# $7^{\text {th }}$ Composing Tourney of FRME, 2021 <br> Section - Endgame Studies Provisional award 

Organizers: The Royal Moroccan Chess Federation (FRME). Tournament director: Vidadi Zamanov (Azerbaijan). Judge: Geir Sune Tallaksen Østmoe (Norway)<br>Award publication: http://frme.fr.nf

74 study from 34 authors 14 countries:Azerbaijan-Vidadi Zamanov, Bulgaria-Ognian Dimitrov,France-Daniel Keith, Georgia- David Gurgenidze, Germany -Martin Minski,Michael Roxlau, Rainer Staudte, Michael Schlosser, Israel- Amatzia Avni, Michael Pasman, Itay Richardson, Italy- Daniele Gatti, Marco Campioli, Mario Micaloni, Jan Sprenger,Moldova -Croitor Mihail, Russia -Pavel Arestov, Aleksandr Stavrietsky, Alexander Shpakovsky, Sergey Osintsev,Serbia- Ilinčić Borislav, Djurašević Branislav, Hlebec Darko, Ilić Miloje,Slovakia-Lubos Kekely, Michal Hlinka,Spain- LuisMiguel González, Luis Gomez Palazon,Ukraine - Vladislav Tarasiuk, Leonid Topko, Ivan Malyi, USA-Richard Becker, Dmitry Zilberstein, Paul Muljadi

I received from tourney director Vidadi Zamanov 74 study entries on anonymous diagrams. In the end, I included 13 of them in the award. Among the non-awarded studies, there were many where I did not see an idea noteworthy enough for the award. Some studies also had introductory play which in my opinion did not add anything to the study. Especially when the introductory play involves piece exchanges, then there should be a good reason to add those moves, other than just extending the length of the main line. Otherwise, I would prefer to just leave out the introductory play. Not all the non-awarded studies had these defects, though. Some studies had ideas I found interesting, but with constructional defects I found too severe, or with too strong anticipations to include them in the award. There arefour studies where I would like to comment specifically on why I did not include them in the award (king positions in brackets):
-№6. $\mathrm{Kg} 5 / \mathrm{Kg} 8$ : I liked the play in this solver-friendly study. The final stalemate is of course not original, but the way it arises is new. However, the reason I did not include this study is White's rook, which does not participate until it is captured on the last move. If it is possible to make White's rook part of the play, then this will be a good candidate for an award.
-№22. Kd6/Ka5: This study immediately caught my interest as it shows a fortress which was unknown to me. I was not able to find any examples of this fortress in HHdbVI either. However, the main line itself is not very eyecatching. If it is possible to extend the main line somehow - an interesting try, a paradoxical manoeuvre, etc. - then it would be a good candidate for an award.
-№42. Ka6/Kc4: The mutual zugzwang position is surprising, and it seems to be original. However, I am not convinced the introductory play adds anything significant to the study. If possible, I would prefer an introduction where a try leads to the mutual zugzwang with White to move. If not, then I would prefer to just remove the first 5 moves.
-№62. Kc6/Kd4: I would easily have given this study a prize if it was all original. However, I think the main point of the study is the manoeuvre starting at move 5 , and that manoeuvre has been shown before in various versions. I still think the introduction is a nice addition, particularly the 4th move where I did not find any direct anticipations, but it should be presented as an addition to previous studies.
-№65.Kg8/Kf6: A fascinating rook endgame which would have been included in the award if it was all original. However, only the first three moves are new. The thematic tries add a new element to the original study, but not enough to be included in the award, and the study should be presented as an addition to the original. By the way, I
would have chosen $7 \ldots \mathrm{Kf6}$ as the main line, like the original study does. Now over to the awarded studies:

