡

Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's moves are made only by the king. The thematic wPe3 is not needed in the first solution (UKR)

19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> Place (7 points) E92: Michel Caillaud (France)

1...S×d6 2.d4 Bf3 3.B×d6 a8=Q 4.R×f3 Q×f3‡

1...Sc5 2.Kd4 Bc6 3.K×c5 a8=R 4.K×c6 R×c8‡

Zilahi (Se4, Pf3), Kniest (h5, g5), Chumakov (Pg4, Ph5), Kozhakin (f4), model mates (Country) Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's play is not quite homogeneous (UKR)

21st-24th Place

- E36 (6,8 points): János Csák (Hungary) Rendering of the theme by both White and Black. Simplified Chumakov theme. Model mates (Country) Original, although the thematic play varies (FIN) Exchange of the blocking pieces (UKR)
- E42 (6,8 points): Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Three delayed white sacrifices with cyclic change of functions of three white units including cyclic Zilahi. Play of the bK on 8 different squares with follow-my-leader effect in two solutions; square vacation, two model mates (Country) Cyclic Zilahi. In all phases, the theme is implemented at different levels of play (UKR)
- E81 (6,8 points): János Csák (Hungary) Tempo sacrifices, interference unpins with dual avoidance due to unblock, model mates (Country) Clean white tempo with a delay. Dual avoidance, but otherwise mainly bK/wP walks, not very good economy (FIN) Quiet tempomotivated sacrifices. In the second solution, there is no dual avoidance because 2.Se6? not only vacates the black king's future flight but also takes the mate-line under control (no purity of aim) (UKR)
- E84 (6,8 points): Mark Kirtley, George P. Sphicas (United States) Black mirrors White's theme of moving a piece to a square to be captured there after some delay. The delay in the capture of the wR in both solutions is somewhat paradoxical since it is legal for Black to capture immediately. Mixed AUW (Country) AUW. Repetition of the move b7. Compare to *Roman Zalokotsky & Mikola Kolesnik, Shakhmatnaya Poeziya 2002*, 4n3/p3p2K/r1p1P3/ kr2p3/p7/1n6/ 3pppqb/3b3R, h‡4, b) ■b5→b6: a) 1.Qd5 (Sc5?) Rg1 2.Qd7 (Sd7?) e×d7 3.f×g1=B (=Q?) d8=S (=Q?) 4.Bb6 S×c6‡, b) 1.Sc5 (Qd5?) Rf1 2.Sd7 (Qd7?) e×d7 3.e×f1=B (=Q?) d8=Q (=S?) 4.Bb5 Q×d2‡ (UKR)

25<sup>th</sup>-29<sup>th</sup> Place

- E25 (6,6 points): Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) Echoed mates (UKR)
- E28 (6,6 points): Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Three delayed white sacrifices with cyclic Zilahi. Play of the bK on 9 different squares and Y-flights by the wK. Full harmony of the play (W1: sacrifice; B2: bK's move with follow-my-leader effect; W2: wK's move to guard squares; B3: acceptance of sacrifice by bK; W3: check to bK by wP; B4: arrival of bK on the 5<sup>th</sup> row; W4: mate by wP on the fourth row). Uniform twinning by transfer of a bP which does not move in a) (Country) In the first solution, the thematic Pe3 is needed neither for the WCCT theme nor for the Zilahi (UKR)
- E47 (6,6 points, not counting for the country): Silvio Baier (Germany) Tempo sacrifices on the same square with exchanged W1/W4 moves (Country) Quiet tempo-motivated sacrifices of pieces on the same square. Acceptance of sacrifices is delayed by 2 moves (UKR)
- E62 (6,6 points): Mikael Grönroos (Finland) Four successive pawn sacrifices (UKR)
- E72 (6,6 points): Ivo Tominić (Croatia) The active pawn of the black half-battery annihilates wPd3, W1 anticipatory sacrifices, W2 follow-my-leader; the inactive pawn prevents dualistic route of the other knight. Reciprocal roles of black pawns and white knights, Zilahi. Though looking same in notation, the moves 3 and 4 are performed by different units (Country) Quiet sacrifices with choice of move (UKR)

30<sup>th</sup> Place

• E32 (6,3 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Thematic sacrifices on W1 are different moves by the same pawn to squares eventually occupied by the mating piece (Country) Acceptance of sacrifices is delayed by two moves, but the solutions are not quite homogeneous (UKR)

31<sup>st</sup>-32<sup>nd</sup> Place

- E67 (6,2 points, not counting for the country): Zlatko Mihajloski (North Macedonia) Two delayed white sacrifices with Zilahi; one-two step play by wPh2; model mates on the same square (Country) Quiet sacrifices of pieces at different timing (UKR)
- E89 (6,2 points): Indrek Aunver, Christer Jonsson (Sweden) Two thematic moves in each solution (Country) Two thematic moves in each solution. Black's moves are made only by the king. The thematic pawns are not needed in the other solutions (UKR)

33rd-38th Place

- E22 (6 points): Francesco Simoni (Italy) Delayed capture of the sacrificed unit due to the need to unpin first, with unpin moves specified by distant self-blocks. The bK moves then to the square cleared by the capturing unit. Zilahi and model mates (Country) Quiet sacrifice of the thematic piece. Zilahi (UKR)
- E33 (6 points, not counting for the country): Janne Syväniemi (Finland) Mate by royal battery. In one phase, the sacrifice can be accepted at once; in the other, this cannot be done immediately (UKR)
- E60 (6 points): Cornel Pacurar (Canada) Quiet officer-to-officer sacrifices (UKR)
- E69 (6 points): Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) Two self-blocks by bQ and bR (Country) Officerto-officer sacrifices (UKR)
- E71 (6 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Sacrifices to provide Black with a later tempo move (Country) Quiet tempo-motivated sacrifices of pieces. Zilahi (UKR)
- E74 (6 points): R. Phanibhushan (India) Active Zilahi and exchange of functions. White battery formations and paradoxical destruction of newly formed batteries (Anti-Ziel element). Black king is mated on the squares initially occupied by white bishop and rook. Orthogonal-diagonal mates and distant self-blocks with dual avoidance. Analogy of play between the two phases (Country) Nice play with moves to squares previously occupied by the blocking piece or the mating piece. The analogy doesn't quite work in Black's second move, because the bB doesn't move (FIN) Anticipated by *Mikola Kolesnik & Valery Semenenko, 3<sup>rd</sup> HM 8<sup>th</sup> TT Maroc Echecs 2018* (WinChloe ID 775933) (UKR)

39th-44th Place

- E26 (5,8 points): Gerard Smits (Netherlands) Anticipated play (FIN) Quiet sacrifice of the white rook. Echoed mates (UKR)
- E43 (5,8 points, not counting for the country): János Csák (Hungary) Zilahi (Country) BK move for b-form is distracting, but quite good analogy, where the sacrifice motive is black line interference for white king (FIN) Interference sacrifices, but the twinning shifts the bK a long way (SLO) Quiet sacrifices of pieces. Zilahi (UKR)
- E63 (5,8 points): Andy Ooms (Belgium) Follow-my-leader, exchange of functions, Zilahi, Avanta, chameleon echo model mates (Country) Quiet sacrifices of pawns (UKR)
- E75 (5,8 points): Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) Zilahi, Kniest and Chumakov (Country)
- E79 (5,8 points): Ján Dučák, Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Exchange of W1/W4 moves, Zilahi (Country)
- E91 (5,8 points): Lkhundevin Togookhuu (Mongolia) Critical Grimshaw, three self-blocks in each solution, model mates (Country) Not quite homogeneous (UKR)

45<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Place

- E15 (5,6 points, not counting for the country): Živan Šušulić (Serbia) Two critical moves over e5 with two different bR interferences on e5. White rook on all 4 corners (Country) Officer-to-officer sacrifices. Critical moves. No homogeneity (UKR)
- E21 (5,6 points): Vlaicu Cri**ş**an (Romania) Long delayed captures. Diagonal-orthogonal correspondence and exchange of white functions (Country) In the twin, a thematic pawn is shifted. Repetition of the thematic move 4.K×e3 (UKR)
- E51 (5,6 points, not counting for the country): George P. Sphicas (United States) Two thematic captures in each solution. Meredith with only pawns. Model mates (Country) Two thematic moves in each solution. Repetition of pawn sacrifice on d4. Acceptance of sacrifice at different timing. Not quite homogeneous (UKR)

48<sup>th</sup>-51<sup>st</sup> Place

- E12 (5,4 points): Ricardo de Mattos Vieira (Brazil) wP/bK follow-my-leader, bR/bS reciprocal play (captured / self-block = Chumakov), wS/wB reciprocal play (guard/mate), wPd2/wPd3 reciprocal play (delayed active sacrifice / passive guard), Kniest (Country)
- E46 (5,4 points): Mario Parrinello (Italy) Two thematic moves in each solution. Zilahi, Kniest allowed by active white sacrifices, model mates and follow-my-leader effects (Country) Two thematic moves in each solution. Non-playing thematic pawns (UKR)
- E61 (5,4 points, not counting for the country): Michael McDowell (Great Britain) Theme shown by Black as well as by White. Two sacrifices of wS and two mates by wB occur reciprocally on f7 and g6 (Country) Quiet sacrifices of a white piece. Black's delayed sacrifices. Elements of symmetry (UKR)
- E73 (5,4 points): Marko Klasinc (Slovenia) Interferences on the fourth row and Zilahi (Country) Quiet sacrifices (UKR)

52<sup>nd</sup>-58<sup>th</sup> Place

- E01 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Borisas Gelpernas, Viktoras Paliulionis, Antanas Vilkauskas (Lithuania) Black active and white active delayed sacrifices, Kniest, promotions, model mates (Country) Artificial extension to h‡n. If the wS is shifted to g6, the concept is implemented in 3 moves (UKR)
- E10 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Christer Jonsson (Sweden) Quiet (no check, no capture) sacrifice of the white piece. Elements of symmetry (UKR)
- E30 (5,2 points): Jorge J. Lois, Roberto Osorio (Argentina) Active delayed Zilahi, follow-myleader, Chumakov, Kniest, Kozhakin. Meredith (Country)
- E37 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Michel Caillaud (France) 4 thematic sacrifices in a single line (Country) The finales of the set play and the solution are the same. Repetition of thematic sacrifices (UKR)

- E41 (5,2 points): Dieter Werner, Anton Baumann, Thomas Maeder (Switzerland) Quiet sacrifices of pawns. Repetition of mating move (UKR)
- E68 (5,2 points): Theodoros Giakatis (Greece) Kniest, Phoenix (Country) Chumakov, Kniest (UKR)
- E70 (5,2 points): Theodoros Giakatis (Greece) Kniest, Maslar (Country) Two sacrifices of pawns in a single phase (UKR)

59<sup>th</sup> Place

• E17 (5 points): Lkhundevin Togookhuu (Mongolia) Line clearances. Self-pins. Exchange of wR/wB functions (mate/pin). Model mates (Country) The twinning moves a thematic pawn (SLO) Not quite homogeneous. Pin-mates (UKR)

60<sup>th</sup>-63<sup>rd</sup> Place

- E06 (4,8 points): Jan Rusinek (Poland) Bf3? cannot be classified as choice of move (UKR)
- E45 (4,8 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Zilahi, Kniest, self-blocks, square vacation, exchanged functions, model mates (Country) In the first solution, the mate is not model, contrary to the claim (UKR)
- E50 (4,8 points): Vlaicu Crişan, Paul Rāican (Romania) Cyclic change of functions among three white pieces (Country) Blocking of the a6-square by different black bishops (UKR)
- E85 (4,8 points): Ashot Egiazaryan (Armenia) In three solutions the theme is shown 4 times three times by White and one time by Black (Country) Acceptance of sacrifices at different timing. Heterogeneous play (UKR)

64<sup>th</sup>-69<sup>th</sup> Place

- E02 (4,6 points): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Four white promotions to pieces of the same type as that of the captured black pieces: bB→wB, bQ→wQ, bR→wR, bQ→wQ (Country) Multiple repetition of thematic moves (UKR)
- E11 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) Three heterogeneous solutions with sacrifices of white pieces at different timing (UKR)
- E18 (4,6 points): Bogusz Piliczewski (Poland) wS tempo sacrifices, bQ sacrificial hideaways, chameleon echo model mates, Meredith (Country) Sacrifices are accepted at different timing (UKR)
- E20 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): S. Manikumar, S.K. Balasubramanian (India) Anticipatory active sacrifices, Zilahi, Kniest, Chumakov. B1 moves unblock and self-block. Long trips of mating pieces on opposite directions (clockwise and anti-clockwise). No white pawns (Country) Anticipated play (FIN) Active Zilahi, Kniest, Chumakov (UKR)
- E57 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Lkhundevin Togookhuu (Mongolia) Critical Grimshaw. Three self-blocks in each solution. Come-and-go play (Country) Repetition of 2...Sf3. In the twin, the thematic white pawn is shifted (UKR)
- E90 (4,6 points): Jorge M. Kapros (Argentina) The square where the white unit is sacrificed in one phase is the mate square in the other phase. Model mates, miniature (Country) Quiet sacrifices of a piece. Elements of symmetry (UKR)

70<sup>th</sup> Place

• E40 (4,5 points, not counting for the country): Ljubomir Ugren (Slovenia) Black line closing to enable unpin of the white rook. Echo model mates (Country) Not homogeneous sacrifices (UKR)

71st-73rd Place

- E05 (4,2 points): Sergey Chidemyan (Armenia) Changed square blocks, follow-my-leader play (Country) Repetition of 4.Se4. In the twin, a thematic piece is shifted (UKR)
- E64 (4,2 points): Marcos Roland (Brazil) Underpromotion. Anticipatory sacrifices by both White and Black. Negative wB star, with three different reasons why other moves don't work. Kozhakin. Tempo tries (Country) Quiet sacrifice of a piece with choice of move (UKR)

• E77 (4,2 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland) Acceptance of sacrifices at different timing. Zilahi (UKR)

74<sup>th</sup>-76<sup>th</sup> Place

- E07 (4 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Active sacrifices, Kniest, self-blocks, promotions, square vacation, follow-my-leader play (Country) Repetition of move (UKR)
- E44 (4 points, not counting for the country): Gerold Schaffner, Martin W. Hoffmann, Thomas Maeder (Switzerland) Acceptance of sacrifices at different timing. One sacrifice is quiet, the other is not (UKR)
- E76 (4 points): Poul Hedegaard Nielsen (Denmark) Acceptance of sacrifices at different timing. Brutal sacrifices (UKR)

77<sup>th</sup>-79<sup>th</sup> Place

- E13 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Jorge M. Kapros, Roberto Osorio (Argentina) Elements of symmetry. Black's moves are made only by the king (UKR)
- E38 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Sacrifices of white pieces to pawns for promotion, Zilahi, changed square blocks, model mates (Country) Partially anticipated by *WinChloe ID 594701* (UKR)
- E87 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Stefan Milewski (Poland) Active white delayed sacrifice, check avoidance, Kniest, wB long trip, model mate (Country) Only one thematic sacrifice (UKR)

80<sup>th</sup> Place

• E53 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Miguel Uris (Spain) Roentgen theme, self-blocks, square vacation, ideal epaulette mate, gate opening (Country) Only one thematic sacrifice (UKR)

81<sup>st</sup>-82<sup>nd</sup> Place

- E80 (3,4 points, not counting for the country): Ricardo de Mattos Vieira (Brazil) Theme by White (2...g3 and 4.f×g3+) and pseudo-theme by Black (5.Sd3 and 6...c×d3‡). The black moves are played by six different pieces and none of them may be replaced by another of a different kind (the rook must be a rook, the queen must be a queen, and so on) (Country) The theme is presented one time only (UKR)
- E82 (3,4 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen, Bjørn Enemark (Denmark) Thematic move with unpinning motivation (Country) Only one thematic sacrifice (UKR)

83<sup>rd</sup> Place

E03 (3,2 points, not counting for the country): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Cycle of types
of captured black pieces and types of promoted white pieces in respect to positions a) to c): bBwQ, bQ-wR, bR-wB and b) to d) or e): bQ-wR, bR-wB, bB-wQ (Country) Multiple repetitions of
moves by both sides. Black's moves are made only by the king (UKR)

84<sup>th</sup> Place

• E52 (3 points, not counting for the country): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) Ideal mate with the black king on the square initially occupied by the white king (Country) Only one thematic sacrifice (UKR)

# Section E: Helpmates

Place	Country	No	FIN	GBR	ISR	SLO	UKR	Total
1	SVK	E56	3,6	3,2	3,6	3,2	3,2	10,0
2-3	ISR	E14	2,2	3,6		3,4	2,6	9,0
2-3	UKR	E86	3,2	3,0	3,0	2,4		9,0
4	SRB	E55	2,4	3,0	3,0	3,0	2,8	8,8
5	UKR	E49	2,0	3,2	3,0	2,8		8,7
6-7	NED	E31	2,8	3,2	2,4	3,4	2,6	8,6
6-7	GER	E83	3,0	3,0	2,6	3,0	2,4	8,6
8	SVK	E54	2,2	2,8	2,8	2,8	2,8	8,4
9	SVK	E04	2,8	3,0	2,2	3,2	2,4	8,2
10	SLO	E35	2,4	3,2	3,0		2,2	8,1
11	IND	E34	2,6	2,6	2,8	2,8	2,2	8,0
12-13	UKR	E24	2,4	3,2	2,8	2,4		7,8
12-13	GBR	E58	2,8		2,4	3,4	2,0	7,8
14-15	ISR	E39	2,2	2,8		2,4	2,6	7,5
14-15	ISR	E66	2,6	2,4		2,6	2,2	7,5
16-17	SRB	E29	1,4	2,8	2,4	2,6	2,4	7,4
16-17	FRA	E48	2,6	2,6	2,0	3,0	2,2	7,4
18	GER	E65	2,0	2,8	2,4	2,6	2,2	7,2
19-20	USA	E88	1,6	3,0	2,2	3,0	1,8	7,0
19-20	FRA	E92	2,2	3,2	2,2	2,4	2,4	7,0
21-24	HUN	E36	2,8	1,8	2,6	2,4	1,8	6,8
21-24	MKD	E42	1,8	2,2	2,4	2,4	2,2	6,8
21-24	HUN	E81	2,4	2,2	2,4	2,2	2,0	6,8
21-24	USA	E84	1,8	2,0	2,6	2,6	2,2	6,8
25-29	FIN	E25		2,2	2,2	2,2	2,0	6,6
25-29	FIN	E62		2,6	1,6	2,0	2,4	6,6
25-29	MKD	E28	2,0	2,4	2,2	2,4	1,8	6,6
25-29	GER	E47	2,0	1,8	2,4	2,4	2,2	6,6
25-29	CRO	E72	1,0	2,4	2,0	2,4	2,2	6,6
30	GBR	E32	2,2		1,8	2,6	2,0	6,3
31-32	SWE	E89	1,6	2,8	2,0	2,4	1,8	6,2
31-32	MKD	E67	1,8	2,2	2,2	2,0	2,0	6,2
33-38	LTU	E69	1,6	1,8	2,0	2,2	2,6	6,0
33-38	IND	E74	2,6	1,6	2,2	2,2	0,4	6,0
33-38	CAN	E60	1,4	1,8	2,0	2,2	2,2	6,0
33-38	FIN	E33		2,2	1,8	2,2	1,8	6,0
33-38	SWE	E71	2,4	2,0	1,8	2,2	1,8	6,0
33-38	ITA	E22	2,2	1,8	2,2	2,0	1,8	6,0
39-44	NED	E26	1,6	2,6	2,2	1,0	2,0	5,8
39-44	HUN	E43	2,8	1,8	2,0	2,0	1,8	5,8
39-44	LTU	E75	2,0	2,2	1,8	2,0	1,8	5,8
39-44	MGL	E91	2,0	2,2	2,0	1,8	1,4	5,8
39-44	BEL	E63	1,8	2,0	2,0	2,4	1,6	5,8
39-44	CZE	E79	1,8	2,4	2,0	2,0	1,8	5,8

45-47	SRB	E15	1,8	2,4	1,8	1,6	2,0	5,6
45-47	ROU	E21	1,2	2,2	1,8	2,2	1,6	5,6
45-47	USA	E51	1,6	2,4	1,8	2,2	1,6	5,6
48-51	ITA	E46	1,6	2,0	1,6	2,8	1,8	5,4
48-51	GBR	E61	1,4		1,6	2,0	2,2	5,4
48-51	SLO	E73	1,8	1,8	1,8		1,8	5,4
48-51	BRA	E12	1,8	2,2	1,8	1,4	1,8	5,4
52-58	ARG	E30	2,0	1,6	1,8	1,4	1,8	5,2
52-58	SWE	E10	2,0	2,2	1,4	1,6	1,6	5,2
52-58	FRA	E37	1,6	1,8	1,6	2,2	1,8	5,2
52-58	GRE	E68	1,6	1,4	2,0	2,2	1,6	5,2
52-58	GRE	E70	1,4	1,8	1,8	1,8	1,6	5,2
52-58	LTU	E01	2,4	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,0	5,2
52-58	SUI	E41	1,6	2,0	1,4	2,0	1,6	5,2
59	MGL	E17	1,0	1,6	1,8	2,0	1,6	5,0
60-63	POL	E06	1,6	1,6	1,6	1,4	1,6	4,8
60-63	ROU	E50	1,4	1,8	2,0	1,6	1,4	4,8
60-63	ESP	E45	1,8	1,4	1,8	1,6	1,4	4,8
60-63	ARM	E85	1,6	1,8	1,8	1,4	1,4	4,8
64-69	CZE	E02	1,0	1,6	1,6	1,6	1,4	4,6
64-69	IND	E20	0,8	1,6	2,0	1,0	2,0	4,6
64-69	MGL	E57	1,8	1,2	2,2	1,4	1,4	4,6
64-69	POL	E18	1,6	1,4	1,8	1,4	1,6	4,6
64-69	GRE	E11	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,6	4,6
64-69	ARG	E90	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,6	4,6
70	SLO	E40	1,2	1,6	1,6		1,4	4,5
71-73	ARM	E05	2,0	1,4	1,4	1,2	1,4	4,2
71-73	SUI	E77	1,2	1,2	1,6	2,0	1,4	4,2
71-73	BRA	E64	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,6	4,2
74-76	ESP	E07	1,2	1,0	1,6	1,6	1,2	4,0
74-76	DEN	E76	1,2	1,2	1,4	1,8	1,4	4,0
74-76	SUI	E44	1,4	1,0	1,6	1,2	1,4	4,0
77-79	ARG	E13	1,0	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,2	3,8
77-79	POL	E87	1,2	1,8	1,4	1,0	1,2	3,8
77-79	ARM	E38	1,4	1,2	1,4	0,0	1,2	3,8
80	ESP	E53	1,0	1,2	1,4	1,2	1,2	3,6
81-82	DEN	E82	1,0	1,0	1,2	1,2	1,2	3,4
81-82	BRA	E80	1,0	1,0	1,6	1,0	1,4	3,4
83	CZE	E03	0,8	1,0	1,4	1,2	1,0	3,2
84	DEN	E52	1,0	0,8	1,2	1,0	1,0	3,0
	NED	E27	0,0	2,0	1,2	0,0	1,0	0,0
	ITA	E59	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0

## SECTION F: SELFMATES

Judging countries: Bulgaria, Germany, North Macedonia, Poland, Slovakia

Theme (proposed by Russia): In a selfmate in 3 to 7 moves, White's first move (a try or the key) creates a threat. On his first move Black creates a battery aimed at the white king (this may be a refutation or may lead to a variation). The battery must be able to fire if White tries to continue with the threat. The battery is not required to fire in the variation.

