

US CHESS FEDERATION'S OFFICIAL

RULES OF CHESS

7TH EDITION

FREE DOWNLOAD VERSION: CHAPTER 2 ONLY
Revised August 24, 2020

Tim Just, Chief Editor

US Chess National Tournament Director
FIDE National Arbiter



US CHESS
FEDERATION

© 2018 by United States Chess Federation

Summary Of Major US Chess Rules Updates In the Seventh Edition For Chapter 2

28L2a Variation (announced): Giving the bye to a higher rated player. A variation that need not be announced in advance was added to rule 28L2. The variation allows assigning the bye to a higher rated player, rather than the lowest rated player, in the lowest score group in order to improve color assignments for the entire group.

29E8: Variation (unannounced) team pairings take precedence over color equalization. A variation that need not be announced in advance was added to rule 28E. Variation 29E8 avoids pairing players from the same team as a higher priority than equalizing player assigned colors in team/individual tournaments.

32B1: Special prizes, above and beyond the typical prize fund, should be announced and designated.

32B3: When pooling prizes, no player can receive a prize larger than the largest amount they would be eligible for without the split.

33D1: Added wording regarding special prizes.

35F10e: Added duties of an assistant to a blind or disabled player.

35F10g: Added duties of an assistant to a blind or disabled player.

Links in this document sometimes refer to chapters not available online and may not work as expected.

Contents

US CHESS FEDERATION'S	1
OFFICIAL	1
RULES OF CHESS	1
7TH EDITION	1
Tim Just, Chief Editor	1
US Chess National Tournament Director	1
SUMMARY OF MAJOR US CHESS RULES UPDATES IN THE SEVENTH EDITION FOR CHAPTER 2	2
CHAPTER 2: OFFICIAL RULES OF CHESS	5
TOURNAMENT SECTION.....	5
25. Introduction	5
26. Variations and Exceptions	5
26A. Notification.	5
26B. Major variations.	5
27. The Swiss System tournament.....	5
27A. Basic Swiss system rules.	6
28. Swiss System Pairings, Procedures	6
28A. Pairing cards or program.....	6
28B. Numbering late entrants.	9
28C. Ratings of players.....	9
28D. Players without US Chess ratings.	10
28E. Assigned ratings for rated players.	11
28F. Validity of wall-chart ratings.....	11
28G. Old ratings.	12
28H. Revising ratings after tournament begins.....	12
28I. Opponents of expelled players.	12
28J. The first round.....	12
28K. Late entrants.....	13
28L. Full-point byes.....	13
28M. Alternatives to byes.....	14
28N. Combined individual-team tournaments.	15
28O. Scoring.....	16
28P. Unplayed games.	17
28Q. Pairing unfinished games.....	18
28R. Accelerated pairings in the first two rounds.....	18
28S. Reentries.....	19
28T Variation. Players may request a non-pairing against each other.....	20
29. Swiss System Pairings, Subsequent Rounds.....	20
29A. Score groups and rank.....	20
29B. Order of pairing score groups.....	21
29C. Method of pairing score groups.	21
29D. The odd player.	21
29E. Color allocation.	23
29F. Last-round pairings with unfinished games.....	32
29G. Re-pairing a round.	32
29H. Unreported results.....	33
29I. Class pairings.	34
29J. Unrateds in class tournaments.....	35
29K. Converting small Swiss to round robin.....	35
29L. Using round robin table in small Swiss.....	35
29M. Recommendations.....	36

30. The Round Robin Tournament	36
30A. Description.....	36
30B. Scoring	37
30C. Withdrawals.....	37
30D. Penalties for withdrawals.....	37
30E. Effect of withdrawals on colors.....	37
30F. Double round robins.....	37
30G. Quads.....	37
30H. Holland system.....	37
30I. Unbalanced Holland.....	38
31. Team Chess.....	38
31A. Combined individual-team tournaments.....	38
31B. Player rankings.....	39
31C. Team ratings.....	40
31D. Pairing cards.....	40
31E. Pairing rules.....	40
31F. Wall charts.....	41
31G. Team captain.....	41
32. Prizes	42
32A. Announcement.....	42
32B. Distribution.....	42
32C. Payment.....	43
32D. Minimum penalty for violation of 32C4.....	45
32E. Partial guarantees.....	45
32F. Trophies.....	45
32G. Other non-cash prizes.....	45
33. Some Notes About Prize Funds	46
33A. First prize.....	46
33B. Place prizes and class prizes.....	46
33C. Classes.....	46
33D. Non-monetary (indivisible) prizes.....	46
33E. Prizes based on points.....	50
33F. Unrateds.....	50
34. Breaking Ties.....	51
34A. Introduction.....	51
34B. Announcement.....	51
34C. Monetary prizes.....	51
34D. Choice of tiebreak methods.....	51
34E. Calculating Swiss tiebreaks.....	51
34F. Round robin tiebreaks.....	53
34G. Team tiebreaks.....	53
34H. Reentry tiebreaks.....	54
35. Rules for Disabled and Assisted Players	54
35A. Purpose.....	54
35B. Equality of treatment.....	54
35C. Eligibility for US Chess events.....	54
35D. Analogous situations.....	54
35E. Access.....	54
35F. Rules for visually impaired and disabled players.....	55
36. Rules and Regulations for Computer Participants	57
36A. Membership.....	57
36B. Purchase of membership.....	57
36C. Computer participation must be advertised in advance.....	57
36D. Player may not object.....	57
36E. Computer vs. computer.....	57
36F. Prize eligibility.....	57

36G. Commercial computers.....	57
36H. Consultation.....	57
36I. Rules for play involving computers.....	57

An additional set of [scholastic rules](#), developed by the Scholastic Committee for scholastic tournaments, may apply instead of the rules in this book. The scholastic rules are updated often and are available from [US Chess](#).

Chapter 2: Official Rules of Chess

Tournament Section

25. Introduction

A player entering a competition has a right and an obligation to know the rules and conditions. What follows, therefore, is an exposition of U.S. tournament procedures as they are now practiced. The most significant features of a tournament should be noted in the advance publicity and posted prominently at the tournament site. These include round times, speed of play, major pairing variations, prizes, and tiebreak procedures. Players should understand, however, that last-minute circumstances can sometimes force revisions of earlier plans, though conscientious organizers and directors do all they can to avoid changes in announced conditions for competition.

The most common types of US Chess-rated tournaments are the Swiss system and the round robin. Rules for their conduct are discussed below.

26. Variations and Exceptions

26A. Notification.

Any variations from these published standards, including variations discussed in this rulebook, should be posted and/or announced at the tournament prior to their use, preferably before the first round.

26B. Major variations.

A variation sufficiently major that it might reasonably be expected to deter some players from entering should be mentioned in any *Chess Life* announcement and all other detailed pre-tournament publicity and posted and/or announced at the tournament.

27. The Swiss System tournament

The Swiss system can accommodate a large number of players in a relatively short time and has therefore become widespread. Although not as accurate as the completed round robin in determining a winner, the ratings-controlled Swiss is more precise than earlier versions. Since its methods are complex, novice directors should learn them by working with an experienced director.

A Swiss tournament should ideally have a number of rounds adequate to reduce the number of players with perfect scores to one. This result can be guaranteed by limiting entries to a number no greater than two raised to the power of the number of rounds ($2^{\text{number of rounds}} = \text{ideal number of players that produce a single winner}$). For example, a three-round Swiss will produce no more than one perfect score for up to eight players ($2^3=2 \times 2 \times 2=8$), a four-round Swiss can handle up to sixteen players ($2^4=2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=16$), a five-round up to thirty-two players ($2^5=2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2=32$). **See also 28R, [Accelerated pairings in the first two rounds](#).**

In practice, however, these numbers are only guides due to the unpredictable number of draws. A properly paired Swiss system usually produces no more than one perfect score from at least double the theoretical number of

players. It cannot, however, guarantee a clear winner, nor can it assure that competitors for the same awards will face opposition of similar strength.

It is both a weakness and strength of the Swiss system that slow starters will tend to have faced weaker fields than players who do well in the early rounds but finish with the same end result. While this situation has an element of inequity, it tends to keep more players in the running for a longer time, making Swiss tournaments competitive and exciting.

27A. Basic Swiss system rules.

The following rules are listed in order of priority from [27A1](#) for the highest priority to [27A5](#) for the lowest. If it is not possible to adhere to all rules in making pairings, the director should generally follow the rule with the higher priority. However, there are cases in which [27A4, Equalizing colors](#), or [27A5, Alternating colors](#), have priority over [27A3, Upper half vs. lower half](#), (see [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#)) and even a variation in which [27A4, Equalizing colors](#), can have priority over [27A2, Equal scores](#) (see [29E5f, Colors in a series](#); [29E5f1, Last round exception](#); and [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#)).

27A1. Avoid players meeting twice (highest priority).

A player may not play the same opponent more than once in a tournament. Even this most basic of all pairing rules must be violated when the number of rounds is greater than or equal to the number of players. If it is necessary for players to play each other twice, then top priority should subsequently be given to having them face each other no more than twice. If two players were paired against each other earlier in the tournament, but the game was forfeited due to the nonappearance of one, they may be paired against each other again.

27A2. Equal scores.

Players with equal scores are paired whenever possible. Note that if accelerated pairings ([28R](#)) are used, pairings for round two disregard this rule. For exceptions to the priority of this rule see [29E5f, Colors in a series](#); [29E5f1, Last round exception](#); [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#); and [28S1, Reentry playing opponent twice](#).

27A3. Upper half vs. lower half.

Within a score group, i.e., all players who have the same score, the upper half by ranking ([28A](#)) is paired against the lower half. See also [28J, The first round](#); [29C1, Upper half vs. lower half](#); and [29E2, First-round colors](#). For exceptions to the priority of this rule see [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#).

27A4. Equalizing colors.

Players receive each color the same number of times, whenever practical, and are not assigned the same color more than twice in a row. In odd-numbered rounds, the objective is to limit the excess of one color over the other to one. See also [29E, Color allocation](#); [29G, First round colors](#); [29E3, Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#). For exceptions to the priority of this rule see [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#); [29E5f, Colors in a series](#); [29E5f1, Last round exception](#); and [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#).

27A5. Alternating colors.

Players receive alternating colors whenever practical. See also [29E, Color allocation](#); [29E3, Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#). For exceptions to the priority of this rule see [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#); [29E5f, Colors in a series](#); [29E5f1, Last round exception](#); and [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#).

28. Swiss System Pairings, Procedures

28A. Pairing cards or program.

Before the first round, the tournament director prepares a pairing card (Figure 2) for each player, or uses a computer program to enter each player. The player's name, rating, and US Chess ID number are written on the card or entered into the program. For scholastic tournaments, the school or team is also included. Directors who want states or cities on their wall charts add this information as well. See also [28C, Ratings of players](#).

TD TIP: To verify a player's ID number and rating you can check the US Chess rating list (imported to the hard drive) and the Internet at www.uschess.org. To save a lot of time at registration, check the manuals for the pairings programs to see if they can directly import player information from the data downloaded to a hard drive from the US Chess rating list or the US Chess web site. Contact US Chess for more information.

TD TIP: At scholastic events, pairing by hand or with a pairing program, it is useful to give each school team and each of the team members the same school code. This will prove helpful in both preventing team members from being accidentally paired against each other (28N2) and producing team reports. Team codes can be recorded on the pairing cards or in a manner indicated by the pairing software.

If cards are used, they are placed in order of rank, from the highest rated to the lowest. Unrated players and players with the same rating are ranked in random order, with the unrated players being placed at the bottom of the group. The director then numbers the cards, giving the highest-rated player number 1, the second highest number 2, and so on until all the cards are numbered. That number is the player's *pairing number*, which will be used throughout the tournament.

Some directors prefer to assign an arbitrary rating of 1200 or 1300, for pairing purposes only, to all unrated players. Such assignments usually place them at or near the bottom, causing pairings similar to those that would result if they were paired as unrated. One major difference is that in a score group with an odd number of players the lowest rated player drops, but not an unrated player. An unrated player who is scoring well in the tournament would often be the highest-rated player in the score group if all games played up to that point had already been rated.

TD TIP: When assigning a rating to any player (including unrateds) for pairing purposes, directors should make sure they use the pairing numbers, and not the ratings of players, when prioritizing the basic Swiss System rules. Most pairings programs have a separate entry field to perform this task. Consult your pairings program manual to find out more information on how to handle director-assigned player ratings.

The pairing cards are used to prepare the wall chart (28O) and to pair each round. Computer programs also do both, as well as the sorting and numbering described above, all automatically.

PAIRING NO. _____ RATING _____

Round No.	COLOR		Opponent No.	Circle if unplayed		TIE BREAK	
	W	B		SCORE		A	B
				GAME	TOTAL		
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

USCF ID No. _____ EXP. DATE _____

OTHER _____

ENTRY FEES \$ _____ OTHER FEES \$ _____

USCF DUES \$ _____ OTHER DUES \$ _____ TOTAL \$ _____

PRIZE: Place _____ AMOUNT \$ _____

Figure 2

28B. Numbering late entrants.

Players who enter after pairing numbers have been assigned are issued the next available unassigned pairing numbers. These numbers should be accompanied by a symbol such as an asterisk to serve as a reminder that rating and not pairing number should be considered when ordering them in their score groups.

Some directors assign an intermediary pairing number such as 12A for a player rated below player 12 but above player 13. Directors need to take care to ensure that this will not cause problems or confusion with the wall chart. The intermediary numbers may not be used in the ratings report sent to US Chess; therefore, directors must renumber each of the players assigned an intermediary pairing number on the wall chart, remembering to also cross reference this new pairing number with all their opponents' pairings information (see illustration). **See also** [28K](#), [Late entrants](#).

A director using a computer program is able to automatically insert the late entrants in their proper places with other player numbers being appropriately and automatically revised.