№38. David Gurgenidze \& Martin Minski (Georgia/Germany) ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Prize.
1.Qc3! (1.Bg1+? Kc6!-+;1.Kb2? Bf6+-+] 1...Bf6 2.Ne4+! (2.Bg1+? Kc6-+) 2...Qxe4 3.Bg1+ main A: 3...Bd4 (3...Kc6 4.Qxf6+=) 4.Bxd4+ Qxd4 5.Ka2! [logical try: 5.Qxd4+? Kxd4 6.Kb2 Kd3-+ position X with wPc4] 5...Qxc4+ [5...Qxc3 postion Y with bQc3, stalemate] 6.Qxc4+ Kxc4 7.Kb2 Kd3 position X without the wPc4 8.Kc1 a3 ideal stalemate [8...Kc3 model stalemate] main B: 3...Qd4! 4.Ka2! [logical try: 4.Bxd4+? Bxd4 5.Ka2 (5.Qxd4+ Kxd4 6.Kb2 Kd3-+ position $X$ with wPc4) 5...Bxc3-+ position Y with bBc3, no stalemate] 4...Qxg1 5.Qa5+ Kxc4 [main: 5...Kd6 6.Qd5+ Ke7 7.Qc5+! (7.Qb7+? Kf8 8.Qc8+ Kg7 9.Qd7+ Kh6 10.Qd2+ Qg5 11.Qxc2 Qc5! 12.Qxa4 Qf2+ 13.Kb3 Qb2\# mate with self-block) 7...Qxc5 model stalemate] 6.Qa6+ Kd5 7.Qb7+ Kd6 8.Qb8+ Ke6 9.Qc8+ Kf7 10.Qc7+ Le7 [10...Kg8 11.Qc8+ Kg7 12.Qd7+ Kg6 13.Qd3+ Kh5 14.Qh7+ Kg4 15.Qe4+ Kg5 16.Qe3+! Qxe3 stalemate] 11.Qc4+ Kf8 12.Qc8+ Kg7 13.Qc3+ Kg8 [13...Bf6 14.Qg3+! Qxg3 stalemate]14.Qc8+ Bf8 15.Qc4+ Kh8 16.Qh4+! [16.Dd4+?! Dg7!-+] 16...Kg7 17.Qd4+! Qxd4 model stalemate. After a pleasant introduction with crosspins, therefollows a position after $5 \ldots \mathrm{Kxc} 4$ where White's queen has to give check on the right square no less than 12 times before finally sacrificing herself for a model stalemate. In the meantime, Black's king is able to walk from c4 to h 8 on an open board, only to be forced onto the wrong square in the end. A remarkable discovery, masterfully constructed! Adding to the already brilliant main line, there are additional lines $3 \ldots \mathrm{Bd} 4$ and $5 \ldots \mathrm{Kd} 6$ leading to different model stalemates.