#### Bulgaria's general remarks

From the 71 initial entries, 6 were excluded because of the sanctions on Russia/Belarus and we gave a zero score to two (one because it was not thematic and one because of a dual). So, in the end 63 entries were left to be scored. We expected better quality, but unfortunately most of the entries have poor thematic content and suffer from weaknesses, such as repetitions of moves, rough play, short threats, or very poor demonstration of the theme. Nevertheless, several problems are of good level and demonstrate the theme nicely. But even these compositions have some unpleasant nuances and weaknesses, so in the end, we did not find a masterpiece deserving the highest score.



1<sup>st</sup> Place (9,3 points) F10: Jozef Havran (Slovakia)

1.Rd8! [2.B×e5 [3.Qb6+ a×b6‡]]

1...R×b4 2.Bf5+ Be6 3.Be4+ R×e4‡, 1...Sa×b4 2.B×c4+ Be6 3.Bd5+ S×d5‡

1...Sc×b4 2.B×g8+ Qg6 3.Bd5+ S×d5‡, 1...c×b4 2.Qa8+ Kc5 3.Bb6+ a×b6‡

Quiet threat and four battery-creating thematic defences on the same square. The variations of the knights are distinguished by bishop arriving from different squares and mating moves delivered by different units (Country) Difficult task of four thematic variations with creation of black batteries on the same square, but in the last variation the battery does not fire which differs from the other variations. The captures of the bB and bR on W2 are rough (BUL) Four battery formations as defences by captures of wPb4, exploited by White. The threat and the variation 1...c×b4 are of a related character, even more prominently the very different further three lines with their white battery-play. The black correction 1...Sc×b4 leads to an inversion of motive of second degree. Albeit reminiscent of an Adabashev synthesis, this combination impairs here the unity of the thematic performance. Still the overall impression is convincing (GER) Three well-matched variations after a quiet threat are supplemented by a fourth thematic variation with varied white play (MKD)

2<sup>nd</sup> Place (9,2 points) F63: Marjan Kovačević (Serbia)

1.Qd6! [2.Be6+ Ke4 3.B×f5+ R×f5‡]

1...Sd3 2.Be4+ K×e4+ 3.Sc3+ B×c3‡, 1...S×c4 2.B×c4+ Ke4+ 3.Sc3+ B×c3‡

1...S×a4 2.Bc6+ Kc3 3.Qd2+ K×d2‡, 1...Sd1 2.B×b6+ R×b6 3.B×b7+ R×d6‡

Fourfold duel of front battery pieces bS-wB. White bishop star (Country) Difficult thematic complex with fourfold duel between bS and wB with wB star, unfortunately with repetition of moves and mates in the first two variations and rough captures of the bQ and bS on W2 (BUL) Duel between bS and wB, half-battery and battery. White's secondary double threat after a move of bSb2 (2.B×b6+, 2.Be4+) is differentiated by the dual avoidance moves 1...Sd1, 1...Sd3 and parried by the black corrections 1...S×c4, 1...S×a4, an ambitious background of these four thematic variations. Counting also the threat, the wBd5 draws a star on W2 (GER) Four thematic bS-moves, of which three lead to matching wB's play (star including the threat) and the fourth one still employs the wB/wQ battery on the W3 move. The repeated W3 and B3 moves after 1...Sd3 and 1...S×c4 detract from the overall impression (MKD) Four variations after bS defences. Unfortunately, one of the wB star moves appears in the threat instead of a variation. Still a good impression (SVK)

3<sup>rd</sup> Place (9 points) F57: Jan Rusinek (Poland)

- 1.Sh5! [2.R×h4 [3.B×g2+ h×g2‡]]
- 1...Bb2,Ba3 2.R×e3+ f×e3 3.Qe4+ B×e4‡

1...Bd2 2.R×f2+ (2.R×e3+?) e×f2 3.Qd5+ (3.Qe4+?) Be4‡

1...Ba2,Bc2,Bg6,Bh7 2.Q×f4+ (2.R×f4+?) R×f4 3.R×e3+ B×e3‡

1...Bd3 2.R×f4+ (2.Q×f4+?) R×f4 3.Q×e3+ B×e3‡

- 1...Be4 2.R×e3+ B×e3+ 3.Qd1+ R×d1‡, 2...f×e3 3.Q×e3+ B×e3‡
- 1...Bf5 2.R×f2+ e×f2 3.Q×f4+ B×f4‡

Task of six thematic variations after black half-battery play and two black corrections, but the play is with many repetitions of moves and also repetition of mates (BUL) Sixfold presentation of the theme in a half-battery setting. Inversion of Black's general defence motive and three black corrections by moves of Black's light-squared bishop. The play is colourful and rich in variety. It is not surprising, but still a pity, that the cluster of units around the right lower corner of the board could not be avoided (GER) Complex play in six variations, but with only 4 different W2 moves (MKD) Black half-battery with blend of variations. However, two W2 moves repeat (SVK)



4<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points) F51: Mark Erenburg (Israel)

1.Qe1! [2.Sa4+ b×a4 3.Rc2+ Kd3 4.Qe4+ R×e4‡]

1...b1=Q 2.Qe3+ Qd3 3.Rc2+ b×c2 4.Qd4+ Q×d4‡

1...b1=R 2.Rh3+ Sg3 3.Re2+ R×e1 4.B×b4+ K×b4‡

2...R×h3 3.Qe3+ R×e3+ 4.Se4+ Re×e4‡

1...b1=B 2.Qe3+ Bd3 3.Sb1+ Kc4+ 4.Qd4+ B×d4‡

1...b1=S 2.Rdf2+ Sd2 3.Q×a1+ b2 4.Rf3+ S×f3‡

1...Sf2,Sg3,Sd6 2.Se4+ S×e4 3.Rc2+ Kd3 4.Q×e4+ R×e4‡

1...S×c5 2.Sb1+ Kc4 3.Qc1+ b×c1=~+ 4.Rd4+ B×d4‡

Black AUW in the thematic defences (Country) Four thematic variations with AUW, unfortunately with repetition of the wQ moves in the 1...b1=Q/b1=B variation (BUL) Thematic AUW, however with very similar play after 1...b1=Q/b1=B (W2 and W4 moves are the same) (GER) AUW is a strong achievement, and in this context the repeated W2 move 2.Qe3 is acceptable, even though still unpleasant (MKD)

5<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points) F21: Jozef Havran, Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia)

1.Sh7? [2.Qd6+ K×d6 3.b8=Q+ Kc5 4.Qb4+ a×b4‡]

1...Rg8 2.Rf5+ B×f5,g×f5 3.Bf4+ Ke4+ 4.Qd4+ B×d4‡

1...R×h7 2.Bf6+ B×f6 3.Re4+ B×e4 4.Qd6+ K×d6‡ but 1...f6!

**1.Sfg8!** [2.Qd6+ K×d6 3.b8=Q+ Kc5 4.Qb4+ a×b4‡]

1...R×g8 2.Bf6+ B×f6 3.Re4+ B×e4 4.Qd6+ K×d6‡

1...Rh7 2.Rf5+ B×f5,g×f5 3.Bf4+ Ke4+ 4.Qd4+ B×d4‡

Dynamic play across the whole chessboard: In order to threaten mate from the very left file, White needs to move his knight towards the top-right corner. Two white queens are sacrificed in the threat, while in the variations all possible types of white officers are sacrificed. Reciprocal change of continuations where White utilises the thematic battery created by Black (Country) Two interesting thematic half-battery variations. After B1, the existence or absence of a control on f6 by the white knight is decisive for the correct choice of White's continuation. Therefore, the reciprocal changes between try and solution taking place on a merely formal level, does not substantially increase the value in this case. The construction is flawless (GER) Excellent content in a well-constructed setting (MKD)

6<sup>th</sup> Place (8,6 points) F27: Sre**ć**ko Radovi**ć** (Serbia)

1...Qf3 2.Qd3+ R×d3 3.e×d3+ K×d3‡, 1...Qg2 2.Qc2+ Rd3 3.R×d4+ K×d4‡

1.Qb4! [2.Sgf6+ Ke5 3.Qe7+ S×e7‡]

1...Qf3 2.d3+ R×d3 3.e×d3+ K×d3‡, 1...Qg2 2.Qb1+ Rd3 3.R×d4+ K×d4‡

1...Qh1 2.Sg3+ B×g3 3.B×f5+ K×f5‡, 1...Q×g4 2.Sf6+ Ke5 3.Qe7+ S×e7‡

The bQ creates three royal batteries (Country) Good creation of three black Royal batteries by the bQ and three different battery mates (BUL) Formation of a royal battery by three ambush moves of the bQ as defences, exploited by White in noticeably distinct ways (three inversions of motive), with three different discovered checks by the bK on the mating move. Convincing uniformity and freshness of play (GER) Triple battery creation by the bQ is a good achievement, so in this context the slightly varied white play can be excused (MKD)



7<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points) F55: Mark Erenburg (Israel)

1.Qd2! [2.Qe1 [3.B×g2+ h×g2‡]]

1...R~ 2.Sd4+ S×d4+ 3.Qd3+ B×d3‡, 1...R×c3 2.Qd5+ (2.Q×c3+?) e×d5 3.Sd4+ S×d4‡

1...Sb~ 2.S(×)d4+ R×d4+ 3.Qe2+ B×e2‡, 1...S×c3 2.Q×c3+ (2.Qd5+?) b×c3 3.Sd4+ R×d4‡

Black corrections (Country) Four thematic variations with nice combination of black half-battery play and two black corrections. All mates are different (BUL) Highly elegant and economical fourfold presentation of the theme in a half-battery setting. Two balanced systems of black correction, inversion of Black's primary defence motive, dual avoidance on W3 after the primary defences, on W2 after the secondary defences. Despite the reoccurrence of 2.Sd4+, an impressive achievement (GER) Four thematic variations with two battery mates and two direct mates. The repeated W2 move 2.Sd4+ decreases the value (MKD) Black half-battery mechanism with black correction. Pity that 2.Sd4+ occurs after both random defences (SVK)

8<sup>th</sup> Place (8,1 points) F16: Frank Richter (Germany)

1.Rc5! [2.c×b4 [3.Rc3+ S×c3‡]]

1...B×f3 2.Bh7+ Be4 3.Qf3+ S×f3‡ (2.c×b4? Sg2+!)

1...S×f3 2.Se5+ S×e5 3.Qe2+ B×e2‡ (2.c×b4? Be2+!)

1...Be2 2.Qf4 [3.Qd2+ S×d2‡] (2.c×b4? S×f3+!)

1...Sg2 2.Re2 [3.Rd2+ S×d2‡] (2.c×b4? B×f3+!)

Four thematic variations (Adabashev synthesis of two pairs of variations). The four thematic defences reappear as unique refutations if White tries to continue with the threat (Country) Four thematic variations with black half-battery play and 2×2 thematically connected variations (BUL) An excellent quartet of variations with harmonious black and white play, thereby surpassing problems with similar idea, such as F16a (MKD) Unified play in four thematic variations using black half-battery (SVK)

9<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points) F35: Mike Prcic (United States)

1.Qe6? [2.Qe4+ d×e4 3.Be5+ d×e5‡] but 1...S×c5!

1.Qe8! [2.Qe4+ d×e4 3.Be5+ d×e5‡]

1...S×d2 2.Bg5+ Kg3 3.Qe3+ Sf3‡

1...S×c3 2.q3+ Kf3 3.Qe2+ S×e2‡

1...S×c5 2.Rg4+ Kf5 3.Qe6+ S×e6‡

The theme is tripled (Country) Three thematic variations, three different white pieces move to three different squares on the g-file at W2, three different wQ moves on W3 (BUL) Battery formations on three distinct lines by knights that capture a pinned wP. White's exploitations are finished off by three different checks by the wQ on the e-file. An unfulfilled desire is to see those batteries created

by moves of a single bSe4. The variations 1...S×c3, 1...S×c5 show echoed play (GER) Double check mates are not usually pleasing, but still they are a cohesive factor in this problem together with the bK play at B2 moves and the wQ play at W3 moves (MKD) Three variations in unified play (SVK)



10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) F01: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

1.Qg1? [2.Qb1 [3.Qb5+ a×b5‡]]

1...R×c6 2.Qc5+ R×c5‡

1...S×c6 2.Qd4+ S×d4‡

but 1...b×c6!

1.Qd1! [2.Qb1 [3.Qb5+ a×b5‡]]

1...R×c6 2.Qg1 [3.Qc5+ R×c5‡]

1...S×c6 2.Sb2+ (2.Se5+?) c×b2 3.Qd4+ S×d4‡

1...b×c6 2.Se5+ (2.Sb2+?) S×e5 3.Qd5+ c×d5‡

Three newly formed batteries prevent the quiet threat by firing against the wK (useful effect of the defences) and are used for mating the wK (inversion of motives). The wQ makes an ambush key and four W3 moves in two systems of white play with: I) quiet W2 move in the threat and after 1...R×c6; II) sacrificial play by the wS on the W2 move opening the d-file for the wQ in an anti-dual manner after 1...S×c6/b×c6. Change of functions of three white moves and one black move between the solution and the try by the key piece (Country) Three thematic variations with creation of batteries on the same square and three battery mates. 2×2 thematically connected variations (BUL) Well-constructed threefold presentation of the theme. However, Black's defences 1...R/S×c6 against the threat 2.Qb1 aim at the control over the square b5 (2...Rc5(R×b6)+ / Sd4(Sa7)+), 1...b×c6 at providing the flight d4 (2...c5+ 3.Qb5+ Kd4), while the involved discovered check has no defencive effect. Therefore, there is no inversion of Black's defence motive (as claimed by the author). Still, the presentation with four wQ sacrifices on W3, quiet queen moves and dual avoidance on W2 is of a very good quality (GER)

10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) F64: Hartmut Laue (Germany)

1.Rh5! [2.R×f5+ e×f5 3.Sg5+ R×g5‡] Qa6 2.c6 [3.R×f5+ e×f5 4.Sg5+ R×g5‡] Q×c6 3.Rh4 [4.Rf4+ e×f4 5.Sg5+ R×g5‡] Qc3 4.Qf1+ Kg3 5.Qf4+ e×f4‡

Peri-decoy of the bQ with threefold iteration of the stipulated effect; final exploitation by inversion of Black's thematic defence motive (Country) Three thematic moves in a single variation with decoys of the bQ (MKD) Only a single thematic variation, but the idea is nicely echoed at a later stage of the solution (SVK)

10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) F02: Oleg Shaligin, Sergiy Borodavkin (Ukraine)

- 1...Rh4 2.Se3+ Q×e3 3.Rc5+ Q×c5 4.Qb5+ Q×b5‡
- 1...Qf4 2.Rd4+ Q×d4 3.Rc5+ Q×c5 4.Qb5+ Q×b5‡
- 1...Qd4 2.Rc5+ Q×c5 3.Qb5+ Q×b5‡
- 1.Qa6! [2.Rb6+ Kc5 3.Rc6+ d×c6 4.Qb5+ c×b5‡]
- 1...Rh4 2.Bd3+ Q×d3 3.Rb4+ Kc5 4.Qb5+ Q×b5‡
- 1...Qf4 2.Rb4+ Kc5 3.S×d7+ S×d7 4.Qb6+ S×b6‡, 3...B×d7+ 4.Qb5+ B×b5‡
- 1...Qd4 2.Sb6+ Q×b6 3.Rc5+ K×c5 4.Qb5+ Q×b5‡
- 1...Q×d5 2.Rc5+ K×c5 3.Qb6+ Kc4 4.Qb5+ Q×b5‡

A two-phase problem with three thematic variations and changed play (Country) Threefold presentation of the theme. The frequent move 4.Qb5+, the rather limited use of wBg6 and wRd1, and a lack of unity in the complex of variations affect the rating considerably (GER) Interesting thematic and changed play, in spite of some repeated white moves (MKD) Three thematic variations changed to set play. Unfortunately, one of the set lines is shorter (SVK)



10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) F18: Gennady Kozyura, Valery Kopyl, Ivan Soroka (Ukraine)

1.Sc~? [2.Qc3+ Ke2 3.Bc4+ Bd3‡] but 1...R×h1!

1.Se5! [2.Qc3+ Ke2 3.Bc4+ Bd3‡]

1...g×h1=Q 2.Rg1+ Q×g1 3.Qe3+ Q×e3‡

1...g1=Q 2.Re3+ Q×e3+ 3.Qd2+ Q×d2‡

1...g×h1=R,g1=R 2.Rf1+ R×f1 3.Qe2+ K×e2‡

1...R×h1 2.Qf3 [3.Sd3+ B×d3‡]

Fourfold presentation of the theme (Country) Four thematic variations, but the line 1...R×h1 requires an extra wS and does not match convincingly the character of the harmonious complex of the other three lines (GER) Three well-matched thematic variations and another one with quiet W2 move (MKD) Four variations lacking higher unity (SVK)

14<sup>th</sup> Place (7,6 points, not counting for the country) F65: Marjan Kovačević (Serbia)

- 1...d6 2.Se7+ R×e7 3.Rf6+ K×f6‡
- 1...d5 2.Qe6+ Q×e6 3.R×g5+ K×g5‡
- 1...c4 2.R×f4+ K×f4 3.Qe3+ S×e3‡
- 1.Qb3! [2.R×f4+ K×f4 3.Qe3+ S×e3‡]
- 1...d6 2.Qe6+ Q×e6 3.R×g5+ K×g5‡
- 1...d5 2.Se7+ R×e7 3.Rf6+ K×f6‡

Reciprocally changed bK mates (Country) Nice reciprocal changes of white continuations after bP one-two steps (BUL) Two thematic variations, nicely embedded into a reciprocal change mechanism which, however, is based on a well-known matrix. The white battery is inactive in the thematic lines (GER) Exchanged W2 moves with arrival of the wQ to e6 from different squares (MKD)

15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points, not counting for the country) F33: Michael Barth, Hartmut Laue (Germany) 1.Ba1! [2.c3+ Kb3+ 3.Qc4+ R×c4‡] 1...S×e3 2.Rg1 [3.Qc4+ S×c4‡] Be1 3.Bc3+ B×c3‡ 1...S×d5 2.c6 [3.Bc3+ S×c3‡] R×c6 3.Qc4+ R×c4‡, 2...d×c2 3.Qb5+ K×b5‡

1...d×c2 2.Bc3+ Kb3+ 3.Qc4+ R×c4‡

Two thematic variations on distinct battery lines; inversion of the motives of the thematic defences in a pseudo le Grand mechanism with changed mates after the thematic moves; dismantling of the thematic batteries and direct mates by the former rear pieces, where the strategic roles of the squares c3, c4 are reciprocally exchanged (Country) The most interesting entry with two thematic variations showing an original combination of the set theme with the pseudo le Grand theme. The sub-variation threats are battery mates after quiet W2 moves terminate the white control of the respective black battery and the sub-variation mates are given by former rear battery pieces after they just dismantled the respective black battery (MKD)



15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points) F14: Bogusz Piliczewski (Poland)

1.Ba8! [2.Qb7 [3.Qb2+ a×b2‡]]

1...Bg4,Bh5 2.Q×f1 [3.Qe1+ R×e1‡] Bd1 3.Qf3+ B×f3‡

1...Be2 2.Rc6+ Bc4 3.Qd2+ S×d2‡, 1...Se3 2.Sd5+ S×d5 3.Q×c2+ B×c2‡

1...Sd2 2.Qf3+ S×f3 3.Se2+ B×e2‡, 1...c6 2.Qd2+ S×d2 3.Se2+ B×e2‡

Bristol, switchback, Pelle move, Keller (paradox), Dentist, white sacrifices, reciprocal captures (Country) Four thematic variations with black half-battery play, Bristol key and black correction. Good construction, but use of a half-battery is not so paradoxical for the set theme (BUL) Fourfold presentation of the theme in diversified variations, showing four closures of the diagonal a8-h1. However, the numerous strategic elements appear rather disconnected, and the use of wRe6 is not satisfactory (it plays a role only after 1...Be2) (GER) Four thematic variations after a quiet threat, but the capture after 1...Bg4,Bh5 is both unpleasant and unrelated to the other W2 moves (MKD) Four thematic variations using black half-battery mechanism (SVK)

15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points, not counting for the country) F15: Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemanič, Peter Gvozdják, Štefan Sovík (Slovakia) 1.Sa8! [2.Se4+ d×e4 3.Qb8 [4.Qb2+ a×b2‡]]

- 1...e2 2.Q×f4 [3.Qd2+ B×d2‡] Se3 3.Q×e3 [4.Qd2+ B×d2‡], 2...S×f4 3.Sc7 [4.S×d5+ S×d5‡] (2.Se4+? d×e4 3.Qb8 f3+!)
- 1...f3 2.Q×e3 [3.Qd2+ B×d2‡] S×e3 3.Sc7 [4.S×d5+ S×d5‡], 2...Sf4 3.Q×f4 [4.Qd2+ B×d2‡] (2.Se4+? d×e4 3.Qb8 e2+!)