Other useful information such as address, fees paid, membership expiration date, etc., may also be recorded on the pairing card or in data fields in pairing programs. US Chess sells standardized pairing cards as well as pairing programs for Swiss system tournaments.

28C. Ratings of players.

The rating entered on a player's card is the last-published US Chess rating in the rating list specified in the *Tournament Life* section of *Chess Life*, unless use of a different rating list was specified in the advance publicity for the tournament, or the director has assigned a player a rating. Note that an assigned rating ([28E](#)) used for a tournament may or may not be used for future tournaments. **See also** the first *TD TIP* for [28A](#).

TD TIP: Players sometimes show the director a US Chess crosstable, or their rating from the US Chess web page. It is common practice to allow players to use those ratings if those ratings are higher than their last published rating ([28E1](#)).

28C1. Multiple US Chess ratings.

If a player is mistakenly assigned more than one US Chess rating, the director should try to combine these ratings. Two examples:

- a. If the ratings are 1900/5 (1900 based on 5 games) and 1700/4 (1700 based on 4 games), the rating used should be 1811, calculated as follows: $1900 \times 5 = 9500$, $1700 \times 4 = 6800$, $9500 + 6800 = 16300$, $16300 / 9 = 1811$.
- b. If a player with an old established rating of 1900 is erroneously started over as 1700/5 (1700 based on 5 games), the rating used should be that of a 1900 player who draws 5 games vs. 1700 player, or 1860. See the chapter on [The US Chess Rating System](#).

28C2. Foreign or FIDE ratings.

A foreign or formerly foreign player with a foreign or FIDE rating or category is required to disclose such a rating or category when entering a tournament, if any of the following circumstances exist:

- a. The player lacks an established US Chess rating.
- b. The player's US Chess rating has not been published during the past two years.
- c. The director requests this information.

If a player fails to disclose such a rating as required and plays in the tournament, the director may withhold any rating-based prize or unrated prize the player may win. Directors have the right not to accept entries from players who fail to disclose rating information.

TD TIP: Often a director can find a player's FIDE rating by checking a recent or old Informant or the official FIDE web site.

28D. Players without US Chess ratings.

Players without official US Chess ratings are eligible only for place (or top non-class) prizes and prizes for unrated players unless alternate procedures are used to assign ratings (28E), such as the following recommendations:

28D1. Non-US Chess ratings verified.

Players who are known to have ratings or categories of other types, such as foreign, FIDE, regional, or US Chess Quick (or if a Quick tournament, US Chess regular), which can be verified.

It is recommended that such players not be considered unrated and that their ratings be used, adjusted if necessary to be consistent with the US Chess rating scale. If a player has more than one non-US Chess rating, the highest should be used.

Currently, the following adjustments are believed to be roughly appropriate. Changes are likely in the future and will be announced in US Chess rating supplements.

- a. Bermuda, Jamaica, Canada, and US Chess Quick (or US Chess regular at Quick tournament): No adjustment needed.
- b. Quebec (FQE): Add 100 points.
- c. FIDE: The following three formulas are provided for guidance:
 - (1) US Chess = FIDE + 50
 - (2) US Chess = 0.895 (FIDE) + 367
 - (3) US Chess = FIDE + 100

Formula (1) represents an average conversion. This means that 50 percent of the time the FIDE-rated player will be stronger than his or her converted US Chess rating would indicate. This becomes important for prize considerations when the FIDE rating is in the low 2100s; i.e., FIDE players between 2100 and 2149 will remain in the US Chess Expert class after their ratings are converted with this formula. By using formula (2), the FIDE-rated player will be stronger than his or her converted US Chess rating only 10 percent of the time, thus providing a degree of protection for the players with established US Chess ratings. Formula (3) provides a great degree of protection for players with established US Chess ratings without compromising the integrity of the FIDE player's strength compared to their new converted US Chess estimate rating. The above is for players with FIDE ratings but no US Chess ratings.

- d. England: Multiply the 3-digit rating by 8 and add 700.
- e. Germany (Ingo System): Multiply by 8, and subtract answer from 2940. Lower Ingo numbers reflect greater strength.
- f. Most nations not named: Add 200 points.
- g. Ratings or categories of the former Soviet Union or of the Philippines: Add 250 points. If a category, use the midpoint—for instance, a Russian Candidate Master should be 2100 + 250 or 2350.
- h. Brazil, Peru, Colombia, or possibly other nations' ratings: These have proved highly unreliable. Players from these countries should not be considered eligible for prizes for classes below 2200 based on such ratings.

28D2. Non-US Chess ratings claimed without verification.

Players who state they have a rating, as listed in [28D1](#), which cannot be verified.

Directors may assign ratings ([28E](#)), but they should not be under 2200 if this would make the player eligible for a class prize.

28D3. US Chess label or printout ratings.

Players who have unofficial initial US Chess ratings on labels or printouts that have not yet appeared in a rating supplement, and who are believed to have no foreign ratings or categories.

Directors are encouraged to use such ratings without adjustment. Players with fewer than four career games, though, are unrated.

28D4. Director-calculated ratings.

Players who have played in one or more US Chess-rated events from which their approximate strength may be calculated but do not yet have even unofficial ratings, and who are believed to have no foreign ratings or categories.

Directors may calculate and use such ratings, but if their calculation puts the player within 100 points of a higher prize category, the assignment (28E) should be raised to put the player in the higher category. Players with fewer than four career games are unrated.

28D5. Assignments based on nonrated activity.

Players lacking known results in US Chess-rated tournaments and believed to have no foreign ratings or categories, but whose strength may reasonably be approximated from other play, such as nonrated club activity, tournaments, or speed games.

Directors may assign ratings (28E), but they should not be under 2200 if this would make the player eligible for a class prize.

28D6. No information on player available.

There are players with no known results, ratings, or categories of any kind.

These players are unrated and should be indicated by *NEW* on the pairing and wall chart. They should not be assigned ratings for prize purposes. If assignments are used for pairing purposes, these should not appear on the wall chart.

28D7. Improperly assigned ratings.

If a director assigns a player rating (28E) that is in violation of any part of 28D, and this is pointed out before prizes are awarded, that player shall not be eligible for prizes based on the assigned rating.

28E. Assigned ratings for rated players.

The director may assign a rating to any rated player.

28E1. Rating level.

The assigned rating shall not be lower than the player's last published US Chess rating, or its foreign or FIDE equivalent, adjusted if necessary, if the player lacks a US Chess rating.

28E2. Cause for assignment.

A rating may be assigned only for reasonable cause, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. The player has shown significant superiority to those in a particular class.
- b. The player has demonstrated a tendency to achieve much better results when significant prizes are at stake than when they are not.
- c. The player's rating has recently dropped into a lower class due to results that are statistically highly unlikely.
- d. The player's moves, time management, statements, or other actions during play in a previous tournament have caused the director to conclude that the player did not make a reasonable effort to avoid losing games.

28E3. Notification.

The director should notify a player assigned a rating, in advance of the tournament if possible, so the player will have this information when deciding whether or not to enter. However, such notification is not always possible, since the cause for assignment may not be evident to the director until the late-registration period, or even during the tournament.

28F. Validity of wall-chart ratings.

A properly assigned rating that appears on the wall chart without disclaimer is valid for both prizes and pairing purposes unless it is erroneous and a correction appears on a subsequent wall chart.

Directors who wish to use an assigned rating (28E) for pairing purposes but not prize eligibility should include a disclaimer on or near the wall chart next to the player's rating to explain that the rating is not valid for prize purposes.

28G. Old ratings.

Old ratings of inactive players are still valid. If an old rating cannot be located or confirmed from memory by a reliable person, the director should allow the player to receive a class prize only after confirmation of the old rating.

28H. Revising ratings after tournament begins.

The director for reasonable cause may revise the rating of any player at any time. If this results in a player being ineligible for the section he or she is playing in, the following procedures, 28H1-28H3, shall apply:

28H1. Removal.

The player shall be removed from that section.

28H2. Reassignment.

The director may offer the player the opportunity to continue in the tournament in an appropriate section, with half-point byes for games missed.

28H3. Entry fee refund.

- a. If the erroneous rating assignment is due to false, misleading or incomplete information provided by the player, including failure of the player to disclose a rating, the director is not required to refund the entry fee.
- b. If the erroneous rating assignment is primarily a mistake by the director or tournament staff, the entry fee should be refunded. If the player is given the option of continuing in a higher section, it is still appropriate to refund all or part of the fee if the player has missed sufficient rounds to substantially reduce prize chances.

28I. Opponents of expelled players.

If a player is removed from an event or section because of being made ineligible by a corrected rating (28H), the following adjustments shall be made to that player's opponents:

28I1. Expulsion before last round of tournament is paired.

Use the same procedure outlined in [Rule 28I2](#).

28I2. Expulsion after last round of tournament is paired.

Earlier opponents of the expelled player shall have their results adjusted for tournament scoring purposes (see also [28I3](#)) as follows:

- a. A player who lost to the expelled player shall instead receive a half-point bye.
- b. A player who drew the expelled player shall instead receive a win by forfeit.

28I3. Extra rated games

The actual results of each opponent vs. the expelled player shall be transferred to an "extra rated games" chart for US Chess rating purposes ([28M4](#)).

28J. The first round.

The director (or computer) flips a coin to decide who will play white on the first board, the higher- or lower-rated player. After ordering all the players by rating, the director divides the cards into two equal sized groups, pairing the highest player in the upper half against the highest player in the lower half, the second-highest in the upper half against the second-highest in the lower half, etc. Pairing programs do this automatically. **See also** [22B, Full-point byes](#); [22C, Half-point byes](#); [27A3, Upper half vs. lower half](#); [28A, Pairing cards or program](#); [28K, Late entrants](#);

28L, Full-point byes; 28M, Alternative to byes; 28S, Reentries; 29C1, Upper half vs. lower half; 29D, The odd player; 29E2, First round colors..

TD TIP: Directors often number the cards once they are in rating order. They then proceed to remove all requested byes; if there is, at that point, an odd number of players, the card for the lowest rated player, who will be assigned a bye, is removed. The cards are then divided into halves as described above.

Colors are alternated down through each half. If the coin toss determined that the higher-rated player on board one would receive white, the higher-rated on board two receives black, and so on. If there is an odd number of players, the lowest-rated player, but not an unrated player, receives a one-point bye. **See also** 22B, Full-point byes; 28L, Full-point byes; and 28M, Alternative to byes.

TD TIP: When using a pairing program make sure that it is set up not to give a bye to an unrated player or to players that have requested a bye in a future round.

The boards are numbered in the playing hall and the individual or team pairings are posted on pairings sheets (Figure 3), which indicate each player's or team's opponent, board number, and color. It is customary to assign the highest-rated player or team in the top score group to board one, the second-highest in that group to board two, etc. The director may modify the pairings somewhat, especially in the early rounds, in order to avoid pairing family members, close friends, or members of the same club against one another.

TD TIP: Consult the pairing software manual for information on how to set up the program to avoid unwanted pairings and for information on producing an alphabetical list of players, their opponents, their board numbers, and their colors. Many players find an alphabetical list more convenient than a board-by-board pairing list.

TD TIP: It is useful to post more than one set of pairings in large events; however, to prevent confusion regarding where game results are to be posted, remove all sets of extra pairings about 15 minutes into the round.

Pairings for Round 5				
Bd	Result	White	Result	Black
1		Enpassant, Edwin		Attack, Allen
2		Bishop Barbara		Files, Fred
3		Goodplayer, Gordon		Chesser, Curtis
4	.5	Defender, Donald	.5	Helpmate, Harry

Figure 3

28K. Late entrants.

The director may accept and pair entrants after the announced closing time for registration, but late entrants shall forfeit any round missed if it is inconvenient or too late to pair the players for play, or may take a half-point bye (22C) if the tournament offers them for that round. **See also** 28B, Numbering late entrants and 28S, Reentries.

28L. Full-point byes.

28L1. Explanation and display.

In any round in which the total number of players in a tournament or section of a tournament is uneven, one player is given a full-point bye. The player's score is posted as a win on the wall chart, but circled to indicate that the game was not played. Wall charts generated by computer may print *bye*, or circle the score. **See also** 22B, Full-point byes and 28M, Alternatives to byes.

28L2. Determination.

In the first round, the bye is given to the player with the lowest US Chess rating but not to an unrated player or a late entrant. In subsequent rounds, it is given to the lowest-rated player in the lowest score group but not to an unrated player. If there are no rated players eligible for the bye in the lowest score group, it is given to an unrated player who

has played in a US Chess-rated tournament too recently to obtain a published rating. If this, too, is impossible, a new player may be assigned the bye. New players should be indicated by *NEW* on the pairing card and wall chart. **See also** 28J, [The first round](#); 28S, [Reentries](#); and 28L4, [Full-point byes after half-point byes](#).

Variation (unannounced) 28L2a. Giving the bye to a higher rated player.

Give the bye to a higher rated player if doing so improves the overall color allocation for the lowest score group, subject to the limits specified in rules 29E5a and 29E5b. **See also** 29E5a, [The 80-point rule](#); and 29E5b, [The 200-point rule](#).

28L3. Players ineligible for full-point byes.

A player must not be given a full-point bye more than once, nor should one be awarded to a player who has won an unplayed game due to the opponent's failure to appear.

TD TIP: Not all pairing software takes care of this task automatically; therefore, directors should check the software manual to determine the correct setting(s) to ensure that 28L3 is in force. Directors may also check software pairings each round to ensure that 28L3, as well as all other pairing rules, are being enforced.

28L4. Full-point byes after half-point byes.

A full-point bye should not be awarded to a player who has previously taken or committed to a half-point bye unless all others in the score group have already had a bye or a no-show forfeit win. **See also** 22C, [Half-point byes](#).