## №58. Sergey Osintsev (Russia) 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Prize.

Logical try 1.Kf7? Nd5! 2.Kxe6 (2.g3 h4! 3.gxh4 Nxf4=) 2...Nxf4+ 3.Kd6 h4! 4.Kc6 h5 (или 4...h3 5.gxh3 h5 6.Kd6 h4 7.Kc6 Ne6) 5.Kd6 h3! 6.gxh3 h4! 7.Kc6 Ne6 8.Kd5 (8.Kd7 Nc5+ 9.Kc8 Nxa6=) and if 8...Nf4+? 9.Kd6! Nd5, then $10 . \mathrm{b} 7+$ ! (not $10 . \mathrm{Kxd5}$ ? =) 10...Kxa7 11.Kxd5+-, but $8 \ldots . . \mathrm{Nc} 5!9 . \mathrm{Kxc} 5=$ stalemate, there is no f 5 pawn on the board! 9.b7+ Nxb7!=; 9.Kd6 Nxa6! 10.Kc6 Nb4+!=; 1.Kf6! Ng6! 1...Nd5+ 2.Ke5! Nxb6 3.Kxe6 Nc4 4.f5 Ne3 5.g3! (5.f6? Nxg2 6.Kf5=) 5...Ng4 6.f6+- 2.f5!! logical try 2.Kxe6? Nxf4+ etc; 2.g3? h4! 3.gxh4 Nxf4= 2...exf5 3.Ke6 There was just a pawn on this square! 3...Nf4+ 4.Kd6 h4 5.Kc6! Ne6 6.Kd5! Nf4+ 7.Kd6 h6 8.Kc6 Ne6 9.Kd5 Nf4+ 10.Kd6 h5 11.Kc6 Ne6 12.Kd5 Nf4+ 13.Kd6 h3 14.gxh3 h4 15.Kc6 Ne6 16.Kd5 Ng7 After 16...Nf4+ 17.Kd6+- the remaining f5 pawn brings Black a loss; 16...f4 17.Kxe6 f3 18.Kd7(d6) f2 19.Kc7 f1Q 20.b7+ Kxa7 21.b8Q+ Kxa6 22.Qb6\#, 17.Kd6! Lost of time 17.Kc6?! Ne6 18.Kd5 Ng 7 and the position will be repeated. 17...f4 18.Kd7!+18.Kc7? Ne8+! 19.Kc8 Nd6+ 20.Kd7 Nb5! 21.b7+ Kxa7 22.Kc8 Nd6+ 23.Kc7 Ne8(b5)+ 24.Kc8 Nd6+= perpetual check. 18...f3 19.Kc8(b7+) f2 20.b7+(Kc8) Kxa7 21.b8Q++- Systematic movement, "the effect of foresight". A logical study where the natural 2.Kxe6 fails while the counter-intuitive 2.f5!! exf5 3.Ke6! wins, landing on the square which Black's pawn has just left. Only on move 15 it shows why White had to do this, as Black's pawn prevents the stalemate defense. At first sight, White's pawn sacrifice even seems to create losing chances as it gives Black the possibility to create a passed pawn, until you realize that Black can never play f 4 because the knight needs that square. A paradoxical solution in an apparently simple position!
№20. Pavel Arestov \& Daniel Keith (Russia/France) $\mathbf{3}^{\text {rd }}$ Prize.

1. h5 Nh3 (1...Ne2 2. Ke5 +-; 1...Ra8 2. Bc3 +- ; 1... Ra7 2.Bd2! Rh7 3.h6 +-) 2. Ke5 (2. Bg3+? Kg2 =) 2... Ra8!
2. Rd2+! (3. Kf5? Rf8+ 4. Kg4 Rf4\#; 3. Kf6? Rh8! 4. Kg6 Nf4+ =; 3. Bg3+? Kg2 4. Kf6 Rh8 5. Kg6 Rg8+ =;