Cyclically changed play in sub-variations (Kiss theme). Black batteries would fire against the threat on B3. Quiet W3 moves (Country) In a formal sense, this is a clean and original moremover variation of the Kiss theme, with its cyclic play on W2, W3. For a higher ranking, however, the presentation should exhibit more interesting strategy, more colourful lines. The construction is satisfactory, with the exception of the use of wSd6 (GER) An outstanding key and original content, the latter achieved by means of inherently crude captures of the bS on the thematic line (MKD)

18<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) F43: Gerard Smits, Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands)

1.Sc3! [2.Sd5+ Sb×d5,Sf×d5,e×d5 3.Qe5+ B×e5‡]

1...Ra6 2.Se2+ Ke3 3.S×c4+ S×c4‡, 1...e5 2.R×f5+ K×f5 3.Qe4+ S×e4‡

1...Sf~ 2.B(×)e4+ Bf3 3.R×f5+ e×f5‡, 1...Sg4 2.Be4+ Sf2 3.R×f5+ e×f5‡

Very nice interpretation of the theme where in the threat three different black pieces play on B2 and Black creates batteries with them as defences. Combination of black battery creation and black half-battery play. Sadly, the white play in the bS correction variation is the same (BUL) Three clean thematic variations, two battery lines. No deeper connection between the lines is visible, and wSa5 is weak (GER) Triple battery creation with inversion of motives. The key by an out-of-play piece and the heavy setting are drawbacks (MKD)



20<sup>th</sup> Place F03 Zoran Gavrilovski North Macedonia



19<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points) F71: Daniele Gatti (Italy)

1.c8=Q! [2.Q×d5+ R×d5 3.Bh5+ R×h5‡]

1...Qb1 2.Sg5+ Kf6 3.Qh8+ Ke7 4.Sge4+ Kf7 5.Q×d5+ R×d5 6.Bh5+ R×h5‡

1...b1=Q 2.Ra7+ Qb7 3.Qc6 [4.Q×d5+ R×d5 5.Bh5+ R×h5‡] Qhb1 4.R×b7+ Q×b7 5.Q×d5+ R×d5/Q×d5 6.Bh5+ R×h5/Q×h5‡

1...b1=B 2.Se4 [3.Q×d5+ R×d5 4.Bh5+ R×h5‡] d4 3.Seg5+ Kf6,Ke7 4.Sf7+ K×f7 5.Q×f3+ Q×f3 6.Bh5+ Q×h5‡

Exchange of W2/W3 moves by the white thematic pieces (Country) Excellently constructed problem with sufficiently matching play in three variations, which is difficult to find without computer help. The short threat is acceptable in the light of the problem's length (MKD) A six-mover with three variations one of which is a bit questionable. What follows after 1...b1=B is threatening after the key as well (SVK)

20<sup>th</sup> Place (6,9 points) F03: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

1...B×c2+ 2.Qb3+ B×b3‡

1...Q×c6+ 2.Qb5+ Q×b5‡

1.Bb2! [2.Qb4+ a×b4 3.Bb3+ B×b3‡]

1...R×a6 2.Sd6+ e×d6 3.Qb4+ a×b4‡

1...S×c6 2.S×a5+ S×a5+ 3.Qb5+ Q×b5‡

1...S×c2 2.Se3+ S×e3+ 3.Qb3+ B×b3‡

Three newly formed batteries prevent the threat by firing against the wK (useful effect of defences), but they are also used for mating the wK (inversion of motives) (Country) Creation of three different black batteries (BUL) Three thematic lines in a mechanism similar to that of F35, but the play is uneven and the construction less satisfactory (GER)

#### 21<sup>st</sup> Place

• F69 (6,8 points, not counting for the country): Oleg Shaligin, Sergiy Borodavkin, Oleksandr Derevchuk (Ukraine) Choice of key. Black correction (Country) Three defences by the bS and three mates by the bQ after a good key, even though the presence of a wP on e7 signals the key piece. The W3 move 3.Rg4+ features in two thematic variations (MKD)

22<sup>nd</sup> Place

 F06 (6,6 points, not counting for the country): Waldemar Tura (Poland) Adabashev complex: Two thematic variations (1...Ra1 and 1...Ra2) with creation of black batteries and double dual avoidance [Iwanow theme (B1 and W2 moves) and simple dual avoidance (B2 and W3 moves)] and two non-thematic variations (threat and 1...Bb5) with change of functions of the wQ and wBd8 (Country) One of the two couples of variations of this Adabashev synthesis is thematic, where Black's defences induce a rather shallow dual avoidance effect on W3. Except for a sacrifice on W2 in one of the two thematic lines, both white rooks are idle (GER) Only two thematic variations, but enriched with dual avoidance and additional play which is not thematic (MKD)

23<sup>rd</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> Place

- F19 (6,4 points): Mike Prcic (United States) Exchange of W2/W3 by the white thematic pieces (Country) Exchange of white moves and of the functions of bRf6/bBf3 (a front battery piece if White continues with the threat / an actual front battery piece in the respective variation; and *vice versa*) (MKD)
- F31 (6,4 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) The black bishop forms two thematic batteries, one as rear-piece and one as front-piece. A full-length try echoes the battery formation and play as well as the key-switchback (Country) The idea of using a bB as front piece and as rear piece for two thematic variations is original. Apart from that, the variations do not show highlights that would justify the length of 5 moves. The wRa3 is important after 1...B×b1 but otherwise inactive (GER) The problem's length and the full-length threat are commendable, but the play lacks sufficient unity (MKD)
- F58 (6,4 points): Maryan Kerhuel, Michel Caillaud (France) The notation of the solution should start with 1.Re1? Qf7!, which presents not only a first thematic effect in the sense of the tourney but also indicates the original logical structure of the problem. Both the foreplan 1.Ba4 Qa3 and the continuation 2.Re1 Qf8 (a deflection) show thematic black defences by battery formations. However, the presentation of this attractive idea is tarnished by the weak roles of wBc6 and wSh1 (GER) Two thematic moves in a single variation (MKD)

#### 26<sup>th</sup>-29<sup>th</sup> Place

- F17 (6,2 points): Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) Well balanced construction, two enjoyable thematic variations, but without special highlights (GER) A good key and lively play (MKD)
- F24 (6,2 points): Marko Klasinc, Klemen Šivic (Slovenia) Chasing the bK might seem dull, but the inversion of motifs is nice (MKD)

- F28 (6,2 points): Klemen Šivic, Marko Klasinc (Slovenia) A decently good rendering of the idea of battery firing by means of e.p. captures, in spite of the short threat (MKD)
- F54 (6,2 points): Jorma Paavilainen (Finland) Two clean and balanced thematic variations with exchange of the functions of wSb6 and wQ, very good construction (GER) After battery creation on b5 the mates are given by the rear battery piece (MKD)

#### 30<sup>th</sup>-31<sup>st</sup> Place

- F61 (6 points): Atsuo Hara (Japan) Three variations with uneven play and the same W3 and B3 moves (MKD)
- F66 (6 points): Jiří Jelínek, Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Three thematic defences on the same square (Country) Triple battery creation on the same square. The dual mate after 1...Q×e4 is a drawback (MKD)

#### 32<sup>nd</sup> Place

• F70 (5,8 points): Daniele Gatti (Italy) Two nice analogous thematic ambush defences, but too small for a higher ranking. The wBb8, only preventing 1...Qc1 2.Se8+, is unpleasant (GER) A light setting, but the varied black play (one battery mate and one direct mate) in the thematic variations is not an ideal feature (MKD)

#### 33<sup>rd</sup> Place

• F48 (5,6 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) Good play with inversion of motifs (MKD)

#### 34<sup>th</sup>-38<sup>th</sup> Place

- F09 (5,4 points): Kalyan Seetharaman, S.K. Balasubramanian (India) Two different battery formations by the bQ with different white continuations and battery mates. Changed play after 1...Qa2 from set play to solution. Dual avoidance on W2 move. Bi-valve key opening c5-f5 line and closing c5-d8 line enables changed play. Four different black mates (set, threat and two variations). Inversion of motive of battery formation by Black utilised by White for mate (Country) Inversion of motifs and nice dual avoidance (MKD)
- F23 (5,4 points, not counting for the country): Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Three newly formed batteries prevent the quiet threat by firing against the wK (useful effect of the defences) and two of them are used for mating the wK (inversion of motives). Fourfold play on the same square (e2): three times on the B1 move and the fourth arrival occurs on the threat's B2 move. The try is made by the key piece (Country) Three thematic variations that are (almost throughout) finished off by white checks on d3 and mates by capturing the checking unit. The key is obtrusive (GER)
- F32 (5,4 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Each new black battery has a unique way of firing without mating, circumvented after bPf4 answers two W2 checks (Country) Two thematic variations in a common setting, with the special feature that the intended threat founders on a unique discovered check by the thematically formed battery. This is a worthy and unusual subtlety, but not enough for a higher ranking (GER) Two good variations after a quiet threat (MKD)
- F36 (5,4 points): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) 2 × theme, change function move, free change (Country) Two interesting variations in a heavy and cluttered setting (MKD)
- F53 (5,4 points, not counting for the country): Mike Prcic, Mark Kirtley (United States) Dual avoidance. wSg5 guards e4 in the thematic variations (in the threat, the wQ guards e4) (Country) Good dual avoidance with white battery play, but the mate is the same in both variations (MKD)

#### 39th-42nd Place

- F11 (5,2 points): Michel Caillaud (France) Two simple variations with battery mates (MKD)
- F22 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Miroslav Svítek (Czech Republic) Two thematic defences on the same square, switchbacks (Country) Black switchbacks with delayed Umnov. The capturing W2 move after 1...S×c5 detracts from the overall impression (MKD)

- F42 (5,2 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland) Two thematic variations with varied play (MKD)
- F62 (5,2 points): Henk le Grand (Netherlands) Inversion of motifs becomes effective only after the white line piece that controls the 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> row made a sacrificial W2 move (MKD)

#### 43<sup>rd</sup>-44<sup>th</sup> Place

- F07 (5 points): Kalyan Seetharaman (India) Quiet threat. Inversion of motive of black battery formation. Two battery formations on the same square and correction play by different black promotions. Battery transformation. Diagonal and orthogonal battery mates by Black (Country) The quiet play is a good bonus (MKD)
- F08 (5 points, not counting for the country): Daniele Gatti (Italy) The short threat is a drawback, but the tries add to the general value of the problem (MKD)

#### 45<sup>th</sup>-46<sup>th</sup> Place

- F04 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Marko Klasinc, Klemen Šivic (Slovenia) Chasing the bK to the c-file always leads to the same mate (MKD)
- F37 (4,8 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Fight for the c5 flight square (Country) Peculiar masked battery creation with varied mating strategy (a dual direct mate after 1...Qg4,Qh4 and a battery mate after 1...Rg4). The choice of the W1 move adds charm to the problem (MKD)

#### 47th-48th Place

- F05 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): C.G.S. Narayanan (India) Two thematic battery formations and correction play by the pd5. Inversion of motive of black battery formation by White (Country) Two nice variations. One mate is direct and one is from a battery (MKD)
- F47 (4,6 points): János Csák (Hungary) Two variations with inversion of motifs after a short threat and with a bit varied white play (MKD)

#### 49th-50th Place

- F26 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Michel Caillaud (France) Inversion of motifs with quiet W2 moves (MKD)
- F67 (4,4 points): Ovidiu Crăciun (Romania) The threat is an important part of the set theme, so the dual here is strong. Triple in the mates of the first variation is also very bad (BUL) The author seems to have needed an unpleasant dual threat 2.Q×f3+,R×f3+ to give a thematic effect to 1...S×g3 which by capturing the wPg3 does not defend against 2.R×f3+ (because 3.g4?? is no longer possible). Dual mates after 1...S×g3 are yet another drawback (MKD)

51<sup>st</sup>-53<sup>rd</sup> Place

- F12 (4,2 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland) Two variations with varied strategy of the white play (MKD)
- F41 (4,2 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen (Denmark) Inversion of motifs after 1...R×c4, but not after Qa5 due to the dual mate (MKD)
- F45 (4,2 points): Ivo Tominić (Croatia) Three promotions on b1 are thematic with respect to the first threat (Country) Two thematic variations after 1...c×b1=S/c×b1=B. It would have received a higher score if the unpleasant dual threat did not exist (MKD)

54<sup>th</sup> Place

• F40 (3,8 points): János Csák (Hungary) Two interesting variations, but the short threat is not good at all (MKD)

55<sup>th</sup>-57<sup>th</sup> Place

• F20 (3,6 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) The key opens the wQ diagonal and guards a potential flight square (Country) Two thematic variations with a dual mate in one of them (MKD)

- F49 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) Two variations in which Black can mate the wK only with a double check (Country) The heavy setting and the promoted wB are serious drawbacks (MKD)
- F50 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Tibor Érsek (Hungary) The short threat and varied strategy reduce the score (MKD)

58<sup>th</sup>-59<sup>th</sup> Place

- F13 (2,8 points, not counting for the country): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland) Only one variation, which merely extends the short threat (MKD)
- F68 (2,8 points): José Antonio Garzón (Spain) Black royal battery creation; battery activation; Dombrovskis effect (Country) Only one variation after a key by an out-of-play piece (MKD)

60<sup>th</sup> Place

• F30 (2,6 points, not counting for the country): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Mates on the same square by two different bPs capturing different white units; reciprocal wQ/bPg5 captures (Country) Only the variation 1...Rd×d4 is thematic and it merely extends the short threat (MKD)

61<sup>st</sup> Place

• F46 (2,2 points): Steffen Slumstrup Nielsen, Bjørn Enemark (Denmark) Only one variation, and a try refuted by the thematic B1 move (MKD)

62<sup>nd</sup> Place

• F44 (2 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Only one thematic variation (MKD)

63<sup>rd</sup> Place

• F34 (1,8 points): José Antonio Garzón (Spain) Self-pin key; battery creation (x2); square vacation (Country) Only one thematic variation and a dual mate (MKD)

64<sup>th</sup> Place

• F52 (1,6 points, not counting for the country): José Antonio Garzón (Spain) Battery creation; Double black battery (Country) Only one thematic variation (MKD)
# Section F: Selfmates

Place	Country	No	BUL	GER	MKD	POL	SVK	Total
1	SVK	F10	3,0	3,2	2,8	3,2		9,3
2	SRB	F63	3,0	3,2	2,8	3,6	3,0	9,2
3	POL	F57	2,6	3,6	3,2		2,8	9,0
4	ISR	F51	3,0	2,6	3,2	3,2	2,4	8,8
5	SVK	F21	2,4	2,6	3,2	4,0		8,7
6	SRB	F27	3,0	3,0	2,6	3,6	2,4	8,6
7	ISR	F55	3,2	3,6	2,4	2,0	2,6	8,2
8	GER	F16	2,4		3,0	2,6	2,8	8,1
9	USA	F35	2,6	3,0	2,8	2,6	2,6	8,0
10-13	MKD	F01	3,2	2,8		2,0	2,4	7,8
10-13	GER	F64	2,2		2,4	3,0	2,8	7,8
10-13	UKR	F02	1,8	2,4	2,8	3,2	2,6	7,8
10-13	UKR	F18	2,2	2,4	3,0	2,8	2,6	7,8
14	SRB	F65	2,6	2,4	2,6	2,6	2,4	7,6
15-17	GER	F33	2,2		2,8	3,6	2,2	7,5
15-17	POL	F14	2,4	2,4	2,6		2,6	7,5
15-17	SVK	F15	1,6	2,6	2,4	2,6		7,5
18	NED	F43	2,8	2,6	2,2	2,6	2,2	7,4
19	ITA	F71	1,8	1,8	2,8	3,2	2,6	7,2
20	MKD	F03	2,6	2,6		2,0	2,0	6,9
21	UKR	F69	1,6	2,0	2,6	3,0	2,2	6,8
22	POL	F06	2,0	2,4	2,4		1,8	6,6
23-25	USA	F19	2,0	2,0	2,4	2,6	1,8	6,4
23-25	FRA	F58	2,0	3,0	1,8	2,6	1,8	6,4
23-25	GBR	F31	1,8	2,2	2,0	3,0	2,2	6,4
26-29	FIN	F17	2,0	2,4	2,2	2,0	1,6	6,2
26-29	SLO	F24	1,6	2,0	2,2	2,6	2,0	6,2
26-29	FIN	F54	1,6	2,6	2,0	2,6	1,6	6,2
26-29	SLO	F28	1,0	2,0	2,2	2,8	2,0	6,2
30-31	JPN	F61	0,6	2,0	2,0	2,0	2,0	6,0
30-31	CZE	F66	1,6	2,0	2,4	2,2	1,8	6,0
32	ITA	F70	1,2	2,2	2,0	2,6	1,6	5,8
33	GRE	F48	2,0	1,4	2,0	2,0	1,6	5,6
34-38	IND	F09	1,6	1,8	2,2	2,0	1,6	5,4
34-38	MKD	F23	1,4	2,2		1,8	1,8	5,4
34-38	GBR	F32	1,8	2,4	2,0	1,6	1,6	5,4
34-38	CZE	F36	1,6	2,0	1,8	2,0	1,4	5,4
34-38	USA	F53	1,0	1,8	2,0	2,4	1,6	5,4
39-42	FRA	F11	1,6	2,0	1,8	1,4	1,8	5,2
39-42	CZE	F22	1,6	2,0	1,6	2,8	1,6	5,2
39-42	SUI	F42	1,0	2,0	1,6	2,6	1,6	5,2
39-42	NED	F62	1,6	1,6	2,0	2,4	1,2	5,2
43-44	IND	F07	1,6	1,8	2,0	1,2	1,6	5,0
43-44	ITA	F08	1,2	1,6	2,2	1,8	1,6	5,0

45-46	SLO	F04	1,4	1,8	1,6	1,4	1,8	4,8
45-46	ARM	F37	1,2	2,0	1,4	2,4	1,4	4,8
47-48	IND	F05	1,2	1,8	1,6	1,6	1,4	4,6
47-48	HUN	F47	1,2	1,6	1,6	1,6	1,4	4,6
49-50	ROU	F67	0,0	1,6	1,2	1,6	1,8	4,4
49-50	FRA	F26	1,2	1,8	2,2	1,4	1,0	4,4
51-53	CRO	F45	0,6	1,6	1,2	1,4	1,8	4,2
51-53	SUI	F12	1,4	1,6	1,6	1,2	1,2	4,2
51-53	DEN	F41	0,4	2,0	1,4	1,4	1,4	4,2
54	HUN	F40	0,6	1,6	1,0	1,6	1,2	3,8
55-57	ARM	F49	1,6	1,0	1,0	1,8	1,0	3,6
55-57	ARM	F20	1,0	1,6	1,2	1,2	1,2	3,6
55-57	HUN	F50	1,0	1,4	1,0	1,4	1,2	3,6
58-59	SUI	F13	1,0	1,0	0,6	1,0	0,8	2,8
58-59	ESP	F68	0,2	1,4	0,6	1,4	0,8	2,8
60	GBR	F30	0,4	1,4	0,4	2,4	0,8	2,6
61	DEN	F46	0,2	1,2	0,6	1,0	0,6	2,2
62	SWE	F44	0,2	1,4	0,4	1,0	0,6	2,0
63	ESP	F34	0,6	0,6	0,2	0,6	0,8	1,8
64	ESP	F52	0,4	1,0	0,4	0,6	0,6	1,6
	SWE	F29	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0

## SECTION G: FAIRIES

Judging countries: India, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland

Theme (proposed by Slovakia): Mate in 3 moves with fairy pieces from one (and only one) of the following families:

- 1. Grasshopper, Rookhopper, Bishopper, Nightriderhopper
- 2. Lion, Rook-Lion, Bishop-Lion, Nightrider-Lion
- 3. Leo, Pao, Vao, Nao

A thematic mate is possible thanks to the deactivation of the lines of two or more black fairy pieces. This can be done by White or by Black or in combination by White and Black. The thematic black piece must already be present on the thematic line in the diagram position. Any type of deactivation is allowed: removing the hurdle, adding an extra hurdle, pin, capture, removal of the line-piece, etc.

Definition of pieces

Family 1.