TD TIP: Not all pairing software takes care of this task automatically; therefore, directors should check the software manual to determine the correct setting(s) to ensure that 28L3 and 28L4 are enforced. Directors may also check computer pairings each round to ensure that 28L3 and 28L4, as well as all other pairing rules, are being enforced.

28L5. New players in four-round events.

Directors should try to ensure that new players play at least four games in their first tournament in order to obtain official ratings. In a four-round event, if only new players are available for byes in the bottom score group, the bye may be given to a player one score group above. This should not be done if the player receiving the bye has a substantial chance for a prize. It is preferable to use 28M, [Alternatives to byes](#), than to assign a bye to a new player. **See also** 22C, [Half-point byes](#).

28M. Alternatives to byes.

Awarding byes may be necessary for the smooth progress of a tournament, but they deprive a player of an expected game. To avoid this, several methods have been used successfully. Directors are encouraged to provide games for players who do not want byes. These methods may be combined. **See also** 22B, [Full-point byes](#); 22C, [Half-point byes](#); 27A3, [Upper half vs. lower half](#); 28A, [Pairing cards or program](#); 28J, [The first round](#); 28K, [Late entrants](#); 28L, [Full-point byes](#); 28S, [Reentries](#); and 29C1, [Upper half vs. lower half](#).

28M1. The house player.

Sometimes a spectator will agree to play a game against a player who would otherwise expect a bye. It is desirable that this spectator has a rating approximately within the range of the lowest score group, but this is not required. The player is voluntarily giving up a free point to play, so no one can legitimately claim the opponent is too weak.

Sometimes the player would rather play an unusually strong opponent than receive a bye. This also is acceptable, but if the strong opponent is rated too high for the section, the director may consider retaining the original bye and listing both players for a rated game in a higher section or an *extra rated games* section. **See also** 28M4, [Extra rated games](#).

TD TIP: Directors have found it useful to first ask the player receiving the bye if they would like to keep the bye or play a house player. Some players prefer to take the bye to rest for the next round or ensure that they will not be assigned a bye in future rounds. Directors and organizers who require the odd player to essay a game against a house player, rather than give the player the choice, would be wise to announce this policy in pre-tournament publicity and at the site. A popular alternative, described below, is to use a permanent house player, not eligible for prizes, who is paired normally, not necessarily against the odd player who would have received the bye.

If a permanent house player is available, this is the best solution. Such a player is paired normally whenever there is an odd number, not paired when there is an even number, and may even receive half-point byes if the tournament allows them.

***TD TIP:** Directors using pairing software find it best to award the permanent house player byes for all rounds and then remove those byes if the house player is needed. This technique prevents the pairing program from automatically pairing the house player, leaving the decision in the hands of the director round by round.*

It is not required that a house player be paired against the player who would otherwise receive the bye. Sometimes it is more appropriate to insert a relatively strong house player into a higher score group. In this case, neither the player paired against the house player nor the one who otherwise would have received the bye has the right to refuse to play.

A US Chess-rated commercially available computer may be used as a house player only if computer participation for the tournament was advertised in advance (36C).

Usually, a player whose full-point bye is replaced by a temporary house player should be assigned no additional full-point byes in the tournament. An exception may be appropriate if the house player was strong and the player is competing for a class prize against others who have received full-point byes.

28M2. Cross-round pairings.

The player who expects the bye is asked to wait until one of the games in the lowest score groups has finished. The loser of that game is then asked to play the next-round game early, after a brief rest. The director then pairs the two players and marks the pairing and the result in the appropriate round boxes for each player: for the player who would have received the bye, in the current round; for the opponent, in the next round. This sometimes has the advantage of eliminating the need for a bye in the following round.

Cross-round pairings work best in scholastics and events for low-rated players (e.g., under 1400), because the bottom boards in such events usually play very quickly. If a cross-round pairing is planned and there is a significant delay before the game starts, the director may offer the option of such a pairing only if both sides start with time elapsed from their clocks. Either player may refuse, which may lead to the cross-round pairing being abandoned and the original bye reinstated.

The use of cross-round pairings should be specially indicated on the US Chess rating report. When using a pairing program see the manual for information on how to set the software to perform this task

28M3. Cross-section pairings.

In a tournament with multiple sections, there may be more than one section with a bye for a particular round. In this case, a cross-section pairing may be more desirable than a cross-round pairing, as the game can begin immediately. The player in the lower of the two sections involved retains the bye, but is added to the pairings and wall chart of the higher section for a rated game. The player in the higher section has a game that counts for both score and rating purposes, rather than a bye. Such a player should not subsequently be assigned a full-point bye or a bye alternative.

28M4. Extra rated games.

Directors may accommodate players who wish to play a rated game without giving up a full-point bye by placing both players in an *extra rated games* section with its own wall chart. This section is also used by directors to report correct results of games to US Chess that remain uncorrected (for pairing and prize purposes) in other sections. **See also** 15H, [Reporting of results](#); 15I, [Results reported incorrectly](#); 28I3, [Extra rated games](#); and 29H3, [Double forfeit of unreported game](#).

28N. Combined individual-team tournaments.

Scholastic events are often held as individual Swiss systems, with both individual and team awards. Players are paired individually and team standings are determined by adding the scores of each school's top scorers, usually the top four. The director should try to avoid pairing teammates against each other, but an absolute prohibition of such pairings can give an unfair advantage in the individual standings to players on strong teams, who may be "paired

down” against players with a lower score rather than facing each other. **See also 28A, Pairing cards or program and 31A, Combined individual-team tournaments.**

28N1. Plus-two method.

- a. If a score group can be paired among itself without players from the same team facing each other, this should always be done.
- b. For score groups of less than plus two (*plus two* means at least two more wins than losses), if there is no way to pair the score group without players from the same team facing each other, these players should be raised or lowered into the nearest appropriate score group to avoid pairing teammates.
- c. For score groups of plus two or greater (at least two more wins than losses), players should not be removed from their score group in order to avoid playing those from the same team.

Variation 28N2.

Players from the same team should never be paired against each other unless it is the last round, one is in first place, and if this leader is not paired against a teammate he or she will have to play someone with a lower score.

Variation 28N3.

Rule 28N1 may be modified to use a score other than plus two as the point at which teammates will not be paired out of their score group to avoid facing each other.

Variation 28N4.

The director may decide when it is appropriate to pair players from the same team against each other to maximize fairness in individual or team standings.

28O. Scoring.

The tournament director records the results of the games on the pairing cards or enters them into the computer. These results should also be posted, as quickly as convenient, to wall charts that are prominently displayed (Click on [Figure 4](#) or go to next page.)

#	Name/Rtng/ID	Rd 1	Rd 2	Rd 3
1	Allen Attack	B 5	W 4	B 2
	2000 11111111	1	2	2
2	Barbara Bishop	W 6	B 3	W 1
	1950 22222222	1	2	3
3	Curtis Chesser	B 7	W 2	B 5
	1900 33333333	1	1	1.5
4	Donald Defender	W 8	B 1	W 7
	1850 44444444	1	1	2
5	Edwin Enpassant	W 1	B 8	W 3
	1800 55555555	0	1	1.5
6	Fred Files	B 2	W 7	B 8
	1750 66666666	0	0	0
7	Gordon Goodplayer	W 3	B 6	B 4
	1700 77777777	0	1	1
8	Harry Helpmate	B 4	W 5	W 6
	1650 88888888	0	0	1

Figure 4

TD TIP: Directors may want to prepare a handout to explain to new tournament players how to interpret the information that appears on wall charts. For example: In this illustration Allen Attack is rated 2000 and is first on the list because he is the highest rated player in the tournament. Information about what color he played against which opponent is indicated in round one as Black against player number 5, Edwin Enpassant (B 5). He won the game (each win = 1 point, each draw = 0.5 points (or ½), and each loss = 0 points). In round two he played white against player 4 (W 4) and won again (indicated by a 2: round one score of 1 + the win in round two = 2). In round three Allen played Black against player number 2 (B|2); he lost that game (2 = round two cumulative score of 2 + round three score of 0 for losing).

2801. Computer wall charts.

An advantage of using a computer is that it can print updated wall charts each round. In a large event, avoiding the need to enter the color and opponent of each player on the wall chart saves considerable time.

However, it is still recommended that the scores of each player be manually updated as soon as possible. It may be tempting to wait so that the computer can print out all or many scores, but making the players wait for hours to learn results may make the tournament less enjoyable.

28P. Unplayed games.

If a player fails to appear within one hour of the start of the round or by the end of the first time control, whichever comes first, the game is scored as a forfeit loss for the player and a forfeit win for the opponent. That player is then dropped from the tournament unless he or she presents an acceptable excuse to the director. The player's subsequent games are also scored as zero. A player may also withdraw from the tournament by notifying the director, in which case the remaining games are scored as zero.

The scores of unplayed games, including byes, are marked with an *F* or circled on the pairing cards, on the wall chart, and on the rating report. Unplayed games are not US Chess rated. Note that a game in which both sides make moves is always rated, even if a player forfeits on time or for an infraction of the rules; this type of forfeit is never marked with an *F* or circled. **See also** [13D, Late arrival for game](#); [13F, Late arrival by both players](#); [22, Unplayed Games](#); and [Rule 8D1, Games Not Played](#) (Chapter 10).

TD TIP: Directors using pairing software should consult the software manual for details on how the program handles this procedure.

28Q. Pairing unfinished games.

If at all possible without imposing unreasonable delay in the start of the next round upon the other players, all games from one round should be finished before the next round is paired. If this is not possible, the director has several options (**see also** [18F3, Sudden death](#)):

28Q1. Modified Kashdan system.

The director may approach a game in progress, instruct the player on move to seal ([18A](#)), and inform both players that either player who offers a draw and so informs the director before pairings for the next round begin will be paired as having drawn, and that either player who does not do so will be paired as having won. The director should stop both clocks before this intervention and restart the clock of the player who is to seal at its conclusion.

This modified method, probably the best way to handle adjournments, has several advantages over the original Kashdan system, in which the director privately asked each player what result he or she was seeking. It is much quicker, does not pressure players to respond immediately, and makes it clearer to the players that the draw offer may be accepted at any time during adjournment.

TD TIP: If both players indicate they are playing for a draw, the director can declare the game over with a result of a draw for both players.

28Q2. Temporary adjudications.

The director can adjourn the unfinished game(s) and either pair the players as having drawn, having won and lost, or having won and drawn. The latter might be appropriate if one player has winning chances and the opponent has drawing chances. If necessary, the director may consult strong players whose own pairings are not affected for help. **See also** [18F, Problems of the next-to-last round](#) and [29F, Last round pairings with unfinished games](#).

28R. Accelerated pairings in the first two rounds.

In a tournament where the number of players far exceeds the number two raised to the power of the number of rounds ([see 27, The Swiss System Tournament](#)), more than one perfect score is possible, and top contenders may not play each other. The director has pairing options that have the effect of adding an extra round or two to the tournament without any additional games being played.

Accelerated pairings are most effective in a one-section tournament, an Open Section, or a section in which no more than about half the players are in the same 200-point rating class. Accelerated pairings may fare poorly in a primarily one-class section, as an accelerated pairing for round two will pit the lower-rated 1-0 against the higher-rated 0-1; thus, decreasing the odds (instead of the intended increasing of the odds) that the higher rated player will win.

[28R2, Adjusted rating method](#), is more effective but more complicated than [28R1, Added score method](#), while the little-tested [Variation 28R3, Sixths](#), is intended for events with an especially small ratio of rounds to players and large rating differences.

28R1. Added score method.

Before the first round, the players are numbered, ordered by rank, byes removed, the odd player assigned a bye, if any, removed, and the remaining players are divided into two equal sized groups. The director notes the top number in the lower half and, for the first two rounds, mentally adds one point to the scores of all players ranked above that number, for pairing purposes only. The director divides the players accordingly and pairs normally.

TD TIP: *Pairing software usually has an option to do accelerated pairings.*

The effect, in the first round, is to have the top quarter play the second quarter and the third quarter play the fourth quarter. For the most part, the effect in the second round will be to have the top eighth play the second eighth, the second quarter play the third quarter, and the seventh eighth play the last eighth. This method decreases the number of perfect scores.

28R2. Adjusted rating method.

Before the first round, after the bye, if any, is issued, the players are arranged in the normal order, top rated to lowest rated. Then the field is divided from top to bottom into four groups (A1, B1, C1, and D1) as close to the same size as possible, and paired as follows:

A1 vs. B1 and C1 vs. D1. These first-round pairings are the same as in Variation 1.

For the second-round pairings, the players are regrouped as follows:

1. A2: Winners from A1 vs. B1. If there is an odd number of players, the lowest-rated drops to the top of C2.
2. B2: Non-winners from A1 vs. B1, with players who drew having a temporary 100 points added to their ratings. If there are more players in B2 than C2, the lowest-rated losers from B2 are dropped to the top of D2, until B2 has the same number of players as C2. If there are fewer players in B2 than C2, the highest-rated players from D2 are raised to the bottom of B2 until B2 has the same number of players as C2.
3. C2: Non-losers from C1 vs. D1, with players who drew having a temporary 100 points subtracted from their ratings.
4. D2: Losers from C1 vs. D1.

Each of these groups is arranged in rating order, including the temporary adjustments for first-round performances. Then each group is paired as follows:

1. A2: This group is divided into halves. The upper half plays the lower half according to basic pairing methods.
2. B2 and C2: These groups play each other, with the top player in B2 facing the top in C2, etc., according to basic pairing methods. This will result mostly in players with different scores playing—1 vs. 0, 1 vs. 0.5, or 0.5 vs. 0—though an occasional 0.5 vs. 0.5 is also possible. Whenever the players have different scores, the one with the lower score will be higher-rated.
3. D2: This group is divided in half. The upper half plays the lower half according to basic pairing methods.