3. Bd2? Nf2! 4. Bf4+ Kh1! =) 3... Kh1! [3.. Kg1 4. Kf5 Rh8 5. Kg4 Nf4 6. Bf2+! Kf1 (6... Kh1 7. Kxf4 Rxh5
4. Kg4 Rh7 9. Bg3 Kg1 10. Kf3 Rf7+ 11. Bf4) 7. Kf3 +-] 4. Kf5 (4. Rd3? Kg2 =) 4...Rh8 (4...Ra5+5. Kg4 Nf4 6. h6 +-) 5. Bh4!! Try:5. Kg4? Nf4! 6. Kxf4 Rxh5 7. Bg3 (7. Bf2 Rh7! (7... Rb5? 8. Be3 Rb4+ 9. Kf3 +- echo-win) 8. Bg3 Rb7! 9. Kf3 Rb3+ 10. Kg4 Kg1 =) 7...Rb5!! (7...Rc5? 8. Kg4 +-; 7...Ra5? 8. Bf2! Ra8 9. Kf3 Rf8+ 10. Kg4 Rg8+ 11. Kh3 Rd8 12. Bd4 +-; 7. ... Rh7? 8. Kf3 Rf7+ 9. Bf4 +- echo-win) 8. Bf2 (8. Kg4 Kg1 =) 8... Rb7! 9. Kf3 $\underline{\mathrm{Rf} 7+10 . \mathrm{Kg} 3 \mathrm{Rg} 7+11 . \mathrm{Kh} 3 \mathrm{Rd} 7!12 . \mathrm{Bd} 4 \mathrm{Rh} 7+13 \text {. Kg3 Rh3+14. Kxh3 stalemate 5... Rxh5+ 6. Kg4 Nf4! 7. Bg5! }}$ Rh3! [7... Rh8!? Black moves the wKing away from f 3 and keeps their rook on the first line (f1 and g1). It's desperate, the bKing has to get out of the corner. 8. Bxf4 Rg8+ 9. Kf3 Rg2 10. Rd1+ Rg1 11. Rd3! Rf1+ 12. Kg3 Rg1+ 13. Kh3 Rf1 14. Be5 /Bg5 14. .. Rg1 15. Bf6! +- White will create zugzwangs by playing his bishop and the bR will have to leave the first row. Then White will win as in the solution.] 8. Bxf4 Ra3 9. Re2! Kg1 10. Be3+ Kf1 11. Kf3 Ra8 12. Rh2! Rf8+ 13. Bf4 Rg8 14. Bh6! (14. Rf2+? Ke1 15. Rc2 Rd8! =) 14...Rg6 15. Be3 Rf6+ 16. Bf4 Rg6 17. Rf2+ Ke1 18. Rc2 Kd1 19. Rc1\# 1-0. This miniature got better the more I dug into it. At first sight, the diagram looks like it is just a technical tablebase position, but the lines arising from it are fascinating. Black's $3 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 1$ ! Is brilliant, sidestepping the line $3 \ldots \mathrm{Kg} 14 . \mathrm{Kf5} 5 \mathrm{Rh} 85 . \mathrm{Kg} 4 \mathrm{Nf} 46 . \mathrm{Bf} 2+\mathrm{Kf1} 7 . \mathrm{Kf} 3$ !. And then there is the paradoxical 5.Bh4! instead of the "automatic" $5 . \mathrm{Kg} 4$ ? due to a stalemate ten moves ahead! The resulting endgame with rook and bishop against rook is a well-known win.
5. Itay Richardson(Israel)
$7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Honorable Mention