*Grasshopper (G)*: moves along Queen lines, but must hop over another unit of either colour ("the hurdle") and land on the next square beyond.

Rookhopper (RH): moves like a Grasshopper, but only along Rook lines.

Bishopper (BH): moves like a Grasshopper, but only along Bishop lines.

*Nightriderhopper (NH)*: moves like a Grasshopper, but along Nightrider lines.

Family 2.

*Lion (LI)*: moves like a Grasshopper, but the hurdle can occupy any square between the departure and arrival squares.

*Rook-Lion (RL)*: moves like a Lion, but only along Rook lines.

Bishop-Lion (BL): moves like a Lion, but only along Bishop lines.

*Nightrider-Lion (NL)*: moves like a Lion, but along Nightrider lines.

Family 3.

*Leo (LE)*: captures like a Lion, and moves without capture like a Queen.

Pao (PA): moves like a Leo, but only along Rook lines.

Vao (VA): moves like a Leo, but only along Bishop lines.

*Nao (NA)*: moves like a Leo, but along Nightrider lines.

[*Nightrider (N*): moves along straight lines whose squares are lying a Knight's move away from each other.]



1<sup>st</sup> Place (12 points) G47: Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia) 1.Q~? [2.d8=NL+ RL×d8 3.S×g4‡ 2.S×g4+ BL×g4 3.RL×f6‡ 2.RL×f6+ RL×f6 3.d8=NL‡] but 1...c6!, 1...Sd4!

1.Qd6? [2.d8=NL+ RLd×d8,RLg×d8 3.S×g4‡] 1...c6 2.S×g4+ BL×g4,NL×g4 3.RL×f6‡ 1...Sd4 2.RL×f6+ RLb×f6,RLf×f6,BL×f6 3.d8=NL‡ but 1...RLf4!

1.Qb4? [2.S×g4+ RL×g4,BL×g4 3.RL×f6‡] 1...c6 2.RL×f6+ RLb×f6,RLf×f6 3.d8=NL‡ 1...Sd4 2.d8=NL+ RLd×d8,RLg×d8,NL×d8 3.S×g4‡ but 1...BLe6!

1.Qe5! [2.RL×f6+ RL×f6,BL×f6 3.d8=NL‡] 1...c6 2.d8=NL+ RL×d8,NL×d8 3.S×g4‡ 1...Sd4 2.S×g4+ RL×g4,BL×g4,NL×g4 3.RL×f6‡ 1...RLdd8 2.Qh2+ RLh4+ 3.Q×h4‡ 1...RLgd8 2.RL×f6+ RL×f6,BL×f6 3.g8=S‡

There are 9 fairy thematic black lines targeting to 3 mating squares: a4/c8/a7 towards g4; b2/f1/b6 towards f6; d2/g8/a2 towards d8. A random-move attempt of the wQ (let's say, to e3) explains the mechanism: a triple threat appears with rotated white moves. This, however, fails if Black plays onto either of two intersections c6 or d4. Therefore, White has to correct paradoxically by playing "weaker" moves – creating just a single threat each time. The result is a Dombro-Lačný 3×3 with rotation of W2 and W3 moves across the three phases (Country) A complex matrix involving 9 Black lines and the wQ occupying 3 different intersection points. Shows: 1) Shedey theme (A[BC], B[CA], C[AB]) 2) A try with all 3 thematic threats and refuted by the two thematic defences (Dombrovskis Paradox) 3) Cycle of W2/W3 in each phase (A/B, B/C, C/A) 4) White correction in the 1<sup>st</sup> try (random), 2<sup>nd</sup> try and key by the wQ (IND) This monumental concept is just slightly marred by the en prise key piece. It is worth studying in depth what all those pieces are doing (ROU) A very complex mechanism using 9 thematic lines towards three mating squares, three lines intersecting at c6, three

others at d4 (where the wQ starts), the last three using one of the white mating pieces as a hurdle. A random move the wQ is defeated by black moves to the intersection squares c6 or d4, keeping all thematic mates well guarded. So the wQ must move to a square where one of the lines through c6 and one of the lines through d4 intersect, providing a continuation for both c7-c6 and Sd4. As White uses the same moves in W2 (removing a hurdle from one guard line) and W3 (mating), the result is a complete 3×3 Shedey cycle with three cycles of W2 and W3, one in each phase. The impression of automatic play is mitigated by the refutations of the tries (it is an advantage that Black seems to have a similar refutation in the solution, but it turns out to be insufficient as it allows g8=S‡). That this content could be realized at all, and in such an open position (at least in the center!) is astonishing (SWE) Perfection! (SUI)

2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Place (10,2 points) G52: Juraj Lörinc, Ladislav Salai Jr, Emil Klemanič (Slovakia) 1.e×d3? [2.B×b7+ VA×b7,PA×b7 3.NA×e8‡] 1...LEe5 2.NA×e8+ PAa×e8,PAe×e8 3.S×c5‡ 1...LEe4 2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAh×c5 3.B×b7‡ but 1...LEe3!

1.f×g4? [2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAh×c5 3.B×b7‡] 1...LEe4 2.B×b7+ VA×b7,PA×b7 3.NA×e8‡ 1...LEd5 2.NA×e8+ PAa×e8,PAe×e8 3.S×c5‡ but 1...LEb2!

1.f6! [2.NA×e8+ PAa×e8,PAe×e8 3.S×c5‡] 1...LEd5 2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAh×c5 3.B×b7‡ 1...LEe5 2.B×b7+ VA×b7,PA×b7 3.NA×e8‡ 1...LEc3 2.d×c3 [3.S×c5‡]

White continuations are cycled in 3 phases as threat and two variations, and also mutually on W2 and W3 moves; Black defences are cycled by pairs in 3 phases; a triple le Grand on W2 moves, but also another triple le Grand on W3 moves (Country) This problem achieves the same content as G44: a 3-phase complex showing the carousel pattern, a white move cycle and a triple le Grand. Here too, there are 3 mating squares, 6 different black lines, 3 of which get deactivated by White's 2<sup>nd</sup> move. But instead of the black Leo being a common hurdle for 3 of the lines, there are white Ps as hurdles. In the tries and the solution each wP moves away, threatening a thematic continuation. The black Leo interposes on the lines of the other two black lines, which activates one but deactivates the other (IND) The whole play is based on departure effects of white moves. The exemplary unity between tries and real play enhances the overall value (ROU) Three mating squares (b7, c5, e8) are each guarded by two Chinese pieces with white pieces as hurdles: one guard via a wP, one guard via one of the mating white pieces. So a move by one of those wPs creates a threat to remove the second guard of that mating square by a check from one of the thematic white pieces. Black can activate the line that W1 deactivated by playing LEd4 onto that line, but as the three black lines intersect in the triangle d5-e4-e5, those defences deactivate one of the other two lines by interference. The result is a system of carousel changes, where the W2 continuation that is missing (because one of the three LE moves doesn't defend) is instead the threat. So there is a triple le Grand (one between each pair of phases), and additionally three cycles of W2-W3 moves (one in each phase). The unity is enhanced by refutations by the thematic bLE (which has what looks like a refutation in the solution too, but White has a simple continuation). The content is enormous, using the whole board with excellent white economy (SWE)

2<sup>nd</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> Place (10,2 points, not counting for the country) G07: Peter Gvozdják (Slovakia) 1.RLe5? [2.RLf5+ d3,RL×a7,RLb6 3.RL×g5‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLf7+ d3 3.RLd4‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLf6+ d3 3.RLd4‡ but 1...BLg3!

1.RLe7? [2.RLf6+ d3 3.RLd4‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLf5+ d3 3.RLd4‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLf7+ d3,RLb6,RLc5 3.RL×g7‡ but 1...BLf8!

1.RLe6? [2.RLf7+ d3 3.RLd4‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLf6+ d3,RL×a7,RLc5 3.RL×g6‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLf5+ d3 3.RLd4‡ but 1...NLf6!

1.RLf5? [2.RLe5+ d3,RL×a7,RLb6 3.RL×g5‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLe7+ d3 3.RLd4‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLe6+ d3 3.RLd4‡ but 1...NLg2!

1.RLf6? [2.RLe7+ d3 3.RLd4‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLe6+ d3,RL×a7,RLc5 3.RL×g6‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLe5+ d3 3.RLd4‡ but 1...Be6!

1.RLf7! [2.RLe6+ d3 3.RLd4‡] 1...Rg6 2.RLe5+ d3 3.RLd4‡ 1...Rg7 2.RLe7+ d3,RLb6,RLc5 3.RL×g7‡ 1...Re5 2.RL×e5+ d3,RLb6 3.Rh×g4‡ 1...RLe5,RLf5,RLb6,RLe7 2.Rh1+ RL×h1 3.Q×h1‡

Six phases contain the following blend of themes: a) twice the complete Shedey cycle with six different continuations (A1-B1-C1 and A2-B2-C2), b) three times the key-threat reversal (A1-A2, B1-B2, C1-C2), c) six times the key-continuation reversal (A1-B2, A1-C2, B1-C2, B1-A2, C1-A2, C1-B2). Six different mates, all of them are WCCT-thematic. The first composition of its kind (Country) 3-line mechanism already seen in the 2021 FIDE World Cup and also in a 2008 problem by Mladenović (G07a in the Claims document). Here doubled Shedey theme is shown (IND) Another ambitious concept aiming very high. However, the small constructional blemishes cannot be completely ignored (underused pieces, flight-creating defences) (ROU) Two complete 3×3 Shedey cycles, produced by a very efficient mechanism based on interferences of RLh5+h6+h7 plus a mate on the gfile when the bR is on the same rank as the key wRL moved to. The fact that the same white moves are used in W1 and in W2 automatically produces 3 × reciprocal change of key and threat, and 6 × reciprocal change of key and continuation. These effects don't add much to the value of the problem, as those changes are fairly trivial without any paradox. The fact that all six mates, including those in the by-variations, actually fulfill the stipulated theme is nice to note but also does not add much to the value - which depends on the mechanism leading to a double complete Shedey. This all works like a well-oiled machine, but the mechanical impression is mitigated by the five different refutations of the tries. The basic mechanism is not new but has been used before in the comparison problem G07a. But here a half-battery mechanism is added, producing two complete Shedeys instead of a single complete Lačný (with quiet play in the variations). So this entry cannot be regarded as anticipated, but it does lose some originality (SWE) Phenomenal content, but very heavy position. The NLs are purely technical (SUI)



4<sup>th</sup> Place (9,8 points) G06: Michel Caillaud (France)

1.Rab6! [2.Rd6+ Kc5 3.VAe7‡]

1...Sgf4 2.NAge3+ NA×f1/VA×f1 3.PAee5/VAde5‡

1...Sef4 2.PAe3+ VA×f1/NA×f1 3.VAde5/NAe5‡

1...VAdf4 2.VAe3+ VAd×f1/VAh×f1 3.NAe5/PAee5‡

Cyclic Carousel structure at 2<sup>nd</sup> move. At each step, all moves are played on the same square (variations at 1<sup>st</sup> move, white 2<sup>nd</sup> moves, black 2<sup>nd</sup> moves, mates). Original focal play, reminding the Jacobs theme, but working here in a completely different way. 3 anti-battery mates and 3 antibattery 2<sup>nd</sup> moves (Country) An original twist on the standard Jacobs mechanism with anti-battery checks and mates throughout. 3 Chinese pieces on b3/d3/h3 each guard both the anti-battery lines f1-d5 (with a black hurdle) and f5-d5 (with a white hurdle). The key threatens a check on d6. The 3 black moves to f4 prevent this by activating the line g3-d6. But they also remove a hurdle from the f1-d5 line. White on his 2<sup>nd</sup> move gives an anti-battery check on e3, while simultaneously removing a hurdle to f5 from the piece which had lost a hurdle on Black's first move. The mates are all on e5 and in the typical Jacobs cycle form (IND) The most artistic rendering of the theme from the tournament. The whole play is based on the control of f5 square. Excellent focal play and excellent construction! (ROU) While the carousel change in the Visserman style is known, the additional unification of the variations is less than usual: the mechanism utilizes all B1 moves to f4, W2 to e3, B2 to f1 and W3 to e5 (SVK) Three black fairy pieces control f5 using white pieces as hurdles. Those controls are cyclically deactivated in B1, B2, and W3 using a fantastic system of lines. The three white hurdles can all reach e5 (to act as hurdles for PAf5) and e3 (to act as hurdles for NAf1). The black thematic pieces can reach not only f5 but also f1 (to control NAf1), using black hurdles that can all reach f4 (to activate VAg3 to defend against the threat). So when one of the black hurdles goes to f4, White can move the corresponding white hurdle (for the thematic black piece to reach f5) to e3, forcing one of the remaining controllers of f5 to capture NAf1 (somewhat similar to the logic of the Jacobs theme, as the composer notes), allowing White to deactivate the last controller of f5 by moving its hurdle to e5. Both white and black economy are excellent; only VAb7 is purely technical. Note that VAf6 is not just a hurdle for VAh8 to guard e5/d4, but also mates in the threat (SWE) Very harmonious problem; each mate is made possible by three deactivated lines! (SUI)

5<sup>th</sup> Place (9,6 points) G44: Anatoly Karamanits, Valery Kopyl, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko, Mikola Chernyavsky (Ukraine) 1.b3? [2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAa×c5 3.B×d5‡] 1...LEc3 2.B×d5+ VA×d5,LE×d5 3.S×d4‡ 1...LEb4 2.S×d4+ NA×d4,PA×d4 3.S×c5‡ but 1...NAhf1!

1.b4? [2.B×d5+ VA×d5,LE×d5 3.S×d4‡] 1...LEb3 2.S×d4+ NA×d4,PA×d4 3.S×c5‡ 1...LEc3 2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAa×c5 3.B×d5‡ but 1...LEa7!

1.NAc3! [2.S×d4+ NA×d4,PA×d4 3.S×c5‡] 1...LEb4 2.S×c5+ PAc×c5,PAa×c5 3.B×d5‡ 1...LEb3 2.B×d5+ VA×d5,LE×d5 3.S×d4‡ 1...VAd7 2.Re8+ LE×e8 3.Sd8‡

Carousel change, triple le Grand (three-move interpretation). Cycle of mating and second moves. The threats and variations are thematic (Country) The black Leoc4 is a hurdle for 3 black lines guarding c5/d5/d4. These 3 squares are also guarded by 3 other black lines which get deactivated on White's 2<sup>nd</sup> move. The tries and the key each deactivate a line behind the Leoc4. The Leo moves to two other squares, reactivating the line but also deactivating one of the other lines. All this results in a 3-phase complex showing the carousel pattern, a white move cycle and a triple le Grand. See G52 for a slightly different mechanism which achieves the same content (IND) The whole play is centered around bLEc4 moves and the departure effects of W2. The technical key played by the initially outof-play NAg5 is tolerable (ROU) The carousel change with 3 × le Grand included is engineered by white keys to thematic lines and leo moves in the square b3-c3-c4-b4, switching lines on and off (SVK) A very similar mechanism to G52, resulting in the same impressive patterns of carousel changes, 3 × le Grand and 3 × cycle of W2-W3. Like G52, it uses double guards of mating squares, with one set of guards using the mating white pieces as hurdles. The difference here is that the thematic bLE already stands on the intersection of three thematic black lines, so in each phase White deactivates a thematic line by interference, and Black re-activates it by line-opening (in G52 we have deactivation by removal of hurdle and activation by provision of hurdle). It is nice to have an apparent refutation also in the solution, but White has a fine continuation for 1...VAd7. The structure with the bLE having only two moves available in each phase leads to a more crowded position than G52 (SWE) Impressive Carousel. It's a pity that only the mass of the wNAg5 is used (SUI)

6<sup>th</sup> Place (9,2 points) G27: Marcel Tribowski (Germany) 1.K×f5? [2.PAb7‡] 1...PAf3+ 2.K×f4 [3.Sc7‡] NA×h8 3.PAb7,VAd7‡ but 1...NA×h8!

1.K×f4? [2.Sc7‡] but 1...NA×h8!

1.K×d3? [2.VAd7‡] but 1...NA×h8!

1.Ra6! [2.R×b6+ Ka5 3.NAe3‡] 1...VAe3 2.K×f5 [3.PAb7‡] NA×h8 3.Sc7‡ (2. K×d3/Kf4? VAc5/NA×h8!) 1...PAe3 2.K×f4 [3.Sc7‡] NA×h8 3.VAd7‡ (2.K×f5/Kd3? PAf3+/NA×h8!) 1...NAe3 2.K×d3 [3.VAd7‡] NA×h8 3.PAb7‡ (2.K×f4/Kf5? PAd5/NA×h8!) 1...PAe2 2.K×d3 [3.VAd7‡] Defences on the threat square (Umnov II effect). Ukrainian cycle (Country) Cyclic le Grand. Black's 1<sup>st</sup> move removes a Chinese line-piece. The wK captures another, threatening mate. Black's 2<sup>nd</sup> move opens the same Chinese line (inherent Chinese line threat paradox). But it also deactivates a 2<sup>nd</sup> line to a mating square already unguarded by Black's 1<sup>st</sup> move. Triple avoidance on W2 (IND) The cyclic le Grand theme is presented in a highly unified form. The active white king is a very original feature. Simply the best problem of the tournament! (ROU) Three defences on the same square introduce Ukrainian cycle with cyclic dual avoidance (SVK) An original mechanism with doubled fairy pieces guarding the mating squares b7/c7/d7 via NAd6, where the wK can attack by capturing the front piece of each pair. In the diagram position, those attacks are defended by NAd6 moving away (capturing its pinner); when Black un-doubles the defenders of one mate, that mate follows if NAd6 moves away, so a wK attack of any of the other two doubled defenders should work. The continuations are separated by dual avoidance effects (1...VAe3 2.Kxd3? VAc5!, 1...PAe3 2.Kxf5? PAf3!, 1...NAe3 2.Kxf4? PAd5!), so the result is a cyclc le Grand (=Ukrainian cycle). There is great unity in that all B1 defences go to e3 (the fact that these are Umnov II defences has no great importance, as such defences are trivial with Chinese pieces) (SWE)



7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points) G42: Michel Caillaud (France)

- 1.Rg2! [2.Rg1+ K×e2,Kf2 3.Q×e1‡]
- 1...NAhd1 2.PAcf4+ NA×f4 3.NAd5‡
- 1...PAd1 2.NAd5+ VA×d5 3.VAd3‡
- 1...NAbd1 2.VAd3+ PA×d3 3.PAcf4‡

Cycle of W2/W3 moves. B1 moves on the same square. 6 thematic black lines, 3 of them deactivated by Black at 1<sup>st</sup> move allowing a "non-activation" by White at 2<sup>nd</sup> move (Country) White move cycle in 3 variations. Each black move is an anticipatory deactivation of a line that would have been used after White's 2<sup>nd</sup> move. White's 2<sup>nd</sup> move, in turn, deactivates another black line. Totally 6 different black lines get deactivated (IND) Another clever mechanism based on departure effects. The wonderful economy fully compensates the underused wQ in the thematic variations (ROU) An unusual form of the stipulated theme: the thematic mates are originally only singly guarded, with one of White's mating pieces as a hurdle. If White tries to deactivate one of those guards by an evacuation sacrifice of a hurdle, a line from another black defender is activated with the piece that accepted the sacrifice as a hurdle. So the key induces one of those secondary defenders to give up its position, deactivating its line of guard. This all leads to a cycle of W2-W3 moves in three variations, with all three B1 moves going to the same square d1. The setting is very economical for the content (SWE)

7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points) G50: Dragan Stojni**ć** (Serbia) 1...VA×h5 2.VAd6+ PAe7 3.LEb1‡ 1...PA×h5 2.VAc7+ VAe7 3.Sf2‡

1.LEe7! [2.Bg6+ h×g6 3.LEh7‡] 1...VA×h5 2.VAc7+ PA×e7 3.LEb1‡ (2.LEb1+? PA×b1! 3.VAc7+? Kd3!) 1...PA×h5 2.VAd6+ VA×e7 3.Sf2‡ (2.Sf2+? VA×f2+! 3.VAd6+??) 1...Bc7 2.LEc4+ d×c4 3.LE×b7‡

Departure from the lines e2-d3, b7-b1, h2-f2, c5-f2. Reciprocally changed continuations; Black thematic defences on the same square in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> move (Country) The mating squares on f2 and b1 are doubly guarded by the black VAc5/PAh2 and PAb7/VAe2. After the PAh2 and VAe2 capture on h5, White has to fire the battery e8-e4 and force Black to remove the remaining guard by the VAc5/PAb7. In the set play, he does this by shutting off the black Chinese rider which does not unguard. After the key by the Leo to e7, he does this by forcing the Chinese rider which does unguard to capture on e7. This results in a reciprocal change of continuations (IND) Two changed variations from set to real play, followed by the same mates. But all this play is highly thematic, with the short key aesthetically changing everything (ROU) Reciprocal change using the basic feature of Chinese pieces: a capture needs a hurdle, a non-capture does not. When B1 deactivates one guard of f2 or b1-e4 (by withdrawal), White needs to deactivate the other guard of that square, so he must force VAc5 or PAb7 to go to e7 by the appropriate placing of the firing piece VAe5. Which of d6 and c7 is correct depends on whether the wLE is sitting on e7 or not (2.VAf4+? Be5! leaves only those two squares to choose between). It is unfortunate that VAa6 was needed for the by-variation 1...Bc7 (SWE) Good reciprocal change. The thematic line e2-d3 is orthodox (SUI)

7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Place (8,8 points, not counting for the country) G15: Jean-Marc Loustau, Michel Caillaud (France) 1.Re6! [2.Q×g2+ PA×g2 3.Sf4‡] 1...NA×a1 2.Ree3 [3.Sg1‡] c4/S~ 3.R×g3/S(×)f4‡ 1...PA×a1 2.Re4 [3.R×g3‡] c4 3.Sg5‡ 1...NA×d8 2.Re5 [3.Sg5‡] c4 3.Sg1‡

Cyclic le Grand (Ukrainian theme). 6 black thematic lines. The deactivation of thematic black lines occurs at 3 steps: 1<sup>st</sup> black move, 2<sup>nd</sup> white move, 2<sup>nd</sup> black move (so each variation shows three deactivations). No white pawns, all W2 moves by the same unit (Country) Cyclic le Grand. 6 Black lines. Black's 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> move each deactivates a black line. White's 2<sup>nd</sup> move deactivates 2 black lines. No white pawns (IND) The mechanism is ingenious with the bPc5 opening and closing three different black lines. However, the two unprovided black defences granting a flight by the capture of a white unit and the underused wQ prevent a higher classification (ROU) Inter-variation Ukrainian cycle in a rather known mechanism of switching Chinese lines that was utilized even for a complete Shedey cycle in twomover form (see e.g. Cyclone 1629) (SVK) Each of the three mating squares (g1, g3, g5) is doubly guarded, one guard via Pc5 and one via some other hurdle. B1 deactivates the guard of thematic square A by withdrawal; W2 deactivates the other guard of square A plus a guard of thematic square B by a Nowotny interference, threatening mate on A; B2 reactivates the guard of square A by playing c5-c4, but then deactivates the last guard of square B. The result is a cyclic le Grand (Ukrainian cycle). A clear mechanism with unity by three W2 moves by the same piece (that also played W1). The B1 defence motives are not unified (SWE) Cyclic le Grand nicely introduced by moves by the same rook (SUI)



10<sup>th</sup> Place (8,6 points) G54: Anatoly Karamanits, Valery Kopyl, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine) 1.BLh3? [2.BLcf5+ RLg5 3.S×d3‡] 1...Lld6 2.RL7f5+ RLg5 3.B×f6‡ 1...BLd5 2.RL2f5+ RLg5 3.S×f3‡ but 1...BLe4!