For the third and subsequent rounds, the temporary rating adjustments are ignored and the pairings are made according to the basic system.

This variation of accelerated pairings produces only about half the number of perfect scores achieved with the basic system. It therefore decreases the likelihood of multiple perfect scores, and causes the final standings to be more dependent on games between the top-rated players.

Variation 28R3. Sixths.

Apply the same principles as 28R2, but divide the field into sixths in the first round and pair the first sixth vs. the second, third vs. fourth, and fifth vs. sixth. In round two, pair the winners of 1 vs. 2 against each other, the non-winners of 1 vs. 2 against the winners of 3 vs. 4, the non-winners of 3 vs. 4 against the winners of 5 vs. 6, and the non-winners of 5 vs. 6 against each other.

28S. Reentries.

Tournaments with alternate schedules allowing players a choice of starting times for the early rounds often permit reentry, in which the player abandons or takes byes in the earlier-starting schedule in order to enter the later-starting

schedule. For example, there may be a three-day schedule with round one at 8:00 p.m. Friday and a two-day schedule with round one at 10:00 a.m. Saturday, with the two schedules merging for round two starting Saturday afternoon. A player who loses or draws on Friday night may choose to *start fresh* by reentering the two-day schedule, in which case the Friday game, while still rated, would not damage the player's chances for prizes. **See also** 22B, Full-point byes; 22C, Half-point byes; 27A3, Upper half vs. lower half; 28A, Pairing cards or program; 28J, The first round; 28K, Late entrants; 28L, Full-point byes; 28M, Alternative to byes; and 29C1, Upper half vs. lower half.

TD TIP: *Whether the director is pairing a tournament by hand or using pairing software, it is wise to note reentered players by adding a RE (for reentered) at the end of their name to distinguish the reentries from their original entries.*

28S1. Reentry playing opponent twice.

If one player has reentered and the other has not, they should not be paired against each other for a second time (27A1). Even though the reentry is considered a new entry, from the standpoint of the opponent who did not reenter it is the same player.

28S2. Reentries playing each other twice.

If two reentries have already faced each other while each was playing his or her original entry, they are both considered a new entry and may be paired against each other for a second time, since neither new entry has faced the other new entry.

28S3. Reentry colors.

Reentries are treated as having no color history; the colors from their original entries are disregarded. **See also** 29E, Color allocation.

28S4. Reentry with half-point byes.

Players sometimes reenter the same schedule with half-point byes replacing games missed. 28S1, 28S2, and 28S3 all apply to such reentries as well.

28S5. Reentry scores.

Unless the organizer states otherwise prior to the beginning of the first round, a player who reenters carries the better score, or the best score in the case of multiple reentries, into the later rounds. In the case of equal scores, the latest score must be used. The color and opponent history of the entry carried forward accompanies it in all cases. The organizer, however, has the option of declaring in advance that a reentry must abandon all recourse to the earlier entry(ies), in which case the latest score and color history are carried forward, regardless of comparison to all earlier results. **See also** 32C5, Reentry prizes.

28T Variation. Players may request a non-pairing against each other.

Individual players may request that they not be paired against each other in any tournament. Due to the pairing problems involved, the director may not be able to honor this request.

TD TIP: *Honoring requests of players to not be paired against each other can present serious pairing difficulties for the director, especially in small events and in the later rounds in any tournament; however, sometimes players who often play against each other outside of the tournament do not enjoy traveling to a tournament to simply play against each other again. Some directors honor the player's request for the first half of the tournament only. Directors may automatically "not pair" players from the same family, club, team, area, etc. without a request from the players; however, if at all possible those directors might want to consider consulting with those players first. After all, those players may not mind being paired against each other.*

29. Swiss System Pairings, Subsequent Rounds

29A. Score groups and rank.

The words *score group* and *group* refer to players having the same score, even if there is only one player within a group. The players in each such score group are paired against each other (27A2) unless they have already faced each other (27A1) or are odd players (29D) or must play odd players paired from another score group (29D). In a

combined individual and team tournament, players are sometimes paired out of their score groups to avoid facing teammates (28N). Individual rank is determined first by score (the greater the number of points, the higher the rank within the tournament) and then by rating within a score group (the higher the rating, the higher the rank).

***TD TIP:** Score group determines rank when players are paired outside of their score group. Rating determines rank within a score group. For example: the lowest-rated player in the 4 point score group is rated 1991. The highest-rated player in the 3.5 score group is rated 2105. The 1991 player is ranked higher (the 4-point score group) than the 2105 player (the 3.5 score group). This ranking may be important when determining colors.*

29B. Order of pairing score groups.

In general, the director pairs the groups according to rank, starting with the highest and working down. If games within some score groups are still unfinished shortly before the scheduled start of the next round, the director may wish to modify this order and pair around the groups with games still going on, taking care to provide for any *odd players*. It may be worthwhile to ask the players involved in a long game to confirm that they are playing the next round, as notice to the contrary after the game would be too late and would affect the odd player situation.

It may be helpful to make a quick table beforehand, listing the different score groups in descending order and the number of players in each group, and drawing arrows to show where players must be dropped (in the case of the odd player) to play someone from the group below.

***TD TIP:** Instead of a chart, some directors have been successful placing little sticky notes, drawing arrows and/or noting the number of players in each score group, on the top of a pile of pairing cards for that score group. Pairing programs take care of this task automatically.*

29C. Method of pairing score groups.

In the second and subsequent rounds, the players are paired as follows:

29C1. Upper half vs. lower half.

If there is an even number of players within a group, they are placed in order of rank (rating), divided in half, and the upper half is paired against the lower half, in as close to consecutive order as possible (e.g., in a group with 20 players, the first ranked would play the eleventh ranked, the second the twelfth, and so on). **See also** [22B, Full-point byes](#); [22C, Half-point byes](#); [27A3, Upper half vs. lower half](#); [28A, Pairing cards or program](#); [28J, The first round](#); [28K, Late entrants](#); [28L, Full-point byes](#); [28M, Alternative to byes](#); [28S, Reentries](#); [29D, The odd player](#); [29E2, First round colors](#); [29E3, due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); and [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#).

29C2. Other adjustments.

Transpositions are made in order to avoid pairing players who have already played each other and to give as many players as possible their equalizing or due colors. To this end it is also permissible to make an interchange between the bottom of the upper half and the top of the lower half. **See also** [27A1, Avoid players meeting twice](#); [29E, Color allocation](#); [29E3, Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); and [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#).

29D. The odd player.

Pairing players out of score group.

There will often be situations where some players cannot be paired within their score group. This will always be true if there is an odd number of players with a given score, and can also happen when players within a score group have already played each other, or are otherwise restricted (family members, same scholastic team, requested non-pairs, etc.) from playing. At least one, and possibly more, players will have to be dropped to play in a lower score group. In such situations, the first priority (other than avoiding restricted pairings) is to have players play as close to their score group as possible.

29D1. Determination.

- a. In the case of an odd number of players, the lowest-rated player, but not an unrated player, is ordinarily treated as the odd player and is paired with the highest-rated player he or she can play in the next lower group. Care must be taken in doing this that the odd player can be paired in the next score group, that the remaining members of both affected score groups can be paired with each other, that the odd player has not played all the members of the next lower group, and that the color consequences are acceptable (29E, 29E3). **See also** 28S3, [Reentry colors](#); 29E4, [Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); and 29E5, [Colors vs. Ratings](#).
- b. If the conditions in (a) cannot be met, then try treating the next lowest rated player as the odd player, or pairing the odd player with a lower ranking player in the next score group. In deciding whether to make a switch of either the odd player or the opponent, you should look only at the rating difference of the players being switched. There is no rating limit on the permitted switch if it is needed to keep the score groups intact. However, switches to correct colors should stay within the appropriate limits (29E5). **See also** 28S3, [Reentry colors](#); 29E, [Color allocation](#); 29E3, [Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); 29E4, [Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#)
- c. If the entire score group is unrated, then an unrated player must be designated as the odd player and dropped.

29D2. Multiple drop downs.

It is sometimes necessary to jump over an entire score group to find an appropriate opponent for an odd player.

A pairing which drops a player down for one or more score groups should be chosen over a pairing which drops two or more players down for one or more score groups (This can be relaxed in low score groups if necessary to allow the bottom score groups to be paired legally). It is acceptable to pair the player against a somewhat lower-rated player to equalize or alternate colors, but only within the rules for transposition as explained in [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#).

The odd player is normally paired with the highest-rated player he or she has not met from the next lower group. It is acceptable to pair the player against a somewhat lower-rated player to equalize or alternate colors, but only within the rules for transposition as explained below.

Examples:

1. **One odd player:** If Group 1 has only one player with a perfect score, who has already played the only two members of Group 2, then the player from Group 1 must play the highest-rated player in Group 3 that he or she has not yet played in the tournament, provided that this allows the remaining members of Groups 2 and 3 to be paired.
2. **Two odd players:** If the only two players in Group 1 have already met, they would both be odd players. It is desirable for them to be paired with the highest-rated players in Group 2 whom they have not played before. The higher-rated player from Group 1 should be paired with the highest-rated player in Group 2, and the lower-rated player from Group 1 should be paired with the next-highest rated player in Group 2, provided that this allows the remaining members of Group 2 to be paired.
3. **Two odd players from two different score groups:** There is only one player in Group 1. There is only one player in Group 2. These players have already played each other. In this example we have a player dropping down more than one score group. The player being dropped from the higher score group is considered to be the higher-ranked and is paired first.

TD TIP: *Dropping an odd player over multiple score groups just to improve color allocation is an unacceptable practice. Applying 28S3, [Reentry colors](#), 29E, [Color allocations](#), 29E3, [Due colors in succeeding rounds](#), 29E4, [Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); and 29E5, [Colors vs. Ratings](#) is more proper. If applications of*

those rules do not solve the color allocation problems, then the possibility of selecting a different odd player may be more equitable.

29E. Color allocation.

The director assigns colors to all players. The objective in a tournament with an even number of rounds is to give white and black the same number of times to as many players as possible; in an event with an odd number of rounds, each player should receive no more than one extra white or black above an even allocation.

In addition to the task of equalizing colors, the director, after the first round, tries to alternate colors, by giving as many players as possible their due (*correct* or expected) color, round by round. The due color is usually the color a player did not have in the previous round, but not always. For example, a player who had white in rounds one and two and black in round three has a due color of black in round four, as equalization has priority over alternation. **See also** [27A4, Equalizing colors](#); [27A5, Alternating colors](#); [28J, The first round](#); [29E2, First round colors](#); [29E3, Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#); and [29M, Recommendations](#).

29E1. Unplayed games.

Unplayed games, including byes and forfeits, do not count for color.

29E2. First-round colors.

[22B, Full-point byes](#); [22C, Half-point byes](#); [27A3, Upper half vs. lower half](#); [28A, Pairing cards or program](#); [28J, The first round](#); [28K, Late entrants](#); [28L, Full-point byes](#); [28M, Alternative to byes](#); [28S, Reentries](#); [29D, The odd player](#); [29E3, due colors in succeeding rounds](#); [29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); [29E5, Colors vs. ratings](#); and [29M, Recommendations](#).

TD TIP: *Example: After the coin toss, the number one player in the top section of a class tournament was assigned to play white. All other top boards in all other sections are assigned white based on this one coin toss. In each of the sections the other players are assigned colors according to [29E2](#). Pairing programs do this automatically.*

29E3. Due Colors in succeeding rounds.

As many players as possible are given their due colors in each succeeding round, so long as the pairings conform to the basic Swiss system rules. **See also** [27A, Basic Swiss system rules](#); [27A4, Equalizing colors](#); [27A5, Alternating colors](#); [29C2, Other adjustments](#); and [29M, Recommendations](#).

29E3a. Due colors defined.

A player who has had an unequal number of whites and blacks is due the color that tends to equalize the number of whites and blacks. A player who has had an equal number of whites and blacks is due the opposite color to that he received in the most recent round. Colors assigned in games won or lost by forfeit do not count in deciding due color. A player who has played no games is due neither white nor black.

29E4. Equalization, alternation, and priority of color.

Equalization of colors takes priority over alternation of colors. First, as many players as possible are given the color that tends to equalize the number of times they have played white and black. After that is accomplished, as many players as possible should be given the color opposite to that which they played in the previous round. **See also** [27A, Basic Swiss system rules](#); [27A4, Equalizing colors](#); [27A5, Alternating colors](#); [29A, Score groups and rank](#); [29C2, Other adjustments](#); and [29M, Recommendations](#).

TD TIP:

Example 1. A player who has had BWB is due white (equalization of colors).

Example 2. A player who has had BW is due black (alternation of colors).

Example 3. A player who has had WWB is due black (equalization takes priority over alternation).

Example 4. A player who had white in round one, then won by forfeit in round two, is due black in round three regardless of which color he had been assigned in the unplayed round two game.

Pairing players due the same color. Whenever it is necessary to pair two players who are due the same color the following rules apply:

1. If one player has had an unequal number of whites and blacks, while the other has had equal colors, the player who has had unequal colors gets due color. Example: WBW gets black over BxW, where x denotes any unplayed game—full-point bye, half-point bye, forfeit win, forfeit loss, etc.
2. If both players have had an unequal number of whites and blacks, the player with the greater total color imbalance gets due color. Example: WWBW gets black over xWBW.
3. If both players have had an equal number of whites and blacks, or both are equally out of balance, and if they had opposite colors in the previous round, the players should be given colors opposite to that which they played in the previous round. Example: WWB gets white over WBW.
4. If both players have had an equal number of whites and blacks, or both are equally out of balance, and if they had different colors in one or more prior rounds, priority for assigning color should be based on the latest round in which their colors differed. One or both players should be assigned the color opposite to that which they played in that round. Example 1: WBWB gets white over BWWB, because the first player had black in round two, the latest round in which colors differed. Example 2: BWxBW gets white over BWBxW, because the first player had black and the second had no color in round 4, the latest round in which colors differed.
5. If both players have had the same color sequence, the higher-ranked player gets due color. The higher-ranked player is the player with the higher score. If the players have the same score, the higher-ranked player is the higher-rated (*rank* is defined in [29A](#)).

