# On Bidding Five of a Minor 

What does it take a make 5C/D a good contract? by RAKESH KUMAR


Rakesh Kumar describes himself as an enthusiastic nonexpert who makes enough errors to have plenty of material for bridge columns.

This month I haven't played in any congresses, but I did go to Canberra to play in the Seniors. Over the course of 9 matches, one theme that emerged in relation to bidding judgement was that of playing in 5C/D. Back in the dark ages I seem to remember being told that one needed a combined 25-26 hcp to make game in a major, but more like 28-29 hcp to make game in a minor. The former is clearly not true, especially with a 9-card or better fit. The latter is mostly irrelevant, because with enough high card points and controls in all suits, the partnership wants to be in 3 NT , not 5 m .

So what does it take to make 5C/D a good contract? The answer seems to be: shape and top controls. With a lot of shape, there will often be a suit that is not adequately stopped for 3NT. However, without controls, 5 m is usually doomed.

That was certainly the case in this hand from round 4:

| Board 7 <br> Dealer S I Vul All |  |  |  | W |  | N |  | E | S |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | マ KJ652 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 C |
|  |  | - QJ9 |  | P |  | 1H |  |  | P |  | ? |
|  |  | 2 J764 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4 98642 <br> $\checkmark 8$ <br> AT862 <br> © 82 |  | - AJT7 <br> $\checkmark$ Q9743 <br> - 543 <br>  | To avoid an ill-fated 5 C contract, a rebid of $2 N T$ will be a better option |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $4 \stackrel{8}{\square}{ }_{17} 11$ |  | - KQ5 |  |  |  |  | - | $\vee$ | - |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ AT |  | N |  |  | - | 2 | - | 4 |
|  |  | S |  |  |  | - | 2 | - |  |
|  |  | 2 KQT953 |  | E W |  |  |  | - | 2 2 |  |

A contract of 5 C is a very bad idea on this hand. Across the field, there were 22 NS pairs in in 3 NT , making comfortably, but there were 17 in 5C, all of whom went down. How does one avoid this mess? After 1C-1H, perhaps South could upgrade the hand on the basis of the good 6-card club suit and controls in all other suits, to rebid 2NT rather than 3C. The latter is much more likely to lead to the ill-fated 5C contract.

Shape and top controls are the considerations of bidding a minor contract.


In the same round was an interesting hand that posed a different kind of bidding conundrum, the outcome of which depended in part on your system:



|  | $\boldsymbol{2}$ | $\bullet$ | $\vee$ | $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ | NT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N | - | - | - | - | - |
| S | - | - | - | - | - |
| E | 6 | 4 | 1 | - | 5 |
| W | 6 | 4 | 1 | - | 5 |

Playing better minor, if East opens 1D and rebids 2NT over West's 2C, the likely outcome is 3NT. If 1D by East would promise 4 cards then after a 1 C opening, EW may reach 5C via a strong raise and East's rebid showing a diamond stopper. A weak 1 NT opening might be raised directly to 3 NT . As it turns out, either contract is fine, because of all the top controls. In the Seniors there were 24 pairs in 3NT, with 15 in 5C. And yes, there was one adventurous pair in 6C (!) which happened to be cold on the 2-2 trump break, allowing a diamond to be ruffed in dummy.

At the other end of the scale is a hand such as this, from round 9 , where playing in 5C is more or less a no-brainer because of the shape, top controls and lack of a stopper in diamonds:


|  | - AQ2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKT5 |  |
|  | - T |  |
|  | \% KQJ93 |  |
| ¢ KJ854 | N | ¢ T73 |
| マ J962 |  | $\checkmark 84$ |
| - K96 |  | - AQ8754 |
| -5 | S | ¢ 74 |
|  | - 96 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q73 |  |
|  | - J32 |  |
|  | ¢ AT862 |  |


| W |  | N | E |  | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 C | P |  | 3 C |
| P |  | (5C) |  |  |  |
| Almost the entire field played in clubs |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * | $\checkmark$ | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | NT |
| $N$ |  | - | 4 | - | , |
| S |  | - | 4 | - | 1 |
| E |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |
| W |  | 1 | - | 1 | - |

Almost the entire field played in clubs, usually at the 5-level, although 2 very bold pairs bid to 6 C and made it. Remarkably, 4 pairs played in 3NT (you wouldn't, would you?) and 3 of those were allowed to get away with it on a non-diamond lead, presumably because South bid no-trumps first.

While the combined hands above had plenty of high card points, there were quite a few boards in the Seniors that illustrated the gains to be made by gutsy bidding based on distributional values and top controls. Here's a good example from round 9:


After 1D by North and a Ghestem 2D overcall by partner, showing spades and clubs, I bid a quiet 3C. Partner raised this to 5 C ! He had a beautiful 5-loser hand with top controls and inferred that my 3C bid meant I had no more than 2 spades, so there was some chance to ruff the suit good. In fact, with all my high cards working and the club finesse proving to be successful, there turned out to be 12 tricks available.

Across the field, 17 played in 5C, 13 in a part-score in clubs, and somehow one pair reached 6 C - there's always one! There were many much less courageous EW pairs, however, because 12 NS pairs were allowed to play in a diamond part-score, mostly failing but still a cheap save.

Speaking of saving, what about saving in five of a minor - or even more? This can be dangerous, but here is a fascinating hand from round 8 of the Seniors. NS are cold for 5 S, but EW are likely to compete vigorously to at least 5D. The question is would you take the vulnerable-against-not 6D save? Based on shape (shown by West) and top controls (which East certainly has) it actually makes sense to do so. Especially when this turns out not to be a save at all, because 6 D is cold!!


In Canberra, 18 NS pairs played in 4 S or 5 S , sometimes doubled; three NS pairs who played in slam were allowed to make - two of them were in 6 C ; while 18 went off in 6 S , usually doubled. Three EW pairs who took the diamond "save" against 5 S played there and are probably still grinning about it! $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$