1.RLg6? [2.RL7f5+ RLg5 3.B×f6‡] 1...BLc6 2.RL2f5+ RLg5 3.S×f3‡ 1...RLd6 2.BLf5+ RLg5 3.S×d3‡ but 1...Lla1!

1.BLh1! [2.RL2f5+ RLg5 3.S×f3‡] 1...RLd5 2.BLf5+ RLg5 3.S×d3‡ 1...LIc6 2.RL7f5+ RLg5 3.B×f6‡

Cyclic activation and deactivation of lines of three black lion-family pieces (a6, a8, d8). Three-phase cycle of threats and second moves of variations. Cycle of defence squares. W2 moves to the same square. All threats and variations are thematic (Country) 3 mating squares are each guarded twice by black lions. White tries and key each deactivate one of the lines, threatening check on f5 on the 2<sup>nd</sup> move, simultaneously deactivating the 2<sup>nd</sup> black line to the mating square. Black defends by moving two of his other lions to the squares c6/d5/d6, which also unguard a 2<sup>nd</sup> mating square. This results in white checking on f5 with his lion which also deactivates the second guard to the mating square. All this results in a kind of "Pseudo 3×3 Shedey", with the 3 white moves to f5 occurring as a threat and as variations after a different pair of black defences in each phase (IND) Another ambitious cyclic concept, which unfortunately is partially spoilt by the set unprovided flight-creating defence 1...BLe4 (ROU) No carousel change here, rather less usual theme Z-32-63 with threat antiparadoxes. The second moves to f5 remove additional guards from square insufficiently guarded when dust settles after line switching of keys and defences (SVK) The three mating squares are each guarded by two black lion pieces, one via a white hurdle that can also reach f5, one with another white piece as hurdle. The latter three lines intersect on the triangle c6-d5-d6. W1 deactivates one of those lines (by moving on the line across a black hurdle on the mating square), threatening to

deactivate the other guard of the mating square by moving the corresponding to f5 with check. Black can re-activate the guard that W1 deactivated by moving one of the other two thematic lions onto the line (in the triangle c6-d5-d6) as a hurdle. But then it loses its guard of one mating square, which White can use by deactivating the other guard of that square by moving the corresponding hurdle to f5. The process is somewhat similar to G52, but this simpler setting lacks the le Grand motifs and the cycles of W2+W3 moves. If, however, you just consider the defence squares in B1 (so you regard LId6 and RLd6 as the same, etc.), this would be seen to show carousel changes and 3 × le Grand like in G52. The refutations of the tries break the sense of automatic play, and it is an advantage that the longest W1 move is the key. The position seems relatively open despite the 28 pieces (SWE) Similar to a Carousel, but the black defenses are different between the phases (SUI)

11<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) G22: Narayan Shankar Ram (India)

1.Sc3+? LI×c3! 2.Sf6+/Bc6+? LI×f6/RL×c6!

1.Sf6+? LI×f6! 2.Bc6+/Sc3+? RL×c6/LI×c3!

1.Bc6+? LI×c6! 2.Sc3+/Sf6+? RL×c3/RL×f6!

1.Bg3? Llh3+!, 1.Bf4? [2.Sf6‡] g×f4!

1.Bh2! waiting

1...Lla5,Lla4 2.Sc3+ Ll×c3 3.Sf6‡ (3.Bc6+? RL×c6!) [a1-f6 and f3-f6 deactivated]

1...RLhh1 2.Sf6+ LI×f6 3.Bc6‡ (3.Sc3+? LI×c3!) [h6-c6 and f3-c6 deactivated]

1...RLg8,RLf8 2.Bc6+ LI×c6 3.Sc3‡ (3.Sf6+? RL×f6!) [c8-c3 and f3-c3 deactivated]

1...RLch1 2.Sc3+ LI×c3 3.Bc6‡ (3.Sf6+? LI×f6!) [c1-c6 and f3-c6 deactivated]

1...RLa2 2.Bc6+ LI×c6 3.Sf6‡ (3.Sc3+? RL×c3!) [a6-f6 and f3-f6 deactivated]

1...LId8 2.Sf6+ LI×f6 3.Sc3‡ (3.Bc6+? RL×c6!) [h8-c3 and f3-c3 deactivated]

1...g4 2.Bf4 [3.Sf6‡] Llc6/Llc3/BLe6/Sb6 3.B×c6/S×c3/B×e6/Sc7‡

A total of 9 thematic lines are deactivated in the 6 thematic variations after the key: f3-c3, f3-f6 and f3-c6 all twice; a1-f6, a6-f6, c1-c6, c8-c3, h6-c6 and h8-c3. Thematic W1 and W2 move tries. Doubled and reversed cycle of W2 and W3 moves. Cyclic dual avoidance in White's mating move (Country) Another successful waiter aiming for a task rendering (doubled and reversed cycle of W2 and W3 moves). However, the strong unprovided defence 1...Sc7 makes the key piece rather obvious and the play is somewhat mechanical and repetitive (ROU) Triangular mechanism of lines with pairs of lions is supplemented by Llf3 guarding all three thematic squares. The symmetry is quite apparent (SVK) The thematic mates on c3-c6-f6 are only singly guarded by Llf3 in the diagram, but any attempt to use the overload of the lion fails because a check on any of the three squares will create a hurdle for new guards of the two other thematic squares. The solution works by simply inducing one of these new defenders away by Zugzwang, after which successive checks on two of the thematic squares will automatically work. This conforms to the set theme: one potential guard of the mating square is fairly mechanical, but the position is nice and airy (SWE) Reversed cycles presented economically and with a beautiful mechanism (SUI)

12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points) G20: Dragan Stojni**ć** (Serbia) 1.S×d7! [2.f7+ K×e7 3.f8=Q‡] 1...R×h4 2.Sc5 [3.LEb4‡] PAd3/VAd3,VAc4/VA×c5/PA×b6,PAb4/S×f4 3.e8=S/Bc6/VAg3/Sc4/B×f4‡ (2.LEb4? S×f4!) 1...S×h4 2.LEb4 [3.Sc5‡] PAd3/VAd3 3.Bc6/e8=S‡ (2.Sc5? VA×c5!) 1...VAc4 2.e8=S+ PA×e8 3.Bc6‡

Thematic lines: b5-e8, d3-e8, b3-b6, f2-b6. Key-threat reversal (or Reversal II) and reciprocal changes in the two main variations (Country) After Black loses control of g3 and f4, White threatens mate on b4 and c5, while also deactivating black lines to e8 and b6. Black defends by unpinning Vaod2, while also deactivating further lines to e8 and b6. A third thematic variation deactivates both lines on B1 and B2 moves with the thematic mates reappearing as check and mate. W2/W3-threat/key reversal and reciprocal change on 2<sup>nd</sup> move. Heavy (IND) An extended twomover with a wealth of mates. The

rather heavy position requires lots of white pieces used just for one mating move (ROU) Papack combination of key-threat reversal & reciprocal change between two main variations. 17 white pieces seem too many for the main content (SVK) Interesting mechanism for reciprocal change in the variations: e8 and b6 are each doubly guarded, over a white hurdle and over a black one. The W2 moves deactivate a guard of one thematic mate by removal of a white hurdle, and a guard of the other thematic mate by interference. The B2 defences (unpinning VAd2) then exchange their functions, deactivating the second guard of the first mate by withdrawal, or deactivating the second guard of the other thematic mate by removal of a hurdle. To motivate and separate the two B1 variations, Bh2 and VAe1 had to be added outside of the thematic play. So the position is heavy, but the play works well (SWE)

12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place G08 Anatoly Karamanits Valery Kopyl Aleksandr Semenenko Valery Semenenko Ukraine

14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place G38 Zoran Gavrilovski North Macedonia 14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place G51 Dragan Stojni**ć** Marjan Kova**č**evi**ć** Serbia



12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points, not counting for the country) G08: Anatoly Karamanits, Valery Kopyl, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine) 1.B×d5? [2.Bc4+ LE×b4,VA×b4 3.B×c5‡] 1...LE×b4 2.Bc6+ VA×b8/NA×b8 3.Be4/Bf3‡ 1...NA×b4 2.Be4+ LE×f4/VA×f4 3.Bf3/Bc6‡ 1...VA×b4 2.Bf3+ NA×h2/LE×h2 3.Bc6/Be4‡ but 1...LEf8!

1.LE×d5? [2.LEc4+ LE×b4,VA×b4 3.B×c5‡] 1...LE×b4 2.LEc6+ VA×b8/NA×b8 3.LEe4/LEf3‡ 1...NA×b4 2.LEe4+ LE×f4/VA×f4 3.LEf3/LEc6‡ 1...VA×b4 2.LEf3+ NA×h2/LE×h2 3.LEc6/LEe4‡ but 1...PAe6!

1.VA×d5! [2.VAc4+ LE×b4,VA×b4 3.B×c5‡] 1...LE×b4 2.VAc6+ VA×b8/NA×b8 3.VAe4/VAf3‡ 1...NA×b4 2.VAe4+ LE×f4/VA×f4 3.VAf3/VAc6‡ 1...VA×b4 2.VAf3+ NA×h2/LE×h2 3.VAc6/VAe4‡ Zagoruiko 3×3. Each phase presents a cycle of second and mating moves (a total of 3 cycles). Moves to same square by White and by Black. Change of types of pieces making moves to same squares. Task: 18 thematic variations (Country) The Jacobs theme is shown in 3 phases with changed continuations. The wB/VA/LE capture on d5, threatening check on c4. After the black thematic defences on b4, they check on e4, c6 and f3. Task, but obvious mechanism (IND) The author claims a 3×3 Zagoruiko, but actually the play is identical in all phases regardless the identity of the piece arriving on d5. This degrades the claim of "18 thematic variations" (ROU) 3 × Jacobs (in each phase the same play with different hurdle), Z-33-39 between phases, this is quite a considerable achievement. Unfortunately, the role of Bq8 in the solution is only passive (it prevents 1...LEf8!) (SVK) Several composers noted that the well-known Jacobs theme (or rather Jacobs mechanism) fits the set theme, as the normal form is built on three doubly guarded mating squares. Here the mating squares are the anti-battery rear pieces on b8, f4, h2, which are each guarded by two of the three pieces LEd2, VAd6, NAf6. The basic Jacobs mechanism itself is not of great interest anymore, but there is perfect unity here in the use of anti-batteries throughout, in threat and variations, all played by the same piece from d5. The 3×3 Zagoruiko does not impress, however: the play in all phases is exactly the same, the only difference is which bishop-type piece has captured on d5 and makes all the moves. The heavy position is justified by the play (SWE) There is not much change in these Zagoruiko changes (SUI)

14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) G38: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) 1.e×f6? [2.Rc6+ G×c6 3.Sge6‡] but 1...Gg4!

1.Rb6! [2.Sa6+ K×d5 3.Rd6‡] 1...RHa1 2.Rc6+ G×c6 3.Sge6‡ (2.e×f6? Gg4!, 2.d6? Gd5!) 1...Ga2 2.Sge6+ G×e6 3.Rc6‡ (2.e×f6? RHe5!, 2.d6? Ge6!) 1...Gh1 2.d6 [3.Rc6‡] RHe6 3.Sg×e6‡ (2.e×f6? Gg4!) 1...Gb4 2.e×f6 [3.Sge6‡] Gg4 3.Rc6‡ (2.d6? G×b6!) 1...Ge6 2.d×e6 [3.Rc6‡]

1...Gc6 2.b×c6 [3.Rb5‡] (2.e×f6? Gc8!)

Fivefold presentation of the theme, including two pairs of reciprocal deactivations of the lines e1-e6 and g2-c6: a) double dual avoidance with exchanged W2 and W3 moves after 1...RHa1/Ga2; b) pseudo-le Grand and reciprocal dual avoidance after 1...Gh1/Gb4. 12 moves on 6 squares on the 6<sup>th</sup> row (a6-f6) by 6 white units (W1, W2 and W3 moves in the threat; W2 moves in 6 variations) and 2 black units (Ge4 on e6 and c6, RHe1 on e6). 7 W2 moves on the 6<sup>th</sup> row (with double play on c6 or e6 in 4 variations). Play by Black and White on the same squares (e6 and c6). Change of functions of 4 moves and 2 × 2 transfer of mates. Swiss theme and time-shifted Dombrovskis (Country) 4 thematic variations involving 2 mates and 4 black lines. There is an additional fifth thematic variation (IND) Nice mix of quiet variations played by the white pawns and reciprocal moves. But the en prise key piece is clearly a flaw (ROU) The mating squares c6 and e6 are doubly guarded by two hoppers on the same line, with the same front piece (Ge4). In two variations, the rear piece withdraws so that the overload of the front piece can be used. In two other variations the front piece withdraws so that White can activate a thematic mate by removing a white hurdle. The differentiation of the variations is not quite analogous: 1...Gh1 stays on the thematic line and makes no error allowing 2.e×f6, so only 2.d6 works; 1...Gb4 leaves both lines and thereby allows both 2.d6 and 2.e×f6, but the dual avoidance effect 2.d6? G×b6! leaves only 2.e×f6. In the fifth variation 1...Ge6, B1 makes a new error allowing a new continuation 2.d×e6. The mechanism with the three black hoppers is fine, but would have been even better if the two moves of Ge4 had been separated by true dual avoidance (SWE)

14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points, not counting) G51: Dragan Stojnić, Marjan Kovačević (Serbia) 1.Rf2! [2.NAe7 [3.B×e5‡] PA6~ 3.Sd5‡] (2.Rf7? [3.Sd5‡] but 2...VAb3! 2.Sd7? [3.R×f5‡] PA6~ 3.B×e5‡ but 2...PA6e7!) 1...VAc6 2.Rf7 [3.Sd5‡] PA6~/PAf6 3.R×f5/B×e5‡ (2.NAe7? [3.B×e5‡] PA6~ 3.Sd5‡ but 2...PA×b6!) 1...PA8e7 2.Sd7 [3.R×f5‡] PA6~ 3.B×e5‡ 1...VAb3 2.S×c8 [3.R×f5‡] 1...Se2 2.R×e2 [3.Q×e3‡]

Deactivation/neutralization and activation of thematic lines f3-d5, e3-e5, f3-f5, e8-e5, g8-d5, c8-f5. Cyclic le Grand + pseudo-le Grand. 5 thematic black pieces, 3 different corrections by the thematic PAe6 (Country) The black Paoe6 is a hurdle to 3 other Chinese riders guarding d5/e5/f5. In the threat and two thematic variations, a white piece closes one of the 3 black Chinese lines. Black defends by moving away the Paoe6, which unguards the remaining two mating squares. But only one of the mates works due to W2 having prevented the other mate (IND) The thematic intensity deserves admiration. But the key, pinning two black pieces, is much too strong (ROU) Visserman form of the Ukrainian cycle involves threat and variations after 1...VAc6 and 1...PA8e7. The key is unfortunate, pinning two Chinese pieces, even if it is thematic deactivation of three lines (SVK) An interesting mechanism for a cyclic le Grand (Ukrainian cycle) with PA6~ (actually PAd6) as the thematic defence. The mating squares d5/e5/f5 are all guarded via PAe6; the three thematic W2 moves interfere on one of those lines while giving up a white guard needed for another thematic mate. The result is that White threatens just one thematic mate, and that PA6~ defends by using the W1 piece as a hurdle, but that this move allows one of the thematic mates. Which white attack works depends in two cases on better defences by PAe6 and in the third case on a defence by another black piece (VAa4-b3). So the B1 defences and the separation of the W2 moves are not unified, but the cantral part of this cyclic le Grand mechanism is perfectly unified. A big disadvantage of the setting is that the mechanism really deals only with single deactivations of black thematic lines. To make the problem thematic for the tourney, the composer has added a key with simultaneous deactivation of three other lines towards the mating squares by pinning of two black pieces, without any further connection to the thematic play (SWE)

14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place G19 Franz Pachl Germany 17<sup>th</sup> Place G31 Zoran Gavrilovski North Macedonia 18<sup>th</sup> Place G30 Thomas Maeder Switzerland



14<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) G19: Franz Pachl (Germany) 1.PAf3? [2.Se5‡] but 1...Re6!

1.VAf3? [2.R×c5‡] but 1...Rc6!

1.Bc2! [2.Bb3+ a×b3 3.a×b3‡] 1...NAh6 2.PAf3 [3.Se5‡] Re6/NA×e7 3.PAf4/R×c5‡ 1...PA×c2 2.VAf3 [3.R×c5‡] Rc6 3.VAe2‡

2 × thematic white removal of hurdle. 4 × thematic black removal of hurdle. 1 × thematic black removal of the line piece along the thematic line. 2 × W2 moves on the same square. 2 × thematic tries in two moves. Reciprocal change of functions of PA/VA (front and rear piece of an anti-battery) (Country) Logical problem in which the black refutations to two thematic tries have weakening effect after the key and two other B1 move defences which deactivate two Chinese rider lines. There is also dual avoidance on White's second move. Also seen is a mutual anti-battery between the white PAd3/VAe4 (IND) Only two variations, but displaying a surprising extra theme: reciprocal antibattery mates by wPAd3 and wVAe4! We would have loved to see the mate 3.Se5‡ transferred as mate in the last variation (ROU) Black's guards of f4 and e2 are deactivated by removal of black hurdles in B1 and B2. The motif is greatly enhanced by the reciprocal functions of PAd3 and VAe4, using each other as hurdles for the thematic mates, and by the fact that the threats in W2 are also set up by removal of a (white) hurdle. The logical structure (the W2 attacks can be tried immediately, but fail because the B1 decoys haven't been played yet) is also an advantage. It is unfortunate that so much material was needed (SWE)

17<sup>th</sup> Place (7,6 points) G31: Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia)

- 1.Qf5! [2.Q×d3+ RH×d3/Q×d3 3.Se2/Sb5‡]
- 1...Gg2 2.RHd7+ Sf×d7/Sb×d7 3.Se6/Sc6‡
- 1...RH×e5 2.Se2+ (2.Se6+?) RH×e2,d×e2 3.Q(×)e5‡
- 1...G×e5 2.Sb5+ Q×b5 3.Q×e5‡
- 1...BHe4 2.Se6+ (2.Se2+?) S×e6 3.Q×e4‡
- 1...RHe4 2.Sc6+ S×c6 3.Q×e4‡

Two pairs of reciprocal deactivations of lines of the black fairy pieces: I) a5-e5 and g3-e5 after 1...RH×e5/G×e5; II) a8-e4 and h4-e4 after 1...BHe4/RHe4. Three pairs of variations with thematically connected white play: I) double sacrifice in the threat and after 1...Gq2; II) removal of the white hurdle from f4 on the W2 move with reciprocal dual avoidance after 1...RH×e5/BHe4; III) adding an extra hurdle on b5 or c6 on the W2 move after 1...G×e5/RHe4. Change of functions of 4 white moves which are W3 moves in the threat and after 1...Gg2, and also W2 moves in the thematic variations. Transfer of mates after different B2 moves in the thematic variations (Country) Four variations in two pairs in which hopper lines to e4 and e5 are deactivated on B1/W2 moves. The threat and the variation 1...Gg2 are not thematic, although they use the thematic white moves (IND) The white knight moves make this composition so enjoyable. The somewhat out-of-play wQ needs to take immediate measure against the strong unprovided 1...G×e3 creating a flight (ROU) Two variations with double deactivations of guards of e5, with B1 moves to the mating square followed by sacrifice of a white hurdle or sacrificial interference of the other guard; plus two analogous variations regarding e4. The four variations can also be paired RH×e5/BHe4, with dual-avoiding sacrifices of Sf4 in W2, and G×e5/RHe4 with sacrificial interferences in W2. The four thematic variations, plus a good threat and a good by-variation, are a good result (SWE)

18<sup>th</sup> Place (7,5 points) G30: Thomas Maeder (Switzerland) 1.f6! [2.Ke2+ NLc3/RL×g1 3.Rb3/RLh4‡] 1...RLg6 2.Rb3+ BLc2/NL×d1 3.RLh4/Ke2‡ 1...RLf5 2.RLh4+ RLg4/BLe4 3.Ke2/Rb3‡

Jacobs cycle (Country) The only entry showing Jacobs theme in rotating form! The RLb5 helps NLa7 to guard c3/d1, preventing the mates Rb3/Ke2. The RLg8 guards g4/g1, preventing the mates RLh4/Ke2. The threat is Ke2+ followed by RLh4/Rb3. After 1...RLf5, the BLh7 guards e4/c2 preventing RLh4/Rb3, but now the NL has lost control of c3 and d1, allowing RLh4+ followed by Rb3/Ke2. Similarly, after 1...RLg6, the BLh7 guards e4/c2, but the RLg8 has lost control of g4/g1, allowing Rb3+, followed by RLh4/Ke2 (IND) The most economic rendering of the Jacobs theme from the whole tournament. The thematic key makes a very strong impression (ROU) A standard Jacobs cycle with three mates of the anti-battery type (although 3.RLh4‡ is not really an anti-battery as the hurdle is already on the line). One of the thematic variations is the threat, which is introduced by deactivation of a thematic line from BLh7 (SWE)



19<sup>th</sup> Place (7,4 points) G02: Hans Uitenbroek, Gerard Smits (Netherlands) 1.d4! [2.Sh8 [3.Sf7‡]] 1...Lle8 2.Ba4 [3.Sf5‡] RLe6 3.S×e8‡ (2.Sh8? Lla4+!)