TD TIP: Rule 5 takes effect only if rules 1-4 do not decide the issue. Unless the players have had identical color sequences, rules 1-4 should be used.

Variation 29E4a. Priority based on plus, even, and minus score groups.

When applying rule 5 above, the higher-ranked player in plus and even score groups receives priority for color allocation, while the lower-ranked player in minus score groups receives priority. This variation minimizes color problems in the very low score groups, as well as the very high, which are more likely to have color problems in later rounds because these are statistically the smallest groups.

Variation 29E4b. Alternating priority.

When applying rule 5 above, if two players within a score group are both due the same color, the higher-rated player receives due color. But if several such situations exist within the group, the first higher-rated player receives due color, the second does not, the third does, and so on, alternating entitlement from higher- to lower-rated player. This applies both to equalizing and alternating colors.

Variation 29E4c. Priority based on lot.

When applying rule 5 above, in the last round of a tournament, the director may choose to let opponents with equal entitlement to colors choose their own colors by lot, but only after making all the pairings necessary to come closer to equalized and alternate allocations. For example, if after four rounds both players had received WBWB, for the fifth and final round the director might choose to let the players choose for colors rather than assign them automatically by using one of the procedures outlined above. If this system is adopted, it must be used for all such cases without exception. **See also** [29E5f1, Last-round exception](#) and [29I, Class pairings](#).

Variation 29E4d. Priority based on rank.

Rule 4 above does not apply. If both players have had an equal number of whites and blacks (or both are equally out of balance), and if they have had the same colors in each of the preceding two rounds, then the higher-ranked player gets due color.

TD TIP: Variation [29E4d](#) was the old main rule in the 4th edition of this rulebook; therefore, it is possible that it is still used by some directors and pairing programs. It is recommended that, when this variation is used, written notice be posted before the start of the tournament.

29E5. Colors vs. ratings.

Correct Swiss pairings should consider both colors and ratings, so a tournament director should exercise care not to distort either unduly. To improve colors a director may use either a transposition or an interchange of players. **See also** [27A, Basic Swiss System Rules](#); [27A3, Upper half vs. lower half](#); [27A4, Equalizing colors](#); [27A5, Alternating colors](#); and [29C2, Other adjustments](#).

A transposition is the practice of changing the order of players within the upper half or lower half of a group. An interchange involves switching a player from the bottom of the upper half with a player from the top of the lower half. **For more information** and examples see [29E5e, Comparing transpositions to interchanges](#) and [29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges](#).

***TD TIP:** Sometimes pairings get switched more than once. Directors switch players if they have faced each other before, are teammates, or are family members. Excluding those reasons, sometimes transpositions and interchanges occur more than once with the same player for any particular round. The arithmetic for interchanges and transpositions applies only to the first natural pairing (or the pairing after the aforementioned switches are made by the director) before any transpositions or interchanges are made compared to the final pairing after all transpositions and interchanges have been made.*

Transpositions and interchanges should be limited as follows:

29E5a. The 80-point rule.

Transpositions and interchanges for the purpose of maximizing the number of players who receive their due color should be limited to players with a pre-tournament rating difference of 80 points or less.

Example: WB vs. WB. To give one of these players a second straight black in round three is only moderately undesirable and does not justify a switch of over 80 points. **See also** [29E5b, The 200-point rule](#); [29E5c, Evaluating transpositions](#); [29E5d, Evaluating interchanges](#); [29E5e, Comparing transpositions to interchanges](#); [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#); and [29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges](#).

29E5b. The 200-point rule.

Transpositions and interchanges for the purpose of minimizing the number of players who receive one color two or more times more than the other color should be limited to players with a pre-tournament rating difference of 200 points or less. **See also** [29E5a, The 80-point rule](#); [29E5c, Evaluating transpositions](#); [29E5d, Evaluating interchanges](#); [29E5e, Comparing transpositions to interchanges](#); [29E5h, Priority of equalization over ratings](#); and [29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges](#).

***TD TIP:** It has been observed by experienced directors that there are fewer concerns from players paired to play the white pieces in violation of [29E5b](#) than when the situation is reversed and they are paired to play the black pieces in violation of this same rule*

Variation 29E5b1.

Transpositions and interchanges for the purpose of minimizing the number of players who receive black two or more times more than white should be limited to 200 points.

Example: BWB vs. BWB. To give one of these players black for the third time in round four is highly undesirable, justifying a switch limit of 200 points.

29E5c. Evaluating transpositions.

All transpositions should be evaluated based on the smaller of the two rating differences involved. For example:

2000 WB vs. 1800 WB

1980 BW vs. 1500 BW

These would be correct third-round pairings were it not for the color problems. Unless a switch is made, there will be a color conflict on each board.

To trade the 1800 for the 1500 is apparently a 300-point switch, which would violate 29E5a, The 80-point rule. But this is not really the case. The same pairings may be achieved by trading the 2000 for the 1980, only a 20-point switch. However, when manipulating pairing cards the actual interchange takes place by switching the cards in the lower half of the score group.

The resulting pairings, 2000 white vs. 1500 and 1800 white vs. 1980, are considered to require only a 20-point switch and thus satisfy the 80-point rule.

In larger groups, the situation is sometimes more complicated, as a permissible transposition may generate numerous additional transpositions, not all of which satisfy the limits for allowable transpositions. This is especially common when some of the otherwise-desirable pairings are impossible because the players have already faced each other.

In such situations, the director may strictly observe the limits for transpositions or may be flexible. If colors in the group are substantially improved, it is acceptable for the limits to be exceeded somewhat.

See also 29E5a, The 80-point rule; 29E5b, The 200-point rule; 29E5d, Evaluating interchanges; 29E5e, Comparing transpositions to interchanges; and 29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges.

29E5d. Evaluating interchanges.

For an interchange, the director need only consider one rating difference rather than the smaller of two. The difference between the two players switched is the relevant difference; there is no need to look at the other switch that would produce the same pairings.

While interchanges are theoretically acceptable if the rating difference of the switch is within the limits set forth in by 29E5a, The 80-point rule, and 29E5b, The 200-point rule, interchanges do violate basic principle 27A3, Upper half vs. lower half, and so tend to catch players by surprise, causing them to express their concerns. While interchanges are sometimes necessary, they should not be used if adequate transpositions are possible. **See also** 29E5d, Evaluating interchanges; 29E5e, Comparing transpositions to interchanges; and 29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges.

***TD TIP:** Experienced directors have observed that players in contention for prizes tend to express their concern about interchanges more often than players not in contention for prizes.*

29E5e. Comparing transpositions to interchanges.

A transposition that satisfies 29E5a, The 80-point rule, should be preferred to any interchange, provided it is at least as effective in minimizing color conflicts.

If pairing a round in which 29E5b, The 200-point rule, is used because, for instance, many players have had more blacks than whites, an interchange involving a smaller rating switch than a transposition should be preferred to the latter unless the transposition satisfies the 80-point rule.

Example 1:

2050 WBW vs. 1850 WBW
1870 BWB vs. 1780 BWB

These fourth-round *natural pairings* should be switched to improve color allocation. The interchange of trading the 1870 with the 1850 is only a 20-point switch, while the transposition of switching the 1850 with the 1780 is a 70-point change, the smaller number of 70 ($1850-1780=70$) and 180 ($2050-1870=180$). However, since the interchange is only a 20-point switch while the transposition, which meets the requirement of 29E5a, The 80-point rule, is a 70-point change, use of the interchange is not necessary, and the pairings should be 1780-2050 and 1870-1850.

Example 2:

2050 WBW vs. 1850 WBW
1870 BWB vs. 1750 BWB

This is almost the same situation as in Example 1, except the bottom player of the group (1750) is now rated 30 points lower. In this case, transposing the 1850 with the 1750 would be a 100-point switch. This is allowed, as we are trying to avoid assigning two more blacks than whites to someone on board two, so 29E5b, The 200-point rule, applies. But even though it is permitted, it does not meet the requirement of 29E5a, The 80-point rule, and thus does not have priority over an interchange.

The interchange of switching 1870 and 1850, a 20-point switch, is preferred, and the pairings should be 1870-2050 and 1750-1850.

29E5f. Colors in a series.

No player shall be assigned the same color three times in a row, unless there is no other reasonable way to pair the score group or unless necessary to equalize colors.

Variation 29E5f1. Last-round exception.

Except for the last round, when it may be necessary to pair the tournament or class leaders, players shall not be assigned the same color in three successive rounds. **See also** 27A, [Basic Swiss system rules](#); 27A3, [Upper half vs. lower half](#); 27A4, [Equalizing colors](#); 27A5, [Alternating colors](#); 29E, [Color allocation](#); 29E3, [Due colors in succeeding rounds](#); 29E4, [Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#); 29E4c, [Priority based on lot](#); 29I, [Class pairings](#); and 29M, [Recommendations](#).

29E5g. Unrateds and color switches.

If a player is switched to or from an unrated opponent to improve color allocation, this is not in violation of the 80 or 200-point rules for transpositions and interchanges.

Variation 29E5h. Priority of equalization over ratings.

Equalization of colors has priority over rating differences; 29E5a, [The 80-point rule](#), and 29E5b, [The 200-point rule](#), do not apply.

TD TIP: This variation has been more successful at club and local events than at large state or national tournaments.

29E6. Color adjustment technique.

The order in which pairings are switched to improve colors can make a difference, both in the final pairings and in the time it takes to arrive at them. Two methods that have been commonly used are the *Look Ahead* method and the *Top Down* method. The *Look Ahead* method is more accurate and easier to use.

TD TIP: Directors using pairing programs should consult the software manuals on choosing how to implement the desired method.

29E6a. The Look Ahead method.

The director counts to see if more than half the group is due for the same color (29E3). If not, he or she starts with the top pairing and works down, correcting as many color conflicts (games in which both players are due for the same color) as possible. Unless there is a problem with 29E5a, [The 80-point rule](#), or 29E5b, [The 200-point rule](#), or too many players have already faced each other (27A1), all colors will balance. **See also** 29E4, [Equalization, alternation, and priority of color](#).

If more than half the group is due for the same color, the objective is to *avoid pairings in which neither player is due for that color*. This will maximize the number of pairings in which both sides receive their due color.

Note that *neither due for that color* could mean *both players due for the other color*, *both players due no color* (for instance, both players in round two having played no game in round one), or *either player due for the other color while the opponent is due for no color*.

TD TIP: In a score group that has color assignment problems such as those described here, it is best to avoid pairings where neither player is due for the color that is causing a color-assignment problem in a score group. The

best use for each of those players would be to pair them using 29E5a, The 80-point rule, and 29E5b, The 200-point rule, against players that must play a particular color based on rules like 29E, Color allocation, and 29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color.

A player may be due based only on alternation while most in the group are due based on equalization. For example, if pairing round four and most in the score group have had two blacks, a player with one of each color and an unplayed game is due for neither color based on equalization. Alternation is not an issue, as equalization has priority (29E4), so the player is due for neither color.

Assume most players in a group are due for white. The director examines the *natural pairings*. Any pair of players who have already faced each other are changed (27A1) by the switch involving the minimum rating change described in 29E5a, The 80-point rule, and 29E5b, The 200-point rule, while also avoiding pairings in which neither player is due for white.

The tentative pairings are checked for games in which neither player is due for white (or could be assigned either color). If there are none, the pairings are final. If such pairings exist, as many of such pairings as possible are changed by making switches to higher or lower boards, involving the minimum possible rating differences.

Color conflicts are now minimized and pairings stand. While no direct attempt was made to avoid pairings of both players due for white, these were held to a minimum. **See also 29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges.**

Variation 29E6b. The Top Down method.

Using this method, the director, after adjusting to avoid pairing players who have already played (27A1), first considers the color situation on board one of the score group, the board involving the top-rated player in the group. If both players are due for the same color, the pairing is changed by moving up the highest-rated player in the lower half whose color fits, and exchanging that player with the one in the pairing on board one from the lower half, providing the pairing does not violate 29E5a (80-point rule) or 29E5b (200-point rule).

The director then moves down to board two, then board three, etc., correcting any color conflicts encountered in the same manner.

Eventually, the number of color conflicts should be the same as in the *Look Ahead* method. But the pairings are often inferior, and time may be wasted making adjustments that do not reduce the number of color conflicts. **See also 29E7, Examples of transpositions and interchanges.**

29E7. Examples of transpositions and interchanges.

For definitions of the terms *transpositions* and *interchanges* see 29E5, Colors vs. ratings. In each case, we start by looking at what the pairings would be were there no color problems. (See Example 1 on next page.)

Example 1:

2300 BWB vs. 2040 BWB
 2220 BWB vs. 1990 WBW
 2180 BBW vs. 1980 WBW
 2050 BWB vs. 1950 WBW

Using the *Look Ahead* method, the director finds five players due for white, three due for black. Thus, pairings in which neither player is due for white should be avoided. But there are no such pairings, so the above pairings stand. Note that the 2180 is due for white because equalization has priority over alternation (29E3).

The *Top Down* method runs into real problems here. First, the director *corrects* the colors on board one and pairs 2300 vs. 1990. Then, he or she does likewise on boards two and three, resulting in 2220 vs. 1980 and 2180 vs. 1950. This leaves a bizarre pairing on board four: 2050 vs. 2040. When the director is asked why two players with ratings so close are playing each other in a group of eight, the response might be *to improve colors*. Let's hope no one will notice that the colors for this strange pairing are wrong, too!

The remaining examples will show only the *Look Ahead* method.