51. Michael Pasman (Israel)
$7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$2^{\text {nd }}$ Honorable Mention

4. Amatzia Avni (Israel)
$7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$3^{\text {rd }}$ Honorable Mention

№71. Itay Richardson (Israel) $1^{\text {st }}$ Honorable Mention.

1. Sef8+! (1. Rg3? Bxe6=; 1. Rxc4?? g1=Q+ -+) 1... Sxf8 [1... Kg7\g8 2. Rg3 Sxf8 3. Sxf8 Bd5 (3... Bb5 4. Rf4 Rxf8 4. Kh4+ +-) 4. Sg6 +- ; 1... Rxf8 2. Sxf8+ +-] 2. Ra7+ Bf7! (2...Kg8 3. Kh6! (Threatening 4. Rg7\#) 3... Sxg6
2. Rxe8+ Sf8 5. Rg7+ Kh8 6. Rxf8+ Bg8 7. Rfxg8\#) 3. Rxf7+ Kg8 4. Kf6! (Threatening 5. Rg7\#) 4. Rxe8?? g1Q+ -+ ) 4... Sh7+! [4... Sd7+5. Rxd7 Rf8+6. Sxf8 g1=Q 7. Se6 Qf2+ (7... Qxe3 8. Rd8+ Kh7 9. Sg5+ Kh6 10. Rh8\#) 8. Kg6 Qg2+ 9. Kh5 Qh1+ 10. Kg4 Qg2+ (10... Qf1 11. Rd8+ Kh7 12. Rh3+ Kg6 13. Rg8+Kf7 14. Rf8+ +-) 11. Rg3 Qe4+ 12. Kh5+ Kh8 13. Rd8+ Kh7 14. Rg7\#, 4... Re6+ 5. Rxe6 Sxe6 6. Re7+- with and unstoppable mate after 7. Re8] 5. Rxh7 (5. Kf5? Rxe3 -+) 5... Rf8+! [5... Re6+ 6. Rxe6 (6.Kxe6? g1=Q =) 6... Kxh7 7. Re8 8. Rh8\#, 5... Kxh7 6. Rh3+ 7. Rh8\#] 6. Sxf8 (6. Ke7?? g1=Q -+) 6... g1Q 7. Rh8! Kxh8 8. Sg6+ Kg8 9. Re8+ 10. Rh8\# ( $8 \ldots \mathrm{Kh} 79 . \mathrm{Rh} 3+10 . \mathrm{Rh} 8 \#$ ). A tactical battle in an almost aristocratic setting with attractive play from both sides whereWhite's attack is met by strong responsesfrom Black. In the end, Black finally gets time to queen, but White has the last laugh as the final rook sacrifice leads to mate.
№51. Michael Pasman (Israel) $\mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \mathbf{H o n o r a b l e}$ Mention.
1.Qc1+! Kxf2! (1...Rxc1 2.Rxc1+ Kxf2 3.Bc5++-; 1...Ke2 2.e7) 2.Rc2+ (2.Bc5+?? Kf3) 2...Kf3 3.e7! (3.Rxa2 Rxc1+ 4.Bxc1 Qg2+! 5.Rxg2= Stalemate) 3...Rxc1+(3...a1Q 4.Rf6+!!) 4.Bxc1 a1Q (4...Qxe7 5.Rg2!+-) 5.Rf6+!! [ 5.e8Q?? Qxc1+ 6.Rxc1 Qg2\#; 5.Rxa1 Qg2+! 6.Rxg2 Stalemate ] 5...Qaxf6 [5...Qgxf6 6.e8Q Qae5 7.Qa8+! Kg4 8.Qg8+ Kh3
9.Qg2++- ] 6.e8Q Qg1+! [ 6...Qe5 7.Qa8+ ( 7.Qc6+ )] 7.Kxg1 Qg6+! 8.Kf1! [ 8.Qxg6 Stalemate ] 8...Qxe8 [ 8...Qg2+ 9.Ke1! Qg1+ 10.Kd2 ] 9.Rg2! Qg6 10.Rg3+! [ 10.Rxg6 Stalemate ] 1-0. A rook sacrificing itself in the crossfire of two enemy queens ( $5 . \mathrm{Rf} 6+!$ ) is a rare sight! The play is impressive throughout the main line, where White has to step carefully to prevent Black's stalemate attempts. In the end, Black is able to restore material equality, only to find his king is about to get mated.
№4. Amatzia Avni (Israel) $3^{\text {rd }}$ Honorable Mention.
1.Rg8+ Kh6 2.Nf2 Qe6! [2...d1Q 3.Nxd1 Qe6 (3...Qxd1 4.Be2!!+-) 4.Rh8++-] 3.Ng4+ Qxg4 4.Rxg4 d1Q 5.Be2!! Qxe2 [5...Qd5 6.Ra6+ Kh7 7.Rd4+-] 6.Bc1+ [6.Bg7+? Rxg7 7.Rxe2 Rxg4=] 6...Rd2! [Novotny] 7.Rxd2 [7.Bxd2+?? Nf4+ (7...Ne3+-+)] 7...Qxg4 8.Rd4+ Nf4! [A second black Novotny] 9.Rxf4 [9.Bxf4+?=] 9...Qg7 [9...Qd1 10.Rf1+; 9...Qh5+ 10.Rh4+; 9...Qc8 10.Rc4+; 9...Qe2+ 10.Rf2+] 10.Rf5+! [but not 10.Rh4+? Kg6 11.Rg4+ Kh5! 12.Rxg7 stalemate] 10...Kh7 11.Rh5+ Kg8 12.Rg5 1-0 Themes: Deflection, discovered attack, Novotny, stalemate, anti-stalemate. (Author). Two Novotny defenses in response to two discovered attacks give an aesthetically pleasing impression. In the end, it becomes clear that Black's queen cannot escape White's battery, but a final stalemate trap makes sure White has to play accurately until the very end.
3. Pavel Arestov (Russia) $7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$4^{\text {th }}$ Honourable Mention