1...Llf5 2.Ra5 [3.Se8‡] BLe6 3.S×f5‡ (2.Sh8? Lla5+!)

1...RLe7 2.S×e7 [3.S×c8,Rd5‡]

Lines to e8: Lion b5-e8 and Rook-Lion e2-e8. Lines to f5: Lion b5-f5 and Bishop-Lion c8-f5. Pseudo le Grand (Country) Two thematic variations. After the quiet threat, the black lion moves to e8/f5 threatening check on the a-file. White continues by moving the wB/R to the a-file, preventing the checks and threatening mate on f5/e8. Black replies with a BL/RL "anti-Grimshaw" on e6, leading to mates on e8/f5. Pseudo le Grand with nice diagonal-orthogonal correspondence (IND) Crystal-clear thematic play: this problem could serve as a very didactic example of the set theme. The quiet threat can be parried by a checking move at B2, hence the main variations 1...Lle8 2.Ba4 and 1...Llf5 2.Ra5. Rather simple and marred by out-of-play key piece and underused white fairy piece (ROU) A problem with limited content (two thematic mates that both occur pseudo-le-Grand style in two variations) but with high quality in every detail. Good economy, quiet threat, good defences, analogous continuations, analogous B2 defences on e6 (it's not a Grimshaw) (SWE)

20<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points, not counting for the country) G16: Franz Pachl, Manfred Rittirsch (Germany) 1.VAg8! [2.S×f5+ PA×f5 3.VAgd5‡]

1...NAq4 2.NAbd5+ VA×d6 3.Q×c3‡

1...PAq4 2.NAfd5+ LE×d6 3.Be5‡

1...VAg4 2.VAd5+ PA×d6 3.Sb5‡

3 × thematic white removal of hurdle with harmful opening of fairy lines. 2 × thematic black removal of the line-piece. 1 × thematic black removal of hurdle. 3 × W2 moves on the same square. 3 × B1 moves on the same square. 3 × B2 moves on the same square (Country) In order to defend against the anti-battery mate on d5, three black pieces move to g4 to activate the black Leoh3; at the same time, they deactivate another line unguarding a mating square. W2 moves on d5 fire the anti-battery d6-d4 and also deactive another black line to the square unguarded by the B1 move. Heavy (IND) The most populated board of the competition (37 pieces) deserves a special mention (ROU) The pattern of the thematic play is not very complex: B1 deactivates one guard of a thematic mate (by removal of a line-piece or of its hurdle) in order to activate h3-f5, which allows White to give an antibattery check removing the white hurdle for the other guard. Somewhat oddly, W2 would have been mate but for the activation of a black line towards d6 by removal of a white hurdle, an unthematic effect that nevertheless fits the theme here well. The great disadvantage is that all these lines have required a colossal amount of material, 37 units! (SWE) Three rich variations, but extremely heavy realization, mainly because each piece only fulfills one particular task (SUI)

#### 21<sup>st</sup> Place

G13 (6,6 points): Hans Uitenbroek (Netherlands) Lines to c6: Pao c4-c6 and Nao g8-c6. Lines to c7: Pao c4-c7 and Nao g5-c7. Lines to f4: Pao c4-f4 and Vao h2-f4. Lines to d3: Pao d1-d3 and Vao b1-d3. Lines to d4: Pao d1-d4 and Vao h8-d4 (Country) 5 thematic variations using 7 black Chinese riders and 10 lines. Black Pao vs. white Q duel in four variations. Short threat. Dual avoidance in pao-a4/b4. Random and correction in Pao-c1/c2 (IND) Five mates with two deactivations each; a good result. The best ones are the four variations where the wQ forces the hurdle for the second defender away in W2. Prettiest of all are the variations 1...PAa4/PAb4 with unguard of c6+c7 and dual avoidance by new guards from the pao. Next best is 1...PAc2 where B1 withdraws one of the guards. 1...PAc1,c3 deviates as already W1 deactivates one guard by removal of a white hurdle. 1...NAf6 is different but also good. (1...VAf6 is a by-variation.) The problem is reasonably homogenous even though most variations are not quite analogous. But the short threat and the heavy position are drawbacks (SWE)

22<sup>nd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup> Place

- G18 (6,2 points): Mikael Grönroos (Finland) 17 fairy pieces, all of them thematically active, 21 thematic mates with 2-5 thematic elements, dual-free, no cook-stoppers (Country) Triple and double pin-mates from the a-file third-pin, 8<sup>th</sup> rank battery/pin-line and a8-h1 check/pin-line. There are 3 mates after the threat from the 8<sup>th</sup> rank battery with pinned lions on the a-file(2) and a8-h1(1) diagonal, and 3 mates in the variations from the a8-h1 line with pinned lions on the a-file and 8<sup>th</sup> rank. A few thematic by-play variations are also present, in which the thematic white continuations and mates are repeated (IND) Too many thematic mates obscure the author's intention (ROU) A maze of variations based on the half-double pin on the a-file and the four rook-lions on the first and second rank, guarding or potentially guarding mates on the eighth rank or on the long diagonal. Exactly how many different deactivations of guard there are is hard to calculate. The mechanism is basically simple (SWE)
- G26 (6,2 points, not counting for the country): Zoran Gavrilovski (North Macedonia) Triple deactivation of lines of black fairy pieces on B1 and W2 moves: 1) c7-f4 after 1...Rd6 and h6-f4 after 2.Sf3+; 2) a6-d3 after 1...Rdb5 and c1-d3 after 2.c3+; and 3) c7-c3 after 1...Rdc5 and e1-c3 after 2.R×d3+. Exchanged W2 and W3 moves and reciprocal dual avoidance after 1...Rdb5/Rdc5. Change of function of the move 2.Rf4 (W2 in the threat, W3 after 1...Rd6) (Country) Thematic black and white lines to c3, d3 and f4 are deactivated. Exchange of W2/W3 in one pair of variations. Serious dual after 1...G×e7 (IND) Three variations with interference in B1 followed by

removal of a white hurdle in W2. Great unity through the three moves by Rd5. There is a dual avoidance effect in 1...Rd6 (2.Se6+? allows Black to re-activate the guard of f4), but there is no real dual avoidance in 1...Rdb5 and 1...Rdc5 (there is no reason to try to force the mate that B1 has left untouched) (SWE)

G36 (6,2 points): Valerio Agostini, Gabriele Brunori (Italy) Cyclic Zilahi, cycle of W2/W3 moves, cycle of B1/B2 moves, exchange of W2/W3 moves, cycle of captures, Babushka, complete pseudo-Kiss theme. The theme is shown in all possible continuations (a total of 16 times: 4 times in set play; 6×2 times in solution). Change of W2 move between set play and solution after 1...Gf7. All pieces on the board (with the exception of pawns) have at least two different functions (Country) Jacobs theme with a set play variation (IND) Astonishing use of the fairy pieces specificity - probably one of the best in the tournament. However, the unprovided strong black defense 1...e×f6 giving a flight which is simply thwarted by the rather crude capturing key forbids a higher classification. A better key was possible (ROU) A standard Jacobs with the addition of a set variation 1...Gf7 allowing the pin 2.Gg8 with zugzwang. A bit heavy for the content (SWE)

#### 25<sup>th</sup>-26<sup>th</sup> Place

- G28 (6 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Three thematic lines with cyclic effect caused by transfer of P-hurdle (Country) The anti-battery h6-a6 is guarded by the three lion lines a1-f6, c2-g6, and h3-b6. On the first move, the black pawns deactivate 2 of these 3 lines. Then the wK fires the anti-battery, the remaining lion interposes and now there are two mates reactivating the anti-battery and a third mate activating an indirect anti-battery (IND) The sixth rank is guarded by three lions via Pd5-e5-f5. A P move in B1 deactivates two guards, one by removal of hurdle and one by interference, so White can activate an anti-battery on that rank and in two variations mate by capturing the third defender on that rank with the wK. The third variation 1...e4 is different, as the mate doesn't use rank 6 or any deactivation. But W2 does use the two deactivations in B1, leaving only the harmful 2...NAb6, so this variation too must be said to satisfy the theme (SWE)
- G39 (6 points): Narayan Shankar Ram (India) Four thematic variations. Correction play by Gh4. Thematic squares d4, d6 and f6. Cycle of W2 and W3 moves: A-B/C, B-C/A, C-A/B. Jacobs theme (Country) The best rendering using the Hoppers family. Although the mechanism is rather orthodox, the superb economy provides more than enough compensation (ROU) A standard Jacobs setting with three mates. The most interesting point is the variation 1...Gf2, which keeps the guards of d4+f6 but allows 2.K×f2 putting the other two thematic defenders in zugzwang (SWE)

27<sup>th</sup> Place

G33 (5,6 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) The threat creates a fairy-battery with two firing units (Country) Five thematic variations (IND) Using a royal anti-battery is not a bad idea, but the thematic content lacks homogeneity (ROU) There are three thematic mates, two of them (Ke5, Ke7) guarded by three black pieces, and one (Se5) by two pieces. These guards are all deactivated in different ways in four variations (only 1...BLe6 is unthematical). The fine threat has unexpected activity by the bK. All in all, a quite nice, very economical problem, but not strongly thematical (SWE) Only one thematic variation (SUI)

28<sup>th</sup> Place

G11 (5,2 points, not counting for the country): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) In the threat and two variations with reciprocal dual avoidance, both black Lions lose control of d1; or each Lion is decoyed from another line after closure of the bottom rank by Black (Country) Threat and two variations in each of which the 2 bishop-lions lose control of d1 so that the WQ can mate on that square. With cross-checks using the white anti-battery b5-e2 in both variations. Variations 1...Llg1 and 1...RLa2 are also arguably thematic (IND) The splendid check-provoking key is motivated by the lack of white continuation after the strong defense 1...Llg1 (ROU) The check-provoking key leads to two variations with deactivation of both guards of d1, one by a move to

the mating square and the other by Ke2-d2 which either removes a hurdle or puts an extra hurdle on the line (=interference). The variations are not separated by dual avoidance, as each continuation needs an extra error by Black making c2-c4 or Kc4 legal. The variation 1...Llg1 is also thematic, but repeats the move 2.Kc4+ and therefore doesn't add very much. There is good economy apart from the three NLs, who play a minor role (SWE)

29<sup>th</sup> Place

G53 (5,1 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland) The bP interferes with two lines on both c6 and c5, which are used by White for his 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> move (IND) Four variations, but lacking the unifying touch of better ranked compositions (ROU) Limited content requiring heavy material (SWE)

30<sup>th</sup> Place

G37 (4,8 points, not counting for the country): Kalyan Seetharaman (India) Four thematic variations (one after the try and three after the key). Changed continuations after 1...RLe3 in the try and after key. After key, Zabunov theme shown in threat and first two variations. All three post-key variations are thematic. Royal anti-battery with diagonal-orthogonal correspondence on lines e1-h4 and h1-h4. Check provoking key (Country) The two main variations 1...RLe3/f3 are quite similar, with no exchanges of functions (SWE)

31<sup>st</sup> Place

G21 (4 points): Gabriele Brunori (Italy) Thematic lines: h5-e8, h1-b1, g6-b1, e1-e8. Exchange of W2/W3 moves. Zilahi (Country) Short threat, two variations, diagonal-orthogonal echo (IND) The mating squares e8 and b1 are both guarded by both LIg6 and RLe1. The thematic defences give up the two guards by one of these pieces, but still allow only one continuation as Black's pieces also close the lines to the mating squares in the diagram position. Very clear and economical, but the short threat detracts (SWE)

32<sup>nd</sup>-33<sup>rd</sup> Place

- G35 (3,6 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Two thematic variations after interferences by the bS (IND) 1...Sf5 is clearly thematical, with W3 using deactivations in both B1 and B2. The variation 1...Se6 is different, with one deactivation used in W2 and another one used in W3. The way the theme is worded, this must be accepted, but the harmony of the problem suffers (SWE) Only one thematic variation (SUI)
- G40 (3,6 points, not counting for the country): Anton Baumann (Switzerland) Three thematic variations involving the two black lions. Short threat. Repeated W2 move in two variations (IND) 1...Ll1×f5 and 1...Ll5×f5 with self-pin look like a nice pair of variations with de-activation of guards of c6-h1 and e7-h1, but in fact only the fine 1...Ll5×f5 variation and the supplementary variation 1...Lle2 are thematic here. Unfortunately, a short threat (SWE)

34th-35th Place

- G17 (3,4 points): Gábor Tar (Hungary) Thematic lines: h3-b6, g1-b6, b2-d6, a3-d6 (Country) Two thematic variations. Short threat (IND)
- G25 (3,4 points): Rauf Aliovsadzade, Mark Kirtley (United States) Grimshaw (Country) Logical problem with Grimshaw d4 with thematic tries, pseudo le Grand and ODT. R and B hoppers used as plugs on c1 and h1. Use of B-hoppers on b7/c7 also doubtful (IND) Loved the author's good humour and originality! Yes, it is also a pseudo le Grand incorporated here beside the Grimshaw, which makes this look so appealing (ROU) Not thematic (SUI)

36<sup>th</sup> Place

• G23 (2,8 points): Gábor Tar (Hungary) Thematic lines: b1-e4, h1-e4, a7-c5, b1-b5 (Country) Short threat, two variations (IND)

37<sup>th</sup> Place

• G14 (2,7 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Thematic threat and two thematic variations with repeated W2 moves (IND)

38<sup>th</sup> Place

• G09 (2,6 points): Miguel Uris (Spain) Only a single thematic variation after 1...Rc6 (IND) Only one thematic variation (SUI)

39<sup>th</sup>-41<sup>st</sup> Place

- G12 (2,4 points, not counting): Gabriele Brunori, Antonio Garofalo, Daniele Gatti (Italy) Thematic lines: f1-f6, f3-a3, f4-a4. Exchange of W2/W3 moves (Country) Two thematic variations involving double unguard of f5 in both try and key, plus deactivation of f3-b3 and f4-a4 after key (IND)
- G24 (2,4 points, not counting for the country): Miguel Uris (Spain) 2 thematic variations (IND) Two W2 moves appear as mates (W3) in the last variation. The out-of-play key piece hinders a higher classification (ROU) Not thematic (SUI)
- G45 (2,4 points): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Only one thematic variation: 3 lines are deactivated by key/B1/W2 (IND) Only one thematic variation (SUI)

42<sup>nd</sup> Place

• G32 (1,2 points, not counting for the country): Indrek Aunver (Sweden) Only one thematic variation (IND) Not thematic (SUI)

Place	Country	No	IND	ROU	SUI	SVK	SWE	Total
1	SVK	G47	4,0	3,2	4,0		4,0	12,0
2-3	SVK	G52	3,6	3,2	2,0		3,8	10,2
2-3	SVK	G07	3,8	2,6	3,0		3,8	10,2
4	FRA	G06	3,4	3,4	3,0	2,4	3,8	9,8
5	UKR	G44	3,6	3,0	3,0	2,8	3,6	9,6
6	GER	G27	3,4	3,8	2,2	2,2	3,6	9,2
7-9	FRA	G42	3,2	3,0	2,6	2,0	3,4	8,8
7-9	SRB	G50	3,0	3,2	2,6	2,0	3,2	8,8
7-9	FRA	G15	3,2	2,8	2,8	2,2	3,6	8,8
10	UKR	G54	3,2	2,4	3,0	2,4	3,4	8,6
11	IND	G22		3,2	2,8	2,4	2,8	8,4
12-13	SRB	G20	3,0	2,8	2,2	2,4	3,2	8,2
12-13	UKR	G08	2,6	2,6	3,0	3,6	2,4	8,2
14-16	MKD	G38	2,8	2,8	2,6	1,6	2,4	7,8
14-16	SRB	G51	3,0	2,6	1,8	2,2	3,2	7,8
14-16	GER	G19	2,8	3,2	2,2	1,6	2,8	7,8
17	MKD	G31	2,8	2,8	2,0	1,6	3,2	7,6
18	SUI	G30	3,0	3,2		2,0	2,0	7,5
19	NED	G02	2,8	2,6	2,0	1,2	3,4	7,4
20	GER	G16	3,0	2,0	2,8	1,8	2,4	7,2

## Section G: Fairies

21	NED	G13	3,2	1,6	2,2	1,8	2,6	6,6
22-24	ITA	G36	2,4	3,0	2,0	1,8	1,4	6,2
22-24	FIN	G18	2,8	2,0	1,8	2,0	2,2	6,2
22-24	MKD	G26	2,4	1,8	2,0	1,4	3,0	6,2
25-26	IND	G39		3,4	2,2	1,8	1,6	6,0
25-26	GBR	G28	3,0	1,8	2,0	1,4	2,2	6,0
27	GBR	G33	2,6	2,2	1,0	1,0	2,4	5,6
28	GBR	G11	2,8	2,0	1,2	1,2	2,0	5,2
29	SUI	G53	2,0	2,4		1,2	1,4	5,1
30	IND	G37		1,6	1,6	1,8	1,6	4,8
31	ITA	G21	1,0	1,6	1,2	1,2	1,8	4,0
32-33	ESP	G35	1,8	1,0	1,0	0,8	1,6	3,6
32-33	SUI	G40	1,2	1,2		0,8	1,4	3,6
34-35	HUN	G17	0,8	1,8	1,2	1,0	1,2	3,4
34-35	USA	G25	2,0	2,4	0,0	0,6	0,8	3,4
36	HUN	G23	1,0	0,2	1,0	0,8	1,0	2,8
37	SWE	G14	1,0	0,8	0,8	1,0		2,7
38	ESP	G09	0,4	0,8	1,0	1,0	0,8	2,6
39-41	ESP	G24	0,8	2,0	0,0	0,6	1,0	2,4
39-41	ITA	G12	0,8	0,4	0,8	1,0	0,8	2,4
39-41	SWE	G45	0,6	0,8	0,8	0,8		2,4
42	SWE	G32	0,4	1,0	0,0	0,4		1,2
	ARM	G01	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
	POL	G03	0,0	2,4	0,0	1,8	3,0	0,0
	ARM	G29	0,6	1,6	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0
	USA	G41	0,0	2,4	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
	ARM	G46	0,6	2,4	0,0	0,4	0,0	0,0
	USA	G49	2,6	2,4	0,0	0,6	0,0	0,0

## SECTION H: RETROS

Judging countries: Argentina, France, Germany, Ukraine, United States

Theme (proposed by Ukraine):

Proofgames are required. Twins and multiple solutions are allowed.

Square A is the home square for an unpromoted piece X.

In the course of solution, the following elements occur at least once (in any order):

- 1. The original piece X and/or its original sibling is captured (King's Bishop and Queen's Bishop are not considered siblings).
- 2. A pawn of the same colour promotes to a piece of the same type as X. This promoted piece then visits square A (Pronkin effect). It is not required to stay on this square.

A pawn of the opposite colour promotes on square A. This promoted piece is later captured (Ceriani-Frolkin effect).