Example 2:

2320 WBWB vs. 1980 WBWB
 2278 BWBW vs. 1951 WBWB
 2212 BWBW vs. 1910 BWBW
 2199 WBWB vs. 1896 BWBW
 2178 WBWB vs. 1800 WBWB

The director's count shows six players out of ten overall due for white. This means pairings in which neither player is due for white should be avoided.

The only pairing in which neither is due for white is 2212 vs. 1910 (both are due black). There are two options for correcting this.

- a. The first possibility is 2320 vs. 1910. This would require a 70-point transposition in the lower half ($1980-1910=70$) or a 108-point transposition in the upper half ($2320-2212=108$), so we count the switch as 70, the smaller number.
- b. The second option for correcting the colors is 1800 vs. 2212. This is a 110-point transposition in the lower half ($1910-1800=110$) but only a 34-point transposition in the upper half ($2212-2178=34$), and so is preferable to option a.

The resulting pairings:

White	Black
2320	1980
1951	2278
1800	2212
2199	1896
2178	1910

Example 3 shows a different way to pair this same score group on the last three boards. This method is not better or worse, just different. It has both advantages and disadvantages, which are explained below. The director should pick either the method in Example 2 or the one in Example 3 and use it consistently throughout the tournament.

Example 3:

2320 WBWB vs. 1980 WBWB
 2278 BWBW vs. 1951 WBWB
 2212 BWBW vs. 1910 BWBW
 2199 WBWB vs. 1896 BWBW
 2178 WBWB vs. 1800 WBWB

The director's count shows six players out of ten overall due for white. This means pairings in which neither player is due for white should be avoided.

The only pairing in which neither is due for white is 2212 vs. 1910 (both are due black). There are two options for correcting this.

- c. The first possibility is 2320 vs. 1910. This would require a 70-point transposition in the lower half ($1980-1910=70$) or a 108-point transposition in the upper half ($2320-2212=108$), so we count the switch as 70, the smaller number.
- d. The second option for correcting the colors is 1800 vs. 2212. This is a 110-point transposition in the lower half ($1910-1800=110$) but only a 34-point transposition in the upper half ($2212-2178=34$), and so is preferable to option c.

When transposing the 1910 and the 1800, though, there is an intermediate player, 1896. While it is not incorrect to simply swap the 1910 and the 1800 and leave the 1896 undisturbed, it is considered more correct to do a three-way swap, as follows: the 1800 moves up two boards, the 1910 shifts down one, and the 1896 shifts down one. In this way, an additional player moves down a board, but the ratings change of each of the downward moves is not as large.

The resulting pairings:

White	Black
2320	1980
1951	2278
1800	2212
2199	1910
2178	1896

Example 4:

2210 B	vs. 1900 B
2200 B	vs. 1830 B
2150 W	vs. 1820 W
2120 B	vs. 1790 B
2080 B	vs. 1500 B
1920 W	vs. 1350 bye

Eight players are due for white, three for black, and one for neither, so pairings in which neither player is due for white should be corrected. We can quickly see that 2150 vs. 1820 and 1920 vs. 1350 are the problems. The 1350 player who received a bye in the first round is considered not due for white.

Switching (transposing) 1820 up a board is a 10-point change ($1830-1820=10$) on one side, 50 points ($2200-2150=50$) on the other. The lower number is used, so it is a 10-point transposition. Moving 1820 down a board is a 30-point transposition on both sides ($2150-2120$ or $1820-1790=30$). The 10-point change is selected and board two and three pairings are switched.

The two bottom boards may be paired as 2080 vs. 1350 and 1500 vs. 1920. The smaller of the two switches is 150 points ($1500-1350=150$), permissible under the 200-point rule to avoid two extra blacks for a player on the fifth board (29E5b).

However, there is a better way. An interchange between 1920 and 1900 also corrects the colors, and is a switch of just 20 points ($1920-1900=20$). An interchange has priority if it involves a smaller switch than a transposition, and the transposition requires a switch of over 80 points (29E5a).

The resulting pairings:

White	Black
2210	1920
2200	1820
1830	2150
2120	1790
2080	1500
1900	1350

Example 5:

2100 BWB (3 points) vs. 2080 BWB (3 points)
 1990 WBW (3 points) vs. 2050 WBW (2.5 points)
 1980 BWB (2.5 points) vs. 1800 BWB (2.5 points)

Here, an odd player must drop from the 3 point group to the 2.5 point group. The two groups combined will have three pairings, and giving someone three blacks out of four games unfortunately cannot be avoided.

The natural pairings shown above, dropping the low 3 (1990) to face the high 2.5 (2050), are highly undesirable, leaving the colors wrong in all three games.

One way to improve colors would be to switch the 2050 with the second highest 2.5, the 1980. This would be a switch of 70 ($2050-1980=70$) or 190 ($1990-1800=190$), which counts as 70.

The alternative would be to switch the 2080 and the 1990 in the 3-point group. This would be 90 ($2080-1990=90$) or 50 ($2100-2050=50$), counting as 50, and thus slightly preferable.

The resulting pairings:

White	Black
2100	1990
2080	2050
1980	1800

TD TIP: *All of this is done automatically when the director uses a computer pairing program that is set up properly; however, the director is still ultimately responsible for the pairings and should make it a practice to review the final pairings made by any program.*

29E8. Variation (unannounced) team pairings take precedence over color equalization.

In a combined swiss individual and team tournament, the need to avoid pairing players from the same team shall take precedence over the need to equalize colors.

29F. Last-round pairings with unfinished games.

Every reasonable effort should be made to have all games finished before pairing the last round. If this would unduly delay the start of the last round and inconvenience a large number of people, then last-round pairings can be made and the round begun. In this case, the director must be very watchful of the unfinished games to prevent the results from being arranged to affect the prizes. **See also** [18F, Problems of the next-to-last round](#) and [28Q, Pairing unfinished games](#).

TD TIP: *Unless there is an extraordinary problem, games with sudden-death time controls have no problems with unfinished games by the time the last round needs to be paired.*

29G. Re-pairing a round.**29G1. Round about to start.**

If a player withdraws without proper notice as the pairings are nearing completion, the director must decide whether time permits a complete revision of the pairings, the most desirable solution.

If time does not allow this, one solution is to *ladder down* the pairings. For example, if a player with 2 points withdraws, the opponent faces a player with 1.5 points, that player's opponent faces a player with 1 point, and so on down until a bye is assigned or the original bye is paired.

In doing this, the director should attempt to find opponents within the same rating range and due for the same color. If the original pairings included any odd players, their pairings may be useful to change. For instance, if a player with 2 points withdraws and another 2 was paired against a 1.5, the opponent of the withdrawn player may be paired against the odd player with 2, leaving a 1.5 to be *laddered down* rather than a 2.

The use of an appropriately-rated house player should be considered as an alternative to re-pairing.

If a computer pairing program is used, the round can usually be properly re-paired without significant delay, avoiding need for *laddering* or a house player.

29G2. Round already started.

The director has the right to make changes in the pairings, if necessary, to correct errors or to handle sudden withdrawals, but it is recommended that no game be canceled in which Black's fourth move has been determined.

29G3. Selective re-pairing.

If some games have started and others have not, it is often possible to correct the problem satisfactorily by telling those who have started to continue and the others to wait and re-pairing those waiting as a separate group, using normal methods.

29H. Unreported results.

Occasionally, both players fail to report the result of their game. The result once learned by the director, counts for rating purposes. The result (except for [29H3](#)) may also be counted for prize purposes at the director's discretion if it is reported in a timely manner. The director's decision should be based on how much earlier in the tournament the unreported result occurred and how many pairings were affected. **See also** [15H, Reporting of results](#); and [15I, Results reported incorrectly](#).

TD TIP: See also the TD TIP for rule [15I](#) for further guidance in dealing with unreported and incorrectly reported results.

In a Swiss tournament, if it is time to pair the next round and a result is still unreported, the director has several options and should choose the one that offers the greatest equity:

29H1. Ejection.

One or both players may be ejected from the tournament. This is appropriate only if there have been prior non-reporting problems with the player(s) involved.

29H2. Double forfeit of next round.

Both players may be removed from the following round pairings, and forfeited for that round.

29H3. Double forfeit of unreported game.

Both players may be scored and paired as losses. The real result, when learned, may be recorded as an *extra rated game* ([28M4](#)).

29H4. Half-point byes next round.

Both players may be removed from the following round pairings and given half-point byes for that round, assuming that half-point byes are available in the event for that round.

29H5. Guess the winner.

If there is a great rating difference in the unreported game, the director may pair the higher-rated player as a win and the lower-rated as a loss. Such a *guess* is usually right, as not only is an upset statistically unlikely, but players scoring upsets rarely neglect to report results, while those defeating opponents rated well below them tend to have a higher *non-reporting rate* than average. The TD may have seen the game in progress, and therefore have an idea of who was winning. **See also** [29H9, Results reported after pairings done](#).

29H6. Pair as a win and a draw.

A variation of [29H5](#) is to pair the higher player as a win and the lower as a draw. This has the advantage of penalizing someone for non-reporting but also guarantees a wrong pairing (the penalty is being paired in a higher score group). If the director is not sure whether [29H5](#) or [29H7](#) is the better option, this may be an appropriate compromise. **See also** [29H9, Results reported after pairings done](#).

29H7. Pair as a double win.

The director may pair both players as having won. This has the advantage of generally penalizing the loser, or both players if the game was drawn, with a harder pairing. The disadvantage is that when the loser is paired a full point up in the next round, this may reward the opponent in that round with an inappropriately easy pairing. **See also** [29H9, Results reported after pairings done](#).

This option is more appropriate in a class tournament than one involving mixed classes in the same section; it also works better with even or minus scores than plus scores, and in early rounds rather than late rounds.

29H8. Multiple missing results.

If more than one game is unreported, all players who failed to report may be omitted from the next round pairings, and paired against each other once the results are known. If this method is used, care must be taken not to allow a player with a chance for prizes an unusually easy pairing—in effect a reward for failing to report the result. This method may also be used in combination with other methods.

29H9. Results reported after pairings done.

If the unreported result is reported or discovered after the pairings are posted for the next round, but shortly before the start of that round, and the director used options [29H5](#), [29H6](#), or [29H7](#), it is not generally recommended that the round be delayed by doing all pairings over. However, the director may consider changing some pairings. **See also** [29H10, Computer pairings](#).

- a. If Option [29H5, Guess the winner](#), was used, and the higher player actually lost, the pairings can usually be quickly improved by switching the opponents of the two players who failed to report. Another option, if the director does not fear significant delay, is to re-pair either or both of the two score groups involved.
- b. If Option [29H5, Guess the winner](#), was used, and the game was actually a draw, there may be no simple way to improve the pairings. However, they are probably not that bad (involving just half-point, not full-point, errors), and the director may allow them to stand.
- c. If Option [29H6, Pair as a win and a draw](#), was used, and the higher player actually won or drew, the pairings are even better than in **b**. But if the higher player lost, the situation is similar to **a**, and the director should consider at least transposing the pairings of the two non-reporters.
- d. If Option [29H7, Pair as a double win](#), was used, the pairings generally should not be changed. If this option has caused a serious problem, then it was incorrect to use it. The director facing this dilemma must choose between letting the pairings stand or doing many pairings over and delaying the round.

29H10. Computer pairings.

If a computer makes pairings, delaying the start of the round to correct all the pairings becomes a more viable option, since the computer may be able to do this in a few minutes.

The director of a large tournament should remember that in addition to the time required to re-pair, there may be significant delay if players must leave their boards, find new pairings, go to new boards, and set up again.

29I. Class pairings.

In tournaments with significant class prizes, class pairings may be used in the last round, if announced in advance. This allows prizes to be decided by direct encounters between those competing for them. A major benefit is to avoid games in which a player in contention for a large prize faces a higher-rated opponent who is not, a situation that invites collusion to produce a win for the player in contention.

Class pairings should be used only when it is mathematically impossible for any player in that class to win a place prize that is greater than first in the class. If even one player can win more than first in the class, the system should not be used at all. **See also** [29E5f1, Last round exceptions](#) and [29E4c, Priority based on lot](#).

Class pairings may unfairly affect special prizes, such as top junior or senior, a factor a director may wish to consider.

***TD TIP:** This method is not used if a class player is also in contention for a place prize. For example, a 1495 player is in contention for a top prize as well as the “C” prize. If class pairings are used, the 1495 player could be paired against a weaker class “C” opponent instead of the stronger “natural” higher rated opponent, also in contention for a place prize. The “natural” opponent will most likely then be paired against an opponent rated higher than 1495. This unusual pairing may allow the 1495 rated player to win the place prize.*

29I1. Full-class pairings.

The first common method of class pairings simply treats the class as a separate Swiss system tournament, and pairs accordingly. If there is an odd number of players in the class, the bottom player should be paired as normally as

possible outside the class. **See also** [28M1, The house player](#); [29D, The odd player](#); and [29J, Unrateds in class tournaments](#).

29I2. Partial class pairings.

Another system pairs players within a rating class who have a chance for class prizes with each other, and then treats the rest of the field normally. This method can be useful when using a computer program that does not do class pairings, since it can greatly reduce the number of pairings that must be made by hand and entered into the computer.

29J. Unrateds in class tournaments.

In sections or events restricted to players under a specified rating with unrated players also allowed, if there are two or more unrated players with plus scores in the same score group, the director may pair them against each other. This system is most appropriate in events with meaningful cash prizes; it tends to make it more difficult for players to win undeserved prizes. **See also** [28C, Ratings of players](#); [28D, Players without US Chess ratings](#); and [33F, Unrateds](#).

***TD TIP:** Organizers sometimes limit unrated players in class tournaments to their own section with their own prizes. Occasionally unrated players are also given the opportunity to play in the highest section or class with the understanding that they only qualify for the top prizes or a special unrated prize.*

29K. Converting small Swiss to round robin.