4. R.Staudte \& M.Schlosser $7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$5^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention

5. Richard Becker (USA) $7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$1^{\text {st }}$ Commendation

№69. Pavel Arestov (Russia) $4^{\text {th }}$ Honourable Mention.
1.Nf3+ (1.Rb1? Bxe1 2.Rxe1+ Kf2 -+)1...Kf1! (1...Kf2 2.Ra2+! Kxf3 3.Ra3+! Ke2 4.Rb2+ Kf1 5.Rf3+! Ke1 6.Kxg2 +-) 2.Ra1+! (2.Rb1+? Kf2 3.Rb2+Kxf3 4.Ra3+Kxf4 =)2...Be1! (2...Kf2 3.Ra2+Kxf3 3.Ra3+! see ${ }^{\text {st }}$ move)
3.Rxe1+ (3.Nh2+? Kg1! 4.Rxe1+ Kf2 5.Rbb1 Qh8+6.Kg4 Qg8+ 7.Kf5 Qd5+ 8.Kf6 Kg3 =) 3...Kf2 4.Nxc5! Qc8+! (4...Qxb4 5.Nd3++-5.Ne6 g1N+! (5...Kxf3 6.f5! Kf2 7.Rbb1 +-; 5...g1Q 6.Rxg1 - main line. 6.Rxg1! [6.Nxg1? Qc3+! 7.Nf3 (7.Kg4 Qxe1=) 7...Qxf3+ 8.Kh4 Qxe1=] 6...Qxe6+ 7.f5! Qxf5+ (7...Qh6+ 8.Rh4 +-) 8.Kh2 Qh5+! Play for stalemate. 9.Nh4 Qe5+ 10.Kh1! Qe4+! (10...Qd5+ 5.Ng2 (Rg2) +-) 11.Rg2+! (11.Rxe4? - stalemate №1) 11...Kf1! 12.Rb1+!! (12.Rxe4? - stalemate №2) 12...Qxb1 13.Rg1+, win. After a tactical introduction, we find ourselves in an original 6-piece endgame with an attractive finish. Just as White seems to have escaped the checks, Black comes up with a stalemate attempt, but White responds with a decisive rook sacrifice.
№60. Rainer Staudte \& Michael Schlosser (Germany) $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Honorable Mention.
1.Sd5+! The Knight strives for c3 to stop the Pawn. 1...Kc4 (1) 2.Sce7! Kb3 3.Sf5! c4 (threatens c3) (2) 4.Sd4+! controls the square c3 $\mathbf{4 . . . K a 2}$ (3) The Black King reached the drawing zone, but White can checkmate. 5.Sc3+! Ka1 (4) 6.Sc2\# ,(1) 1...Kb3 2.Sa5+! Ka4 3.Sc4! safely guarded Pawn on Troitsky line, 3...Kb3 4.Sde3 or Sdb6, (2) 3...Kc4 4.Sfe3+! Kd3 5.Sd1!,(3) 4...Ka3 5.Sc3!; 4...Ka4 5.Sc3+!,(4) 5...Ka3 6.Kb1 or Kc2. When I saw this diagram, my first thought was that this would be a meaningless computer study. Could there really be anything new to discover in a 5piece endgame that has been thoroughly analyzed since Troitzky? It turned out I was wrong. A symmetrical starting position with a unique winning line ending in mate is a surprising discovery. And the winning line is humanly understandable as long as you know how far White can allow the pawn to advance. Admittedly, making 5...Kal the main line feels a bit arbitrary as it shortens the mate by 52 moves, but the study is technically sound and the immediate mate is the only way to win.
№46. Richard Becker (USA) $1^{\text {st }}$ Commendation.
1.Qa2+! (1.Qd2? Qg1!=;1.Sc6? Rb2! 2.Qxb2 Qc5+ 3.Kxc5 stalemate)1...Kb6 2.Qb2+! [ 2.Qf2+? Kc7 3.Se6+Kd7! 4.Qf7+ Kd6 5.Qf4+ Kd7 6.Sc5+ Ke8 7.Qe5+ Re7 =;2.Qb3+? Kc7 3.Sxb7 Qa6+ 4.Qb5 Qa2+ 5.Kd3 Qa3+ 6.Kd2 Qa2+ 7.Ke3 Qa3+ 8.Ke2 Qe7+ 9.Kd1 Qd7! 10.d6+ Kc8 11.Qa6 Kb8 12.Sc5 Qb4+ = ] 2...Kc7 3.Se6+ Kd7 4.Qg7+ Kd6 5.Qg3+ Ke7 6.Qh4+ Kd6 7.Qh2+ Ke7 8.Sc5! Kd8 [8...Rc7(or Rd7) 9.d6+ -+ ] 9.Qh8+ Kc7 10.Qg7+ [ 10.d6+? Kc6 11.Qh1+ Kxd6 12.Qh6+ Ke7 13.Qg7+ Ke8 = ] 10...Kb6 11.Qb2+ Kc7 12.d6+! Kxd6 [ 12...Kc6 13.Qxb7+ Qxb7 14.Sxb7 -+ ] 13.Qf6+ Kc7 14.Qe7+ Kc7 15.Qe6+ Kc7 16.Qd7+ Kb6 17.Qd6+ Ka5 18.Qd8+ Rc7 19.Qd2+ Kb6 20.Qb2+ Kc6 21.Qf6\#. 21 precise moves is required in order to reach a beautiful midboard mate. Along the way, White has time for a silent move (8.Nc5!) in spite of Black's heavy material, and a surprising pawn sacrifice (12.d6+!). Add a natural try with a stalemate defense (1.Nc6?) and the fact that all this is achieved in a miniature setting, and you have a study which left a strong impression on me. The major downside is that Black's queen does not take part in the play at all, including the final position. In most cases, this would have made me exclude the study from the award. In this case, my overall impression of the study is that it is good enough to be included. If the Black queen somehow participated, this would have been a strong candidate for a prize.