#### 1st Place (10,2 points) H75: Silvio Baier (Germany)

1.e4 f5 2.e5 Sf6 3.e×f6 e5 4.h4 e4 5.h5 e3 6.h6 e2 7.h×g7 h5 8.g8=Q h4 9.Qb3 h3 10.Qb6 a×b6 11.g4 Ra3 12.Bg2 Rc3 13.d×c3 h2 14.Bh6 f4 15.Kd2 e1=R 16.Sh3 Re5 17.Re1 h1=S 18.g5 Sg3 19.g6 Sf5 20.g7 Se7 21.g8=B Bg7 22.Bc4 d5 23.a4 0-0 24.a5 Kh8 25.a6 Sg8 26.a7 Qe7 27.a8=Q d×c4 28.Qa3 Ra5 29.Qc5 Ra8 30.Ra5 b×c5 Presentation with five thematic pieces, three Ceriani-Frolkin, two Pronkin, AUW+1, plus black castling. FPG notation: CF(Q,Q,B) & PR(r,s) (Country) The only rendition showing five thematic pieces (ARG) The only 2½-rendition of the theme (AUW + 1) (UKR) The most ambitious entry with three thematic Ceriani-Frolkin pieces promoted on the home squares of two Pronkin pieces; thematic AUW+1 (USA)

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Place (9,4 points) H74: Dirk Borst (Netherlands)

1.Sh3 g5 2.Sf4 g4 3.h3 g3 4.Rh2 g×h2 5.g4 e5 6.g5 Be7 7.g6 Bh4 8.g7 Sf6 9.g8=R+ Ke7 10.Rg1 Rg8 11.Bg2 Rg3 12.Kf1 Ra3 13.d3 c5 14.Sd2 c4 15.Sb3 c3 16.Qd2 c×d2 17.c4 d6 18.c5 Sbd7 19.c6 Sf8 20.c7 Bd7 21.c8=Q d1=S 22.Qc2 Se3+ 23.f×e3 Rc8 24.Qd1 Rc3 25.Bc6 Se8 26.Kg2 h1=B+ 27.Kh2 Be4 28.d×e4 f6 29.Sd3 Ke6 30.Rh1 Pronkin: Qd1 and Rh1; Ceriani-Frolkin: d1=S and h1=B; AUW with cyclic effect: Q-promotion on bishop home square, B-promotion on rook home square, R-promotion on knight home square, S-promotion on queen home square; No unthematic captures (Country) The cyclic promotions add an aesthetic effect (ARG) Also a double setting, but here the promotions are only visible in the white pawn structure. This is more difficult to implement than the standard case.

Here, moreover, it is presented with AUW and without unthematic captures. The named cyclic effect is nice, but not of an essential importance for the theme and probably discovered by accident (GER) Double theme rendition with AUW plus cyclic effect (UKR) Thematic AUW with minimum number of captures, and the additional cyclic effect of promotions on home squares: QB/BR/RS/SQ (USA)

### 3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place (9,3 points) H78: Michel Caillaud (France)

1.a4 c5 2.a5 Qb6 3.a×b6 a5 4.Ra3 a4 5.Re3 a3 6.g4 Ra4 7.g5 Rh4 8.f4 d5 9.Kf2 d4 10.Kg3 d×e3 11.d4 a2 12.d5 a1=S 13.d6 Sb3 14.c×b3 Be6 15.b4 Bb3 16.g6 e6 17.d7+ Ke7 18.d8=B+ Ke8 19.Bf6 g×f6 20.g7 Se7 21.g8=R c4 22.Rg5 Rg8 23.Sh3 Rg6 24.Rg1 Rgh6 25.Ra5 Sg8 26.b5 Bb4 27.Rg2 Be1+ 28.Rf2 c3 29.Bd2 c2 30.Sc3 f5 31.Qb1 c1=Q 32.Ra1 Qd1 33.Bc1 Qd8 AUW. Switchback by bK. Theme × 2 in economical form (only the minimum of captures requested for this: 4). The 4 promotion squares are occupied by seemingly original pieces. The promotion to Ceriani-Frolkin squares are occupied by switchback pieces. The pieces on the promotion squares are of 4 different types (Q,R,B;S) (Country) An overlong double setting; again with all-transformations and exclusively thematic captures. Some switchbacks are also included, which enhance somewhat the value. However, these seem artificial and are not harmonious (GER) Double theme rendition with additional related effects (UKR) Thematic AUW with minimum number of captures and switchback of the bK, bS, wB. The types of promoted pieces and the home squares between a1/g8 (sR) & c1/d8 (qB) are mutually reversed (USA)



3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup> Place (9,3 points) H49: Silvio Baier (Germany)

1.c4 e6 2.c5 Qg5 3.c6 Ke7 4.c×d7 c5 5.d8=B+ Ke8 6.Bb6 a×b6 7.h4 Ra4 8.h×g5 Rg4 9.Rh6 c4 10.Rg6 h5 11.a4 h4 12.a5 h3 13.a6 h2 14.a7 h1=S 15.a8=R Sg3 16.R8a3 S×f1 17.Rh3 Sg3 18.f×g3 c3 19.Kf2 c×d2 20.Qf1 d1=Q 21.Rh1 Qd8 22.Ke1 f×g6 Thematic AUW blended with consistent switchbacks of both kings; additional switchback of the C-F knight. FPG notation: CF(B,SW(s)) & PR(R,q) & SW(K,k) (Country) AUW complemented with switchback of both kings (ARG) Theme doubling with AUW plus switchbacks of both kings (UKR) Thematic AUW with switchback of the wK, bK and the C-F bS (USA)

## 5<sup>th</sup> Place (9 points) H69: Klemen Šivic (Slovenia)

1.f4 e6 2.f5 Bd6 3.f6 Bg3+ 4.h×g3 d6 5.Rh6 Kd7 6.Rg6 f×g6 7.f7 h5 8.f8=Q h4 9.Qf2 h3 10.Qb6 a×b6 11.Sf3 Ra3 12.Sg5 Rc3 13.a4 h2 14.a5 h1=S 15.a6 Sf2 16.a7 Sd3+ 17.e×d3 e5 18.Qh5 e4 19.Be2 e3 20.Bf3 e2 21.Kf2 e1=B+ 22.Ke2 Bf2 23.a8=R Bd4 24.R8a4 Bf6 25.Rh4 Be7 26.Rh1 Bf8 Thematic squares h1 and f8; Thematic pieces: h1: white rook, black promoted knight - f8: black bishop, white promoted queen; AUW (Country) AUW with a long bB journey to reach the Pronkin square (ARG) Double setting with AUW and exclusively thematic captures. That's good, but for a top place it lacks

something special (GER) Another double theme rendition AUW in economical form (UKR) Thematic AUW with minimum number of captures (USA)

6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points, not counting for the country) H60: Silvio Baier (Germany) 1.d3 h5 2.Bg5 h4 3.Qc1 h3 4.Kd1 h×g2 5.h4 e5 6.h5 e4 7.h6 e3 8.h7 e×f2 9.h×g8=B Rh4 10.e4 Rg4 11.Rh7 a5 12.Sh3 g1=B 13.Bg2 f1=S 14.e5 Sg3 15.e6 Sf5 16.e7 Sh6 17.e×f8=B f5 18.Bb4 a×b4 19.Sd2 Ra3 20.Sf3 Rc3 21.a3 Bc5 22.Ba2 Bf8 23.Be7 Sg8 24.Qh6 b3 25.Rc1 b×a2 The stipulated theme is doubled. The black original pieces are captured on their initial game array squares, so a conclusion on the proof game can only be drawn from the black pawns in the diagram. Here, a single Zig-Zag pawn (so it's on its original file) ensures that all promotions are necessary. FPG notation: (ZZ & CF)(B,B) & PR(b,s) (Country) Double theme rendition; not quite harmonious, but it is appealing that both original pieces involved in the theme are captured on their home squares (UKR) The original Bf8 and Sg8 that were captured at home are replaced by promoted pieces (Pronkin). Both white promoted pieces are captured by the bPa7. Extra points for the difficult Pronkin knight (USA)



6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points) H68: Nicolas Dupont (France)

1.e4 a6 2.Bb5 a×b5 3.f4 Ra6 4.f5 Rg6 5.f×g6 f5 6.b3 f4 7.Bb2 f3 8.Qc1 f2+ 9.Kd1 f1=S 10.a4 Sg3 11.h×g3 c5 12.Rh5 Sc6 13.Rg5 h5 14.a5 h4 15.a6 h3 16.a7 h2 17.a8=Q h1=R 18.Qb8 R1h4 19.Qd6 e×d6 20.e5 Qf6 21.e6 Kd8 22.e7+ Kc7 23.e8=B Ra4 24.Bf7 Ra8 25.Bc4 Qf7 26.Bf1 AUW. Theme × 2 in economical form (only the minimum of captures requested for this: 4) Very economical number of moves under these constraints. FPG notation: CF(Q,s) & PR(B,r) (Country) Double setting with AUW and exclusively thematic captures. That's good, but for a top place it lacks something special (GER) Another double theme rendition with AUW in economical form (UKR) Thematic AUW with minimum number of captures (USA)

6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> Place (8,7 points, not counting for the country) H65: Michel Caillaud (France)

1.d4 f5 2.d5 f4 3.d6 f3 4.d×c7 d6 5.Bf4 Bh3 6.c8=Q Sc6 7.Qe6 Qb6 8.Qh6 e5 9.g×h3 e4 10.h4 e3 11.Sh3 e×f2+ 12.Kd2 g×h6 13.e3 Bg7 14.Ba6 f1=B 15.Sg5 f2 16.Qf3 Bh3 17.Rd1 f1=Q 18.c4 Qd3+ 19.Ke1 Qa3 20.b×a3 Bb2 21.c5 Se5 22.c6 b×a6 23.c7 a5 24.c8=B Kd8 25.Ba6 Bc8 26.Bf1 Theme × 2 with 4 promotions concentrated on two thematic squares: square f1 (return wB Pronkin, promotion bQ Ceriani-Frolkin)=requested theme+promotion bB Pronkin; square c8 (return bB Pronkin, promotion wQ Ceriani-Frolkin)=requested theme+promotion wB Pronkin. White-black echo. Switchback by wK. FPG notation CF(Q,q) & PR(B,b) (Country) The concentration of the theme on two squares is wonderfully successful. The piece movements are also nicely analog here, without the play becoming too symmetric. A double setting is good, but here the aesthetics are particularly well pronounced (GER) Double theme rendition involving same sets of white and black pieces (UKR) Perfectly matched play with promotions on only two squares; switchback of the wK (USA)

#### 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) H66: Dirk Borst (Netherlands)

1.b4 Sc6 2.b5 Rb8 3.b×c6 b5 4.d4 b4 5.d5 b3 6.d6 b2 7.d×c7 d5 8.a4 Bh3 9.Sa3 b1=B 10.c8=Q Rb2 11.Qe6 Qd6 12.Qh6 g×h6 13.c7 Kd7 14.c4 Ke6 15.c5 Kf5 16.c6 Kg4 17.c8=Q+ Bf5 18.Qe6 Bg7 19.Qf6 e×f6 20.c7 Se7 21.c8=Q Re8 22.Qcc2 Bc8 23.Qg6+ f×g6 24.f4 g5 25.Kf2 Sg6 26.g×h3+ Pronkin: Bc8; Ceriani-Frolkin: 3 x c8=Q (Country) Another singular theme rendition with a supplementary set of two thematic pieces (UKR) Three Ceriani-Frolkin queens promote on the thematic square of the Pronkin bishop. Slightly harder to achieve than three Ceriani-Frolkin bishops featured in problems H56 and H70 (USA)



9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) H73: Andriy Frolkin, Mikhail Kozulya (Ukraine)

1.e4 d5 2.e5 Qd6 3.e×d6 e5 4.h4 Se7 5.h5 Sg6 6.h6 Be7 7.h×g7 h5 8.Se2 h4 9.Sg3 h3 10.Qh5 Bh4 11.d7+ Ke7 12.d8=R e4 13.Rd6 e3 14.Rb6 a×b6 15.Be2 Ra3 16.Bd1 Rc3 17.d×c3 e2 18.Bf4 h2 19.Kd2 e1=R 20.a4 Re4 21.Re1 h1=Q 22.a5 Qh3 23.a6 Qd7 24.a7 Qd8 25.a8=Q Be6 26.Qa2 Ra4 27.Sh1 Ra8 28.Bg3 Sf4 29.Qc4 d×c4+ 30.Kc1 Reciprocal change of thematic elements on a8 and d8: Ceriani-Frolkin queen and Pronkin rook on a8 vs. Pronkin queen and Ceriani-Frolkin rook on d8 (Country) Reciprocal doubling is particularly easy to implement with these types of pieces. Not bad, but additional elements are missing for a higher score (GER)

9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) H48: Mark Kirtley (United States)

1.a4 b5 2.Ra3 b4 3.Rh3 b3 4.Rh5 b×c2 5.h4 c×b1=Q 6.Rh3 Qe4 7.Rd3 Qe3 8.d×e3 Sh6 9.Bd2 Sf5 10.Ba5 h6 11.B×c7 Rh7 12.Bh2 d6 13.g4 Kd7 14.g5 Kc6 15.g6 Bd7 16.g×h7 Be8 17.h8=S Sd7 18.Sg6 Rb8 19.Sf4 Rb6 20.Sd5 Ra6 21.Sc3 Qb6 22.Sb1 Thematic square: b1; Thematic pieces: white knight, promoted black queen.

1.a4 b6 2.Ra3 b5 3.Rh3 b4 4.Rh5 b3 5.h4 b×c2 6.Rh3 c×d1=S 7.Rd3 Se3 8.d×e3 Sh6 9.Bd2 Sf5 10.Ba5 h6 11.B×c7 Rh7 12.Bh2 d6 13.g4 Kd7 14.g5 Kc6 15.g6 Bd7 16.g×h7 Be8 17.h8=Q Sd7 18.Qh7 Rb8 19.Qg6 Rb6 20.Qe6 Ra6 21.Qb3 Qb6 22.Qd1 Thematic square: d1; Thematic pieces: white queen, promoted black knight.

It is nice how an opening tempo regulates all the AUW promotions (ARG) Doubling of the theme in two-solution form with reciprocal promotions. The uniqueness of the paths of the Pronkin pieces is impressive, as is the black tempo move (the very first one) in one solution. Of course, a lot of moves have to be the same in both solutions, but this also seems a bit monotonous, so that one could think that a single-line double setting is more difficult to construct (GER) The two lines of play are determined by whether or not Black loses a tempo on his first move. This difference leads to two thematic squares and "reversed" pairs of thematic pieces (UKR)

9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> Place (8,4 points) H77: Andriy Frolkin, Aleksandr Semenenko, Valery Semenenko (Ukraine) 1.f4 a5 2.f5 a4 3.f6 a3 4.f×e7 f5 5.e4 f4 6.Ba6 f3 7.d3 f2+ 8.Kd2 f1=S+ 9.Kc3 Sg3 10.h×g3 b×a6 11.Rh6 a5 12.Rc6 d×c6 13.e5 Kd7 14.e6+ Kd6 15.e8=B h5 16.e7 h4 17.Bh5 h3 18.e8=R h2 19.Re1 h1=Q 20.Be2 Rh2 21.Sh3 Qh4 22.Bg5 Qf1 23.Sd2 Qf7 24.Rh1 Sd7 25.Qg1 Sb6 26.Rf1 Bd7 27.Rf2 Re8 28.Bf1 Re2 29.b4 Qb3+ 30.c×b3 Be8 Double theme presentation. AUW with separation of theme elements: Ceriani-Frolkin for Black, Pronkin for White. The two white Pronkin pieces are promoted on the same square e8, and later this square is visited by black pieces of the same type (rook, bishop) (Country) AUW with echo play on the Pronkin promotion square (ARG) Another very long double setting, in which the white promotions on the same square are nice. The fact that afterwards black pieces of the same type move there too is trivial and does not justify the last black move (GER) Thematic AUW with the additional effect that the bR & bB occupy the single promotion square (e8) of both white Pronkin pieces of the same type (USA)



13<sup>th</sup> Place (8,2 points) H62: Klemen Šivic (Slovenia)

1.a4 e5 2.Ra3 e4 3.Rb3 e3 4.Rb6 a×b6 5.d4 Ra5 6.d5 Sa6 7.d6 Rg5 8.a5 Rg3 9.h×g3 c5 10.Rh6 Sc7 11.Rf6 h5 12.a6 h4 13.a7 h3 14.a8=Q h2 15.Qa4 h1=Q 16.Qc6 d×c6 17.d7+ Ke7 18.Qd4 Qe8 19.d8=R Qh5 20.Rd5 Qf3 21.e×f3 e2 22.Kd2 e1=R 23.Rh5 Re3 24.Rh1 Ra3 25.Bd3 Ra8 Thematic squares h1 and a8. Thematic pieces: h1: white rook, black promoted queen; a8: black rook, white promoted queen. All five pairs of thematic moves are geometrically symmetric with respect to the centre of the chessboard (all captures, all promotions and all returns to thematic squares) (Country) A double setting of the theme without unthematic captures and with probably the easiest pieces to handle. The piece movements are pleasantly analogous without being too symmetric. One cannot get rid of the feeling that additional content (return of the kings) could be possible (GER) A symmetry-based double theme rendition (UKR)

#### 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points) H56: Vidmantas Satkus (Lithuania)

1.d4 b6 2.d5 Bb7 3.d6 Bd5 4.d×e7 Sc6 5.e×f8=B Qh4 6.g4 0-0-0 7.g5 Re8 8.g6 Re6 9.g×f7 g5 10.Ba3 g4 11.f8=B g3 12.f4 Rh6 13.f5 Qf4 14.f6 g2 15.f7 Sf6 16.Bfb4 Rg8 17.f8=B Rg3 18.Bfc5 d6 19.h4 d×c5 20.h5 c×b4 21.Rh4 b×a3 22.Sh3 g1=B 23.Sd2 Bc5 24.Sb3 Bf8 Thematic square: f8; Thematic pieces: black bishop, three white promoted bishops (Country) Economical task (ARG) If a thematic set of pieces (CF + Pronkin) is supplemented with a CF or Pronkin piece appearing on the thematic square, one can talk of a 1½ rendition of the theme. But if the supplement consists of two CF or two Pronkin pieces, it would not be right to claim that the theme has been doubled  $(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 2)$ . It is reasonable to say that this is a specific case of the theme: a singular theme rendition with a supplementary set of two pieces (UKR)

#### 14<sup>th</sup>-15<sup>th</sup> Place (8 points) H58: Vidmantas Satkus (Lithuania)

1.e4 d5 2.e5 Kd7 3.e6+ Kc6 4.e×f7 e5 5.Sc3 Bb4 6.f8=S Se7 7.Sg6 h×g6 8.Se4 Rh3 9.Sf6 Rc3 10.d×c3 e4 11.Qd4 e3 12.Qb6+ a×b6 13.h4 d4 14.h5 d3 15.h6 d2+ 16.Ke2 d1=R 17.h7 Rd5 18.h8=Q Rda5 19.Qh5 Qh8 20.Kd3 e2 21.c×b4 e1=B 22.b×a5 Bb4 23.Bd2 Sf5 24.Re1 Bf8 25.Qd1 Thematic squares: d1, f8; Thematic pieces: white queen, black bishop, white promoted knight, black promoted rook (Country) One of the many double settings with AUW, but without further encores (GER) Thematic AUW (UKR)



16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) H50: Unto Heinonen (†) (Finland)

1.f4 h5 2.f5 h4 3.f6 h3 4.f×e7 h×g2 5.e×f8=B Rh3 6.Bb4 Rc3 7.h4 c5 8.h5 c×b4 9.Rh4 b3 10.Ra4 g5 11.e4 g4 12.Bc4 g3 13.Se2 g1=B 14.e5 Bc5 15.e6 Bf8 16.e7 g2 17.e×d8=B Se7 18.Ba5 b6 19.d3 b×a5 20.Sd2 g1=Q+ 21.Sf1 Qb6 22.Sfg3 Qd8 Thematic squares: d8, f8. White Ceriani-Frolkin parts are realized by two bishops. Analogous play (Country) Anticipated by PDB 1246051 (GER) Theme doubling, three thematic bishops and one queen (somewhat lacking in harmony) (UKR)

## 16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points) H70: Göran Wicklund (Sweden)

1.d4 Sf6 2.d5 Se4 3.d6 Sd2 4.d×c7 d5 5.a4 d4 6.a5 d3 7.a6 Qd4 8.a×b7 a5 9.b×c8=B a4 10.Bh3 a3 11.c8=B a2 12.Bcg4 Sd7 13.b4 0-0-0 14.b5 Kb8 15.b6 Rc8 16.b7 Sb6 17.b×c8=B Ka8 18.Bcf5 e6 19.c4 e×f5 20.Sc3 Sb1 21.Bh6 f×g4 22.e3 g×h3 23.Qh5 d2+ 24.Ke2 g5 25.Kf3 d1=B+ 26.Kg3 Bg4 27.Be2 Bc8 Thematic square c8 with 3 × Ceriani-Frolkin (wB + wB + wB) and Pronkin (bB) (Country) Another singular theme rendition with a supplementary set of two thematic pieces. The capture of a post-castling rook is a nice extra feature (UKR)

16<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> Place (7,8 points, not counting for the country) H72: Andriy Frolkin (Ukraine)

1.f4 Sf6 2.f5 Sh5 3.f6 a6 4.f×e7 f5 5.e4 f4 6.Bb5 f3 7.d3 f2+ 8.Kd2 f1=S+ 9.Kc3 Sfg3 10.h×g3 Sf4 11.Rh5 a×b5 12.Rc5 Ra4 13.e5 Rc4+ 14.d×c4 h5 15.a4 h4 16.a5 h3 17.a6 h2 18.a7 h1=R 19.a8=Q R1h6 20.Qa4 Ra6 21.Kb4 Ra8 22.Sc3 Sa6+ 23.Ka5 b4 24.Qc6 d×c6 25.Sd5 Bh3 26.g4 Kd7 27.e8=B+ Kc8 28.Bg6 Kb8 29.Bd3 Qc8 30.Bf1 Double theme presentation. AUW with Ceriani-Frolkin and Pronkin elements presented by both sides (Country) Another double setting with AUW but without further content. For this, too long (GER)