A 5-round Swiss with six entries or 3-round Swiss with four entries may be converted to a round robin format. This may be acceptable for a quick one-day tournament, but often works poorly for a two-day or three-day six-player round robin.

Withdrawals are likely to cause many more unplayed games in a round robin than in a Swiss and to distort the results more. The round robin format is also not compatible with late entries or half-point byes. It is true that the Swiss may pair players against each other twice, usually the two leaders in the last round, but most players prefer such a rematch to not playing at all.

29L. Using round robin table in small Swiss.

A better option than [29K, Converting small Swiss to round robin](#), is to maintain an event as a Swiss when there is a small turnout, but to use a round robin pairing table to minimize the possibility of players' facing the same opponents twice.

For instance, if a 5-round Swiss has six players, pair round one as in a normal Swiss. Then assign round robin pairing numbers, which cause the first-round pairings to have been correct for round one of a six-player round robin, using the pairing table in *Chapter 12*. Do not announce that the tournament will be a round robin; it may not be.

As long as there are no dropouts or additions, pair each subsequent round using the round robin table by selecting the round from the table in which the top player in the top score group receives the proper Swiss opponent. Do not use the colors from the table, but assign them according to Swiss rules. If three in a row of the same color is inevitable using a pairing line from the table, there is the option of using the next best line.

***TD TIP:** Here is an example list of six players in a five round Swiss, in Swiss rating order (highest rated through lowest rated), with round robin pairing numbers (generated by the round 1 pairings from table B in Chapter 12: Round Robin Pairing Tables): 1. (2205), 6. (2050), 5. (1803), 2. (1650), 3. (1493), 4. (1402). The pairings for round one: 1. (2205) vs. 2. (1650), 3. (1493) vs. 6. (2050), 5. (1803) vs. 4. (1402). Notice that the pairings are Swiss pairings using the pairings numbers from round 1 located in the round robin pairings table B in Chapter 12.*

If everyone completes the tournament, it will in effect be a round robin, but if there are dropouts or late entries it is possible to switch to Swiss methods at any time. For instance, in the last round if only four players are still in the

tournament, use Swiss methods and pair them against each other even if one or both encounters are rematches. This is far better than sticking to round robin pairings and awarding two byes.

The above method may also be used with slightly more players to avoid rematches. For instance, it may be appropriate in a four-round Swiss with five or six players, a five-round Swiss with six to eight players, a six-round Swiss with seven to ten players, a seven-round Swiss with eight to twelve players, or an eight-round Swiss with nine to fourteen players.

Note that in such small Swisses it is especially important to recruit an appropriately rated permanent house player (28M1) if possible, since otherwise byes will have a more harmful effect than in a larger Swiss. Repeated announcements among spectators offering free entry to such a house player are warranted, with the condition that such a player will be paired only when there would otherwise be an odd number. It is even possible to allow such a house player to be eligible for prizes in the event he or she plays sufficient games to be in contention.

***TD TIP:** Some directors may find 29L1, Variation: 1 vs. 2 pairings, easier to administer than using this combination of round robin and Swiss systems when faced with a small number of players that almost matches the number of rounds in a tournament, especially if the event is longer than one day.*

Variation 29L1. 1 vs. 2 pairings.

This pairing system is exactly the same as the Swiss pairing system except that the players in the upper half do not play the players in the lower half in the first or any other round. Instead, in round 1 after the players have been ranked, each odd ranked player is paired with the even ranked player following them on the ordered ranking list; i.e.; 1 vs. 2, 3 vs. 4, 5 vs. 6, etc. In all other rounds the players are ranked in rating order within their respective score groups and paired in groups of two starting with the two top-rated players in the top score group. Odd players should be paired to the player in the next lower score group who closest matches with them in rating, using normal color priorities. Color allocation, transposition, avoiding players meeting twice, byes, late entries, and withdrawals are applied exactly the same way as in a Swiss event.

***TD TIP:** Because it handles withdrawals and late entries as easily as the Swiss system, this 1 vs. 2 pairing system is easier, for some directors, to administer than 29L. Using round robin table in small Swiss, in events with the number of players almost equal to the number of rounds; however, the 1 vs. 2 pairings system can accommodate many players in any size tournament. This system has seen some popularity at the club and local level. It is a hybrid of the traditional club “ladder” system (where one player challenges another player for their spot on the ladder) and the Swiss System.*

29M. Recommendations.

Some disparity in color allocation is inevitable in the Swiss system, as score has priority over color. Tournaments with an even number of rounds cause the most problems, because when a disparity exists, it is larger. Tournaments with an odd number of rounds are therefore apt to keep more players happy, and are easier to pair because it is easier to maintain the expected 3-2 or 4-3 color allocations. **See also** 27A4, Equalizing colors; 27A5, Alternating colors; 28J, The first round; 29E, Color allocation; 29E2, First round colors; 29E3, Due colors in succeeding rounds; 29E4, Equalization, alternation, and priority of color; and 29E5, Colors vs. ratings.

30. The Round Robin Tournament

30A. Description.

This tournament format is also known as *all-play-all*. Formerly the almost-exclusive format for chess competitions, the round robin is most often used now for important events where time is not a factor, club events with one game per week, and one-day four-player events known as *quads*.

Although it is the fairest-known tournament format when there are no withdrawals, it cannot accommodate many players, and so is used much less than the Swiss system. A round robin tournament is easy to pair. Players are assigned numbers by lot, and the pairings are read from Crenshaw tables, Chapter 12.

30B. Scoring.

Scoring is the usual one/one-half/zero, except that players who withdraw before playing half their scheduled games shall be scored as not having competed at all. Their completed games must still be rated, but they are not considered part of their opponents' records for prize purposes.

30C. Withdrawals.

Dropouts cause major problems in round robins. In special invitationals they may be held to a tolerable level, but in open weekend tournaments and weekly club events serious problems are common. Unlike the Swiss, in which a forfeit affects at most one game, a dropout may generate numerous inequities in a round robin, whether notice is given or not.

30D. Penalties for withdrawals.

Players who withdraw without sufficient reason or who repeatedly withdraw from round robins may be denied entry in future such events, or may be charged a special deposit, which will be refunded upon completion of all games. The latter is in addition to any deposit the organizer may choose to require of all players in an effort to minimize withdrawals.

30E. Effect of withdrawals on colors.

If there is a withdrawal, the Crenshaw-Berger system provides tables for adjustments to equalize colors. **See also** [Round Robin Pairing Tables](#).

30F. Double round robins.

In double round robins, each player or team plays each of the others twice, the second time reversing the original color assignment.

30G. Quads.

Quadrangular tournaments divide the entrants into groups of four in rating order. The four highest-rated players form the first group, etc. These players then play three-game round robins following the Crenshaw tables. **See also** [Chapter 12 Round Robin Pairing Tables](#).

When the total number of entries is not divisible by four, the director may create a 3-round Swiss among the lowest five to seven players. This works well with a field of six, but not with five or seven since a large percentage of the field will receive a bye. The simplest method of evening the field is to seek another player. If more than one player appears, the late players should be informed that only an odd number prepared to enter immediately will be accepted.

A five-player section may be held as a round robin if all players agree. Players should be warned that this may take much longer since each player will have four opponents and a sit-out. This format is most appropriate with lower-rated players.

The preferred pairing table for quads is as follows: (Players' numbers are assigned in order of rating, not randomly as in larger round robins.)

Round one: 1–4, 2–3; round two: 3–1, 4–2; round three: 1–2, 3–4 (colors by toss in this round)

TD TIP: Some TDs prefer to randomly assign pairing numbers by lot for Quads.

30H. Holland system.

The Holland system uses round robin preliminaries to qualify players for finals, which are usually also round robins. There is no standard format, but a typical one might be to divide players into groups of similar strength of about eight to twelve players each, with the winner or top two in each prelim qualifying for the championship finals and others possibly for lower finals.

The Holland system, once the standard U.S. tournament format, was surpassed by the more flexible Swiss system in the 1940s and is used today largely for Blitz (G/5) tournaments, in which the lack of delay for pairings is especially advantageous.

30I. Unbalanced Holland.

A Holland variant used successfully in Blitz events places the top-rated players in the first preliminary section, the next highest rated in the second, etc., rather than balancing the strength of the sections. Prizes are awarded for each prelim, and all plus scores in the first prelim qualify for the finals, along with the top two players from the second prelim and the winners of each other prelim.

31. Team Chess

Many varieties of team chess exist in the U.S. Different leagues, inter-club events, and tournaments have somewhat different rules. The concern here is principally for team tournaments, but the points made may have wider applicability. Except for [31A, Combined individual-team tournaments](#), all comments apply to events with team vs. team pairings.

***TD TIP:** Directors are advised to have a team captains meeting before the first round to make sure the special variations on the particular style of team chess for any one event are well understood by the teams involved.*

31A. Combined individual-team tournaments.

As the name suggests, these are not true team tournaments. They are particularly popular as scholastic events because they allow schools to enter any number of players instead of a team with a fixed roster. The tournament is played as a normal Swiss, except that efforts are made to avoid pairing teammates (i.e., players from the same school) with each other. **See also** [28A, Pairing cards or program](#) and [28N, Combined individual-team tournaments](#).

***TD TIP:** No large combined individual-team tournament is paired by hand any longer. The amount of detailed paperwork plus keeping track of team members for reports and pairings along with calculating team and individual tiebreaks makes this style of tournament an ideal candidate for pairing by computer.*

31A1 The Rollins (Military) Scoring system for combined events. This system offers a means to determine team and individual champions from a single event (usually a Swiss). The individual champion is determined using the normal rules and announced tie-breaks for the event. The number of eligible team members (for example, 4, 5 or 6) is determined as announced in the event promotion. Eligible teams are then selected by identifying the respective highest scoring players for each team. Based on the total number of players, each player receives a score that is the inverse of his overall placing. Example: The top player in a 100 player event receives 99 points, second place receives 98 points, etc. Individual scores for eligible team members are then combined to derive the team score. The highest team score is declared the Team Champion.

***TD TIP:** This method is especially useful for Swiss tournaments where the number of teams is small and the total number of participants is large. See rule [28N](#), and the Scholastic regulations, for the typical scoring method used at individual/team tournaments.*

A WORKING MODEL The following scoring happens in a fictional tournament that is a 6 round Swiss event consisting of 100 players and four teams. In this example, the Top Individual player (determined from the 6 round Swiss tournament) was from the Army and the Army won the Team Championship as well (determined from the standings from the individual tournament). (See table on next page)

	Army Team	Points	Navy Team	Points	Air Force Team	Points	Marine Team	Points
Player 1	1st	99	3rd	97	2 nd	98	4th	96
Player 2	5th	95	7th	93	8 th	92	10th	90
Player 3	6th	94	9th	91	11 th	89	12th	88
Player 4	13th	87	14th	86	16 th	84	15th	85
Player 5	17th	83	18th	82	22 nd	78	23rd	77
Player 6	19th	81	20th	80	21 st	79	24th	76
Place/Total		539		529		520		512

Table 31A.1 Rollins System for Combined Events

** This is the official scoring system of the US Armed Forces Open Chess Tournament.*

31B. Player rankings.

Players on a team are ranked according to rating; the higher-rated players play on lower board numbers. Alternates must be lower-rated than regular team members. Unrated players, unless assigned ratings (28D), must play on higher-numbered boards than rated players.

TD TIP: *The lowest board number is 1 (first position where the highest rated player is seated). This can be confusing since the top players play on this board.*

If a player is missing from the lineup, lower-rated teammates must move up to preserve the order by rating, so that if a team forfeits games, they are always on the last (highest-numbered, lowest-rated) boards. Board assignments must always be made as described in the preceding paragraph.

TD TIP: *Players missing from a team lineup require special care. The director can announce that individual team members should not start play unless all team members for both teams are present. After a very short time, announced by the director, all players missing from the lineup must be replaced by lower-rated teammates as outlined in 31B or any announced and posted variations of 31B. The individual games may then begin.*

A variation on this technique is used in round one, which presents special problems regarding players missing from the lineup. Travel is known to delay a player's arrival. Some directors, if they are confident that the player will arrive in time to complete a game, allow play to start in round one with a player missing from the lineup without enforcing 31B. Those directors often check with site officials, such as the hotel staff, to see if the player has arrived before making this ruling; however, this technique can backfire. For a lot of reasons the missing player may not show up at all. What the director rules at this point has an effect on team match points and team tiebreak points.

Ruling one: The team with the missing player forfeits that board and all boards below it. The actual game result is reported to US Chess for rating purposes but scored as forfeit losses for the team event. This method has a negative impact on the calculation of future tiebreak points.

Ruling two: The team with the missing player forfeits only the missing board. In all future rounds 31B will apply to the team with the missing player. This lessens the negative impact on future calculations of tiebreak points; however, it may cause the team with a full team roster to actually lose the round one match.

Since either ruling directly affects the team with the full roster of players, some directors allow that team to choose which ruling they prefer. Other directors may allow that team to decide before play starts if they prefer the enforcement of 31B or one of the two rulings just outlined here.

31B1. Board prizes.

If individual board prizes are offered, players who play on more than one board are eligible only for the lowest board played. The player's points on all boards combined are credited toward the board prize on the lowest board.

TD TIP: If a player plays in positions 1 and 4, the player's combined points would be credited toward the board prize for position 4.

Variation 31B2. Placement of unrated players in team lineup.

An unrated player may play on any board.

31C. Team ratings.

Teams are ranked in order of the average of individual ratings of the rated regulars, not alternates. Unrated players (28D) do not affect their team's average rating.

Variation 31C1. Unrateds and team ratings.

In calculating the average team rating, an unrated on board four is assigned 50 points below the rating of board three. An unrated on board three is assigned the average of the board two and four ratings. An unrated on board two is assigned the average of the board one and three ratings. An unrated on board one is assigned 50 points above the rating of board two. This system and 31B1 have been used at the Pan-American Intercollegiate.