№63.Ilić Miloje \& Djurašević Branislav ( Serbia) 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Commendation.
1.Ba6!! [1.Qxe5? gxf1N+! 2.Kh1 Ng3+! 3.Kh2 (3.Qxg3 Qal + or 3.... Qc1+4.Kh2 Qg1+5.Kxg1 h2+6.Kf2 h1N+!=) 3...Nf1!+= Perpetual check; 1.Bxg2? Qa2! (1...hxg2 2.Qxg2!+-; 1...Qxc5 2.Kxh3 Qxb6 3.Qxe5 Kxa7 4.e4+-) 2.Kxh3 Qe6+! (2...Qg8? 3.Qxc6!! e4 4.Qxb7+!+- (4.Bxe4?? Qe6+ 5.Kg3 bxc6-+) ) 3.Qg4 Qxg4+4.Kxg4 e4=] 1...Qxa6 [1...g1Q+ 2.Kxg1 h2+ 3.Kxh2 Qxa6 4.Qg4!+- The same as in the main variation.; 1...Qa1 2.Bxb7+! Kxb7 3.Qh7+! Ka8 4.Qg8++-] 2.Qg4! [2.Qg6? g1Q+! 3.Kxg1 h2+! 4.Kxh2 Qe2+!=] 2...g1Q+ 3.Kxg1 h2+ 4.Kxh2 Qe2+! 5.Qxe2 e4 6.Qa6!! [6.Qb5? cxb5-+; 6.Qd3? exd3-+; 6.Qf3? exf3=] 6...bxa6 7.Kg3 a5 8.Kf4 a4 9.Ke5 a3 10.Kd6 Kb7 11.a8Q++- 1-0. The three pieces from the initial position are all sacrificed, and in a geometrically pleasing pattern: Bf1-a6, Qa6-e2 and Qe2-a6.
№64. Ilinčić Borislav \& Djurašević Branislav (Serbia) $3^{\text {rd }}$ Commendation.
1.Qf2+! [1.Rg7+? Ka8!=] 1...e3 2.Rg7+! [thematic try: 2.Rh7+? Re7 3.Rxe7+ Qxe7 4.Rg7 Qxg7 5.Qxe3+ Ka8 6.Qf3+ Ka7 7.Qf2+ Ka8=] 2...Re7 3.Rxe7+ Qxe7 4.Rh7! The point. 4...Qxh7 [4...exf2 5.Rxe7+ Ka8 (5...Kb6 6.Rb7\#) 6.b6 or 6. Re6 with mate in 1] 5.Qxe3+ Ka8 6.Qf3+ Ka7 7.Qf2+ Ka8 8.Qg2+! Ka7 9.Qg1+ Ka8 10.Qa1+ Na4 11.Qxa4+ Qa7 12.b6! [12.Qxa7+? Kxa7 13.Kc7 b2 14.b6+ Ka6 15.b7 b1Q=] 12...Qxa4 13.b7+ Ka7 14.b8Q+ Ka6 15.Qb7\# 1-0. A logical study where White has to choose the right rook in order to force Black's queen to the right square. 12.b6! is a pleasant final touch.