#### 19th Place (7,4 points) H59: Marek Kolčák (Slovakia)

1.e4 f5 2.Qg4 Kf7 3.Qg6+ h×g6 4.e5 Rh3 5.e6+ Kf6 6.e×d7 Rb3 7.a×b3 e5 8.Ra5 Bc5 9.Rb5 a5 10.h4 a4 11.h5 a3 12.h6 a2 13.h7 a1=R 14.h8=Q R1a4 15.Qh5 Rh4 16.Qd1 Rh8 17.Rh4 Se7 18.Rhb4 e4 19.Bc4 e3 20.d3 e2 21.Sd2 e×d1=S 22.Sdf3 Sc3 23.Sh4 Ke5 24.f4+ Kd4 25.b×c3+ The required theme is shown twice. On square d1: wQ Pronkin, bS Ceriani-Frolkin. On square h8: bR Pronkin, wQ Ceriani-Frolkin (Country) Another double setting without additional elements. A bit lengthy at the end to motivate the Ceriani-Frolkin capture. The check in the final position is a bit disturbing (GER) Double theme rendition, but lacking in harmony (UKR) Among the entries featuring two thematic cases, this is the only one in which the Pronkin piece is captured (USA)

#### 20<sup>th</sup> Place (7,2 points) H51: Roberto Osorio (Argentina)

1.a4 f5 2.a5 f4 3.a6 f3 4.a×b7 a5 5.b×c8=S a4 6.Sd6+ e×d6 7.b4 Be7 8.b5 Bh4 9.b6 Bg3 10.h×g3 a3 11.Rh5 a2 12.Ra5 h5 13.Ba3 h4 14.Bc5 h3 15.Sa3 h2 16.Rb1 Rh3 17.g×h3 h1=B 18.Bg2 f×g2 19.Sf3 g1=B 20.Sd4 Bb7 21.Sdb5 Bc8 22.b7 a1=R 23.b×c8=B The theme is performed by capturing the Bc8 at home in order to promote the CF piece, and capturing again the Pronkin bishop on c8 (Phantom). Systematic effect: Phoenix. The h1 promotion demands cross-captures on g3/h3 (black bishop and rook), who are re-born on g1/a1. The black bishop promotion demands the Bf1 to be sacrificed, who is thereafter re-born by capturing the Pronkin bishop on c8 (Country) An interesting proofgame with a captured Pronkin piece and in addition cross-captures and three times Phoenix. This is a great program, in which the required theme is unfortunately a bit lost (GER) Formally, a singular rendition of the theme, but with a lot of related effects (UKR)

#### 21st-22nd Place

- H36 (7 points): Marek Kolčák (Slovakia) Double black and white thematic combination with three pawns only: The thematic square on White's side is d1 and on Black's side is a8. Promoted wQ fulfils both the Pronkin and the Ceriani-Frolkin effects (Country) Another 1½ rendition of the theme, a thematic Pronkin piece being captured as a result of a thematic promotion for a CF piece (UKR)
- H42 (7 points): Göran Wicklund (Sweden) Thematic square f8 with AUW: wQ + wS (Ceriani-Frolkin), bB (Pronkin) and wR (unthematic part on the thematic square) (Country) 1½ rendition of the theme plus an AUW in which one of the promotions is non-thematic (UKR)

#### 23<sup>rd</sup> Place

 H53 (6,8 points): Ivan Denkovski (Serbia) Thematic square: h1 and thematic pieces: wR, two promoted bQ. Both promotion squares are occupied by home base/non-home circuit pieces (Country) 1½ rendition of the theme plus an impostor rook (UKR) 24<sup>th</sup>-25<sup>th</sup> Place

- H57 (6,6 points): Mark Kirtley (United States) Thematic square: h8 and thematic pieces: black rook, white promoted queen. Both diagrammed bRs are impostors. Partial computer testing: Jacobi, in heuristic mode, finds the full-length solution and no other (60 hours) (Country) Singular theme rendition plus an impostor rook (UKR)
- H67 (6,6 points): Ofer Comay (Israel) 2 × Ceriani-Frolkin on h8, d8. 2 × Pronkin on a8, h8. The same promoted piece moves to two Pronkin squares (a8, h8). False is 1.g4? Sh6 2.g5 Sf5 3.g6 h6 4.??? (Country) Singular theme rendition with related effects (thematic Pronkin rook visiting another, non-thematic Pronkin square; second CF piece) (UKR)

#### 26<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> Place

- H23 (6,4 points): Velmurugan Nallusamy, S.K. Balasubramanian (India) In a) thematic square: f1 and thematic pieces: Pronkin wB, Ceriani-Frolkin bB. Black king-side castling. In b) thematic square: d1 and thematic pieces: Pronkin wQ, Ceriani-Frolkin bS. C-F piece is captured on its promotion square. In c) thematic square: f8 and thematic pieces: Pronkin bB, Ceriani-Frolkin wS. White queen-side castling. In d) thematic square: h1 and thematic pieces: Pronkin wR, Ceriani-Frolkin bQ. 8 promotions to 7 different pieces (wB/bB, wQ/bS, bB/wS, wR/bQ) including white AUW. Black 0-0 in phase A and white 0-0-0 in phase C (Country) Triple presentation of the theme in four successive twins. Insufficient harmony between the solutions (UKR)
- H64 (6,4 points, not counting for the country): Peter van den Heuvel (Netherlands) Pronkin: Ra1 and Rh1. Ceriani-Frolkin: a1=S. The promoted rook occupies and vacates both Pronkinsquares (Country) Singular theme rendition with the thematic rook visiting a non-thematic Pronkin square on its way to the thematic one (UKR)

#### 28th-29th Place

- H45 (6,2 points): Paul Rāican (Romania) Thematic square f1. The Phoenix-Pronkin piece and the Ceriani-Frolkin piece are of the same nature (bishop). Then the Pronkin piece is captured (Country) The impostor pawn on d3 is a nice touch (UKR)
- H76 (6,2 points): Ivan Denkovski (Serbia) Thematic square: d1 and thematic pieces: wQ, promoted bS. Phoenix theme: 21.e8=B. Klasinc theme: 21...Se7; 22...Rhe8; 23...Sg8. Prentos theme: 30...Q×g5‡ (Country) Singular theme rendition with additional effects (UKR)

## 30<sup>th</sup>-32<sup>nd</sup> Place

- H33 (6 points, not counting for the country): Göran Wicklund (Sweden) Thematic square f1 with Ceriani-Frolkin (bQ+bS) and Pronkin (wB). One C-F is hidden: neither the captured nor the capturing piece is on the diagram (Country) 1½ rendition of the theme (two CF pieces originating from f1 and one Pronkin piece on that square). "Hidden capture" of one of the CF pieces is a nice touch (UKR)
- H38 (6 points): Roberto Osorio (Argentina) To promote on g8, the easy and natural way is to capture the black knight there. However, the black knight has to move three times in order to allow the promotion on its home-square. Castling is hidden by the wQ switchback and the white rooks insinuating are interchanged (Country) Nice debut play by the original bSg8 (UKR)
- H52 (6 points, not counting for the country): Ivan Denkovski (Serbia) Thematic square: b8 and thematic pieces: bS, promoted wQ (an original combination). The thematic white queen is captured by an impostor pawn. One more wQ promotes on the thematic square, after the original wQ is captured (Phoenix theme). [Sb8] and [Pd7] exchange their places (Country) Again a singular theme rendition, with some related effects (UKR)

#### 33<sup>rd</sup> Place

• H46 (5,8 points): Paul Rãican (Romania) 1½ rendition of the theme involving a 4-move journey of the black Pronkin bishop to the thematic square (UKR)

34<sup>th</sup>-35<sup>th</sup> Place

- H63 (5,6 points): Ofer Comay (Israel) The problem may be interesting to solvers, but it is thematically weak (UKR)
- H71 (5,6 points, not counting for the country): Paul Rãican (Romania) Thematic square d8, with a Ceriani-Frolkin knight, captured in Prentos style. In addition, the pc7 makes a circuit, becoming the Phoenix rook. It is obvious that the last move is Rc7×Xc6+. It is then easily verified that X can only be a knight. The problem is C+ up to 28.Kc3 inclusive, so it is HC+ (human-computer+) for 28 complete moves (Country) Singular theme rendition plus "black pawn circuit" (UKR)

36<sup>th</sup> Place

• H31 (5,2 points): Stephen Taylor (Britain) Minimum realisation with only thematic captures; switchbacks performed by all active white pieces (Country) One of the white switchbacks is to a thematic square; the other, unfortunately, is unrelated to the theme (UKR)

37<sup>th</sup> Place

• H34 (5 points): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) SPGs with "bifurcated solutions" were not prohibited, but from thematic viewpoint, the "limited bifurcation" here adds very little content (UKR)

38th-40th Place

- H07 (4,6 points): Velmurugan Nallusamy, S.K. Balasubramanian (India) In a) thematic square: f1 and thematic pieces: Pronkin wB, Ceriani-Frolkin bS; in b) thematic square: h8 and thematic pieces: Pronkin bR, Ceriani-Frolkin wQ. The captured original bR is the sibling of bRh8. Combining phases A & B, AUW (Country)
- H35 (4,6 points): Ashot Egiazaryan (Armenia) The thematic play is almost over after Black's 8<sup>th</sup> move; 9 moves later Black gives check with his Pronkin queen, leaving the thematic square. The extended play looks too long for such modest enhancement of content (UKR)
- H43 (4,6 points, not counting for the country): Aleksey Gasparyan (Armenia) The promoted bQ returns to its original square by the shortest route from square d1 (Country) Again long play, modest content enhancement due to the black Phoenix rook (UKR)

41<sup>st</sup>-43<sup>rd</sup> Place

- H18 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Velmurugan Nallusamy, S.K. Balasubramanian (India) In a) thematic square: d8 and thematic pieces: Pronkin bQ, Ceriani-Frolkin wR. Promoted Ceriani-Frolkin piece captured on the promotion square. In b) thematic square: f8 and thematic pieces: Pronkin bB, Ceriani-Frolkin wS. Promotions Q, R, B & S (AUW) (Country)
- H37 (4,4 points, not counting for the country): Klemen Šivic (Slovenia) Thematic square: d8 and thematic pieces: black queen, white promoted knight. White Sb1 switchback (Country) Quite straightforward (UKR)
- H40 (4,4 points): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Three promotions to light-square bishop; the Pronkin piece is itself captured, with the Ceriani-Frolkin piece replaced by a phoenix unit on b1 (Country)

44<sup>th</sup>-45<sup>th</sup> Place

- H13 (4,2 points): Marco Bonavoglia (Italy) Another case of "unsophisticated twins" (UKR)
- H30 (4,2 points): Henrik Juel (Denmark) Thematic square: d1 and thematic pieces: white queen, black promoted knight. Additional feature: Impostor (Ra8) (Country) The extra feature (impostor rook) is uninspiring (UKR)

46<sup>th</sup>-47<sup>th</sup> Place

• H06 (4 points, not counting for the country): Marek Kolčák (Slovakia) In a) bQ-wB promotions; in b) bB-wS promotions (Country) AUW in twins presented in a trivial way (UKR)

• H14 (4 points): Marco Bonavoglia (Italy) Ceriani-Frolkin, Pronkin, Schnoebelen, Phoenix, bicolour Bristol (Country) Extra features: Schnoebelen and Bristol (UKR)

## 48<sup>th</sup>-49<sup>th</sup> Place

- H11 (3,8 points, not counting for the country): Stephen Taylor (Great Britain) Reciprocal wQ and bR promotions, each occurring on the other's home-square (Country) One of the thematic pieces is a Schnoebelen, which is much harder to achieve than e.g. a Donati piece (UKR)
- H16 (3,8 points): Luis Miguel Martín (Spain) Thematic square: f1 and thematic pieces: white bishop and promoted black knight. Ceriani-Frolkin → Prentos. Homebase. Switchback × 2 (Country)

## 50<sup>th</sup>-51<sup>st</sup> Place

- H15 (3,6 points): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) Thematic square: h1 and thematic pieces: white rook, black promoted knight (Country)
- H22 (3,6 points): Pavel Kameník (Czech Republic) Thematic square: b1 and thematic pieces: white knight, black promoted queen (Country) Pronkin knights are hardest to achieve, in view of the long journey to the promotion square (UKR)

## 52<sup>nd</sup>-55<sup>th</sup> Place

- H24 (3,4 points): Zoltán Laborczi, Gábor Tar (Hungary) Thematic square: f1 and thematic pieces: wB, promoted bR. Both siblings of the thematic bR are captured. Impostor bPh6 (Country)
- H25 (3,4 points): János Mikitovics, Zoltán Laborczi (Hungary) Thematic square: c1 and thematic pieces: wB, promoted bS. Impostor pawns: wPf3 and bPg6. Pins and unpins (Country) "Solitary" impostor pawns are not so impressive (UKR)
- H26 (3,4 points, not counting for the country): Mario Parrinello (Italy) One Ceriani-Frolkin (promoted on b8) and one Pronkin (promoted on g1); the C-F piece (white knight) performs a long journey thus surviving 6 moves before being captured (Country) Long, but not capture-free journeys of two thematic knights (UKR)
- H32 (3,4 points, not counting for the country): János Mikitovics (Hungary) Thematic square: b1 and thematic pieces: wS, promoted bS. Pseudo-Bristol. Umnov × 4 (Country) The non-thematic play at the end is not interesting (UKR)

## 56<sup>th</sup>-57<sup>th</sup> Place

- H21 (3 points): Pavel Kameník (Czech Republic) Thematic square: f8 and thematic pieces: black bishop, white promoted bishop (Country)
- H27 (3 points): Thierry le Gleuher (Canada) bB Pronkin, wB Ceriani-Frolkin (Country)

## 58<sup>th</sup> Place

• H28 (2,8 points): Panagiotis Konidaris (Greece) Thematic square: d8 and thematic pieces: black queen, white promoted knight (Country)

## 59<sup>th</sup>-61<sup>st</sup> Place

- H12 (2,4 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland)
- H17 (2,4 points): Gerold Schaffner (Switzerland)
- H20 (2,4 points): Henrik Juel (Denmark) Thematic square: d1 and thematic pieces: white queen, black promoted knight (Country)

## 62<sup>nd</sup>-65<sup>th</sup> Place

- H03 (2,2 points, not counting for the country): Dimitris Liakos (Greece) Thematic square: h1. Thematic pieces: white rook, black promoted knight (Country)
- H04 (2,2 points, not counting for the country): Henrik Juel (Denmark) Thematic square: f1. Thematic pieces: white bishop, black promoted knight. Additional features: Prentos theme, black homebase (Country)

- H08 (2,2 points): Georgi Hadzi-Vaskov (North Macedonia) Thematic square: c1 and thematic pieces: white bishop, black promoted rook (Country)
- H09 (2,2 points): Georgi Hadzi-Vaskov (North Macedonia) Thematic square: a1 and thematic pieces: white rook, black promoted knight (Country)

66<sup>th</sup>-67<sup>th</sup> Place

- H05 (2 points): Luis Zaragoza (Spain) Thematic square: c1. Thematic pieces: White bishop and promoted black knight (Country)
- H10 (2 points, not counting for the country): José Antonio Garzón (Spain) Thematic square: d1 and thematic pieces: white queen and promoted black knight (Country)

68<sup>th</sup> Place

H02 (1,8 points, not counting for the country): Mark Kirtley (United States) In a) thematic square: f8 and thematic pieces: black bishop, white promoted bishop; in b) thematic square: d8 and thematic pieces: black queen, white promoted knight. Compare to <u>PDB P1112019</u> by Yaakov Mintz (Country) Anticipated by <u>http://anselan.com/CHE.html</u> C04 (GER) These twins are perceived as twins 6 and 7 to the problem by Buchanan and Elkies quoted in the Claims document (UKR)

## Section H: Retros

Place	Country	No	ARG	FRA	GER	UKR	USA	Total
1	GER	H75	3,4	3,4		3,4	3,6	10,2
2	NED	H74	3,0	3,2	3,0	3,4	3,2	9,4
3-4	FRA	H78	3,0		3,0	3,2	3,4	9,3
3-4	GER	H49	2,8	3,2		3,2	3,0	9,3
5	SLO	H69	3,0	3,0	2,6	3,0	3,0	9,0
6-8	GER	H60	2,6	2,8		3,0	3,2	8,7
6-8	FRA	H68	2,8		2,6	3,0	3,0	8,7
6-8	FRA	H65	2,8		3,2	2,8	3,0	8,7
9-12	NED	H66	2,8	2,8	2,2	2,8	2,8	8,4
9-12	UKR	H73	3,0	2,8	2,6		2,8	8,4
9-12	USA	H48	2,8	3,0	2,8	2,8		8,4
9-12	UKR	H77	2,8	2,8	2,8		3,2	8,4
13	SLO	H62	2,8	3,0	2,0	2,8	2,6	8,2
14-15	LTU	H56	3,2	2,6	2,2	2,8	2,6	8,0
14-15	LTU	H58	2,6	2,6	2,4	2,8	2,8	8,0
16-18	FIN	H50	2,6	2,6	1,0	2,6	2,6	7,8
16-18	SWE	H70	3,0	2,4	2,0	2,8	2,6	7,8
16-18	UKR	H72	2,8	2,4	2,4		2,8	7,8
19	SVK	H59	2,2	2,4	2,4	2,6	3,0	7,4
20	ARG	H51		2,8	2,2	2,4	2,4	7,2
21-22	SVK	H36	2,2	2,8	1,6	2,4	2,4	7,0
21-22	SWE	H42	2,6	2,4	1,8	2,4	2,2	7,0
23	SRB	H53	2,2	2,2	1,4	2,4	2,4	6,8
24-25	USA	H57	2,2	2,2	1,8	2,2		6,6
24-25	ISR	H67	2,2	2,6	1,8	2,4	2,0	6,6
26-27	IND	H23	2,0	2,0	2,2	2,4	2,2	6,4
26-27	NED	H64	2,2	2,4	1,6	2,4	1,8	6,4
28-29	ROU	H45	2,2	2,2	1,4	2,2	1,8	6,2
28-29	SRB	H76	1,8	2,6	1,8	2,4	2,0	6,2
30-32	SWE	H33	2,0	2,0	1,0	2,4	2,0	6,0
30-32	ARG	H38		2,2	2,0	1,8	2,0	6,0
30-32	SRB	H52	1,6	2,4	1,6	2,2	2,2	6,0
33	ROU	H46	1,6	2,0	1,4	2,4	2,2	5,8
34-35	ISR	H63	1,8	2,4	1,6	2,0	1,8	5,6
34-35	ROU	H71	1,8	2,0	1,4	2,4	1,8	5,6
36	GBR	H31	1,6	2,4	1,6	2,0	1,6	5,2
37	ARM	H34	1,4	2,0	0,6	1,6	2,2	5,0
38-40	ARM	H35	1,8	1,8	0,8	1,4	1,4	4,6
38-40	ARM	H43	1,6	1,8	1,0	1,6	1,4	4,6
38-40	IND	H07	1,6	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,6	4,6
41-43	GBR	H40	1,2	1,6	1,0	1,6	1,8	4,4
41-43	SLO	H37	1,2	2,2	1,0	1,6	1,6	4,4
41-43	IND	H18	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,6	1,6	4,4

44-45	ITA	H13	1,0	1,4	1,4	1,4	1,6	4,2
44-45	DEN	H30	1,4	1,2	1,4	1,6	1,4	4,2
46-47	SVK	H06	0,6	1,4	1,2	1,4	1,4	4,0
46-47	ITA	H14	1,0	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,6	4,0
48-49	GBR	H11	0,8	1,6	1,0	1,4	1,4	3,8
48-49	ESP	H16	0,6	1,2	1,4	1,4	1,2	3,8
50-51	GRE	H15	0,8	1,4	1,2	1,2	1,2	3,6
50-51	CZE	H22	1,2	1,0	1,2	1,6	1,2	3,6
52-55	ITA	H26	0,8	1,0	1,0	1,6	1,4	3,4
52-55	HUN	H24	1,0	1,2	1,2	1,8	1,0	3,4
52-55	HUN	H25	1,0	1,4	1,0	2,0	0,8	3,4
52-55	HUN	H32	1,4	1,0	1,0	1,6	1,0	3,4
56-57	CZE	H21	0,8	1,0	0,8	1,2	1,2	3,0
56-57	CAN	H27	0,8	1,0	0,8	1,2	1,2	3,0
58	GRE	H28	0,8	1,0	0,8	1,4	1,0	2,8
59-61	SUI	H12	0,4	0,8	1,0	0,6	1,0	2,4
59-61	SUI	H17	0,8	0,8	0,8	0,8	1,0	2,4
59-61	DEN	H20	0,6	0,8	0,8	1,0	0,8	2,4
62-65	GRE	H03	0,4	0,8	0,8	0,6	1,0	2,2
62-65	DEN	H04	0,4	0,8	0,8	0,6	1,0	2,2
62-65	MKD	H08	0,4	0,8	0,8	0,6	1,0	2,2
62-65	MKD	H09	0,4	0,8	0,8	0,6	1,0	2,2
66-67	ESP	H10	0,4	0,8	0,6	0,6	0,8	2,0
66-67	ESP	H05	0,4	0,8	0,8	0,2	0,8	2,0
68	USA	H02	0,8	2,2	0,0	0,4		1,8
	CAN	H01	0,6	0,8	0,0	0,2	0,0	0,0
	FIN	H29	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
	FIN	H47	0,0	0,0	0,0	1,2	0,0	0,0
	CAN	H54	0,6	2,0	0,0	1,4	0,0	0,0
	ISR	H79	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0