## №42. Pavel Arestov(Russia) 4 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Commendation.

1. Rc8+! (1.Rg3? Kb4! 2.Rb3+ Ka4 3.Rb5 Bg7 4.c3!? Bxc3! 5.e5 a1Q 6.h8Q Bb4! 7.Qc8 Qc3! =) 1...Kb4 2.Rb8+ Kc4! (2...Ka4 3.e5! Bxe5 4.h8Q Bxh8 5.Rxh8 a1Q 6.Rh4+ Qd4 7.Rxd4\#). 3.Rb3! (3.Rc8+? Kb4 - pos. draw).
3...Bb2 4.Rxa3! a1Q+! (4...Bxa3 4.h8Q +-) 5.Rxa1 Bxa1 6.Kb7!! (Try: 6.Kb6? Be5! zz 7.Kc6 Kd4 zz 8.c3+! Kc4! 9.Kd7 Kxc3 10.Ke6 Kd4 11.Kf5 Bg7(Bh8) =) 6...Be5! 7.Kb6! zz (7.Kc6? Kd4! see try) 7...Kd4 8.Kc6 zz 8...Kxe4 (8...Kc4 9.c3(Kd7) +-) 9.c4 Kd4 10.Kb5! (10.c5? Kc4! 11.Kb6 Bd4! 12.Kc6 Be5! - pos draw)
10...Bg7 11.c5 Kd5 12.c6 Kd6 13.Kb6 Bd4+ 14.Kb7, win.6.Kb7! is a surprise, leading to an original mutual zugzwang position.
2. Alexander Shpakovsky(Russia)
$7^{\text {th }}$ Tourney FRME, 2021
$5^{\text {th }}$ Commendation


Draw
b) bKe7 => g7 (2+4)
a) diagram 1. Nc5! A (1. Nc3? B) 1... Kf7 [1... f5 2. Kd5 Kf6 3. Nd7+ ~ 4. Nxe5=] 2. Kb7! [2. Kd6? Nb6!-+] 2... f5 3. Kc6!! C (3. Kxa8? D) 3... e4 [3... Kf6 4. Nd7+ =] 4. Kd5 Nc7+ 5. Ke5! Draw! [5. Kd4? Ne6+! 6. Nxe6 Kxe6 -+] 1/2-1/2; b) bKe7 => g7 1. Nc3! B (1. Nc5? A) 1... Kf7 2. Kb7! [2. Kd6? Nb6! -+] 2... Ke6 3. Kxa8 D (3. Kc6? C) 3... f5 4. Kb7 Kd6 [4...f4 5. Kc6 =] 5. Kb6! f4 6. Kb5= 1/2-1/2 The switchback 3.Kc6! in position A is a good find.
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