TD TIP: Pairing software can calculate a team's average rating automatically.

31D. Pairing cards.

Team tournaments use pairing cards similar to those used in individual tournaments, except that there is space to note both match scores and game points. Ideally, a larger pairing card, such as one measuring five-by-eight inches, should be used. These are available from US Chess office.

The front of the pairing card should contain the team name, the team average rating, the round-by-round results of the team, the colors of the team, and the team's opponents. The reverse side should contain the names of the players, their ratings, their US Chess identification numbers, and the name of the team captain, as well as any information about fees and dues paid.

TD TIP: Pairing software can take care of these tasks automatically.

31E. Pairing rules.

Swiss team events should be paired in the same manner as individual events. Teams are grouped by their match points and then ranked within the group by their ratings. Rules governing color allocations apply to the color received by board one. If the first board receives white, for example, so do all teammates on odd-numbered boards, while his or her even-numbered teammates play black. Byes, defaults, lateness, and so forth are treated as in individual tournaments. Scoring is based on match points, without regard to the margin of victory.

In each match of a team tournament, a full match point (1.0) is awarded to the team with the greater game point total, while the opposing team receives no match points (0.0). If the two teams' game point totals are the same, each team receives half a match point (0.5).

TD TIP: Typically to win a match point a team's game point total must be at least one-half point more than the opposing team's game point total for that round (to draw the match both teams' game point totals are the same); i.e., the team with the largest total team game score wins the match or if the team game scores are equal draws the match. In the case of a double forfeit on one or more boards, it is possible for a team to win or draw the match even though its game point total seems insufficient to typically win or draw. For example, with 4-player teams, neither team's 4th board shows up. Team A wins on boards 1 and 2 (two game points) while team B wins on board 3 (one game point). Team A wins the match (and scores 1.0 match point) even though its game score is only 2.0 (typically only enough to draw a 4 board team match). Or, if the games on boards 1 through 3 are all draws, and board 4 is a double forfeit, then teams A and B each draw the match (0.5 match points) even though each team's game score is only 1.5 (typically not enough to draw or win a 4 board team match).

The director or organizer should announce in advance any variation on this procedure, including the minimum number of players (other than a full team) required to be present for a team to be paired or the minimum number of game points required for a team to win or draw a match.

One example variation: in each match of a team tournament, a full match point (1.0) is awarded to the team with the greater game point total only if that game point total is greater than half the available game points for the match; e.g., a team's game point total must be at least 2.5 in a team tournament with four-board teams in order to win. If a team scores exactly half the available game points, then the team receives half a match point (0.5); e.g., a team's game point total must be at least 2.0 in a team tournament with four-board teams in order to draw the match. If a team scores fewer than half the available match points for the match that team receives no game points (0.0); e.g., a team with a game point total equal to or less than 1.5 in a team tournament with four-board teams cannot score a match point.

Under this variation, if two teams with only three players each meet in a four-board match, a game score of 2-1 would lead to one team drawing the match (0.5 match point) and the other team losing the match (0.0 match point), while a game score of 1.5-1.5 would lead to both teams losing the match (0.0 match point).

Note that colors are less important for teams with an even number of boards than they are in an individual tournament, since half the team will have each color in every round.

Variation 31E1. Game point scoring.

Scoring and pairings may be done by game points rather than match points, or by a combination of the two (match points first, then game points if tied).

TD TIP: This is an ideal task for properly set pairing software.

31F. Wall charts.

Swiss team events are unique in that two sets of wall charts are needed: team charts to display team results and individual charts for individual results. The latter, in addition to being informative, are needed for tiebreak and rating purposes.

The individual charts are set up by team so that the highest-average-rated team's players would appear as numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., the second-highest-rated team's players next, and so on down to the lowest-rated team's players. Note that a player on a lower-rated team could have the highest individual rating in the tournament but still be placed far down on the wall charts.

A form that combines individual and team entries on a single wall chart is also possible, as is the use of a separate individual wall chart for each board.

31G. Team captain.

The role of the team captain is:

31G1. Registration.

To register the team with all appropriate information.

31G2. Arrival.

To see that the team arrives on time for each match.

31G3. Lineup.

To see that the team plays the correct opponent, in the correct board order, with the correct colors.

31G4. Draw consequences.

To advise the players, if asked, what the likely consequences of a draw would be for the team, and to respond to such a request without looking at the game of the player making the request.

31G4a. Captain may not impose results.

Each player alone is responsible for the result of his or her own game. The team captain may not impose results upon team members.

31G5. Reporting result.

To report the result of the match to the tournament director in the manner required.

31G6. Wall charts.

To check the wall charts for accuracy and to report any discrepancies to the director.

32. Prizes**32A. Announcement.**

Prizes to be awarded and the methods used to allocate them must be announced in pre-tournament publicity if they vary from the standards below. In all cases, these guidelines apply equally to individuals or teams. **See also** [23A1, Obligation to pay guaranteed prizes](#).

32B. Distribution.**32B1. One cash prize per player.**

No winner shall receive more than one cash award. The award may be one full cash prize if a clear winner, or parts of two or more cash prizes if tied with others. Prizes such as *biggest upset*, *best game*, or *brilliancy* are standard exceptions from this rule. Any other special prizes should be announced and designated as such. A clear winner of more than one cash prize must be awarded the most valuable prize. For examples see [32B5, Offering a choice of prizes](#).

32B2. Ties.

Tied winners of place prizes or tied winners in the same class of class prizes shall be awarded all the cash prizes involved, summed and divided equally; but no more than one cash prize shall go into the division for each winner. For examples see [32B5, Offering a choice of prizes](#).

32B3. Ties for more than one prize.

If winners of different prizes tie with each other, all the cash prizes involved shall be summed and divided equally among the tied winners unless any of the winners would receive more money by winning or dividing only a particular prize for which others in the tie are ineligible. No player may receive an amount greater from the division of those prizes than the largest prize for which he would be eligible if there were no tie. No more than one cash prize shall go into the pool for each winner. **For examples** see [32B5, Offering a choice of prizes](#).

TD TIP: The number of prizes in the pool to be split may not exceed the number of players in the tie.

32B4. Priority of identical prizes.

A player who is eligible for both a place prize and a class prize of an identical amount shall receive the place prize. A player who is eligible for more than one class prize of an identical amount shall receive the prize for the highest class involved. A player who is eligible for prizes of identical amounts, with one being a rating-based class prize and the other being a prize for juniors, seniors, etc., shall receive the rating-based class prize. For examples see [32B5, Offering a choice of prizes](#).

32B5. Offering a choice of prizes.

No player shall ever be offered a choice of which cash prize to accept, as this would allow that player to determine which prizes are available to be awarded to others. (See examples on next page)

Example 1:

1st prize = \$200

2nd prize = \$100

3rd prize = \$75

Players 1 and 2 tie for 1st and 2nd with 4.5-0.5, players 3, 4, and 5 score 4-1. No other player has more than 3.5 points.

Players 1 and 2 win \$150 each (equal shares of 1st and 2nd).

Players 3, 4, and 5 win \$25 each (equal shares of 3rd).

Example 2:

1st prize = \$400

2nd prize = \$200

A prize = \$100

B prize = \$50

Players 1, 2, 3 (Masters) score 5-0, players 4 (an Expert), 5 (an A), and 6 (a B) are next with 4-1. No other player has more than 3.5 points.

Players 1, 2, and 3 win \$200 each (equal shares of 1st-2nd).

Player 4 wins no money.

Player 5 wins \$100 (the A prize).

Player 6 wins \$50 (the B prize).

Note: If instead of the A prize of \$100 and B prize of \$50 an *Under 2000* prize of \$100 and *Under 1800* prize of \$50 had been advertised, players 5 and 6 would win \$75 each.

Example 3:

1st prize = \$250

1st A = \$75

2nd prize = \$200

2nd A = \$50

3rd prize = \$150

1st B = \$75

4th prize = \$100

Players 1 and 2 score 5-0. Players 3, 4, 5, 6 score 4.5-0.5, where 4 and 5 are A players and 6 a B player. Player 7 (an A) scores 4-1.

Players 1 and 2 each win \$225 (equal shares of \$250 + \$200).

Players 3, 4, 5, 6 each win \$100 (equal shares of \$150 + \$100 + \$75 + \$75).

Player 7 wins \$50 (second A).

If both monetary and non-monetary prizes are offered, see [33D2](#) and [Variation 33D2a](#) plus the examples following 33D2a.

32C. Payment.

Prizes advertised as guaranteed must be paid promptly and in full. Prize winners may be required to provide ID, social security numbers, tax forms information, etc. before prizes can be issued. Failure to pay guaranteed prizes may result in penalties, including revocation of affiliation or tournament director certification.

32C1. Withdrawals.

Unless the director decides otherwise, players who fail to complete the tournament are not entitled to prizes.

32C2. One player in class.

An announced class prize must be awarded even if only one player in that class completes the schedule, unless otherwise advertised.

32C3. No players in class.

If no player in a class completes the schedule, awarding an advertised prize for that class is not required.

32C4. Based-on prizes.

In tournaments in which prizes are based on entries, if the actual turnout is smaller than the based on turnout, the following rules apply:

32C4a. Proportional payout.

Each prize must be paid at least in proportion to the turnout.

32C4b. 50% minimum.

If the total advertised prize fund is greater than \$500 (all sections combined), at least 50% of each advertised prize must be paid.

32C4c. Multiple-section tournaments.

If separate based-on goals are announced for different sections, then the proportion paid in each section ([32C4a](#)) is treated separately. If a common based-on goal is announced for multiple sections, then the proportion paid in these sections is considered together. In either case, [32C4b](#) also applies.

Examples:

1. A tournament advertises \$1,000 in prizes if 100 players enter. Only 30 enter. The organizer is required to pay at least \$500, each prize being at least half the original projection.
2. A tournament advertises \$1,000 in prizes if 100 players enter. Only 70 enter. The organizer is required to pay at least \$700 in prizes, each prize to be at least 70 percent of the amount originally advertised.
3. A tournament advertises \$400 in prizes if 40 players enter. Only 10 players enter. The organizer is required to pay at least \$100 in prizes, each prize to be at least 25% ($10/40 = 25\%$) of the amount originally advertised.

TD TIP: *When there are no players eligible for a prize, that prize is simply not awarded. The based-on formula then applies (as it would have been if there were players eligible for all prizes) to the remaining advertised prize money. Directors are not required to redistribute any prize money that players do not qualify for in based-on prize funds; however, be aware that any based-on prize in any tournament that is also a Grand Prix event is subject to review and adjustment by US Chess.*

32C5. Reentry prizes.

Unless announced otherwise, reentries ([28S](#)) qualify only for prizes calculated by their latest reentry score. **See also** [28S5](#), [Reentry scores](#) and [34H](#), [Reentry tiebreaks](#).

32C6. Limited Prizes: In general, when a player is allowed to enter a given event or section, that player is eligible for the prizes in that section. However, when a player (e.g. an unrated in a lower section) receives a limited prize, the distribution of the remaining prize is to follow the following priority list.

The total dollar amount of all cash prizes announced or computed by “based on” shall be paid:

1. Within the event.
2. Within the section in which the limit was awarded.
3. Within the prize group (e.g. place, class or under) in which the limit was awarded.
4. Within the point group in which the limit was awarded.

See also [33F Unrateds](#).

32D. Minimum penalty for violation of 32C4.

The minimum penalty shall be disqualification from advertising in *Chess Life* for one year. Additional penalties may be imposed at the discretion of the Executive Director. If a tournament is affected with extreme adverse events, then the organizer may appeal to US Chess. **See also 21L, Appeal to US Chess.**

Organizers are expected to base their prize funds on estimates of player attendance that can be reasonably achieved. An organizer who repeatedly overestimates tournament attendance may be subject to penalties, at the discretion of US Chess.

32E. Partial guarantees.

Sometimes the overall prize fund is based on entries, but some prize(s), most often first overall, is (are) guaranteed. Organizers should realize that, in such cases, they are guaranteeing more than a proportional payment of prizes, and that if the projected prize fund is more than \$500, they are also guaranteeing more than 50 percent of the projected prize fund under these circumstances.

For example, if projected prizes are \$2,000 based on 60 entries with \$500 guaranteed to first, and 30 players enter, the \$500 first prize must be awarded and the remaining \$1,500 that was projected cannot be lowered below \$750 (as each prize must not be less than half of what was projected). So, the actual total guarantee is \$1,250 (\$500 first place + \$750 minimum based on \$1500 expected payment based on 32C4), not \$1,000.

***TD TIP:** The TD should realize that in the unique case of multiple players all finishing the tournament with perfect scores (winning the maximum number of games possible in a tournament), the standard tiebreaking systems would not have the same relevance as they would in outcomes where the players finished with less-than perfect scores, and could have otherwise done better. It is impossible to improve on a perfect score. Therefore, in the special case of more than one player finishing with a perfect score, the TD should make every effort possible to have a playoff among all players with perfect scores, to determine the winner of the event. The playoff does not have to be rated, and the time control can be faster than the time control used for the tournament (but should allow at least five minutes per player). A special playoff to break perfect-score ties does not need to be announced in the tournament publicity, but should be announced to the players at the beginning of the tournament.*

32F. Trophies.

No player should receive more than one individual trophy or plaque, the most desirable to which he or she is entitled. It is recommended that no class, age, or school grade trophy be as desirable as any of the place trophies. A player should not have a choice of trophies, since such a choice would decide which trophies are available to be awarded to others. **See Also 33D1 one non-monetary prize per player.**

32F1. Tiebreaking.

Unless another method has been announced in advance, tiebreaking (see 34, [Breaking ties](#)) will be used to resolve ties for trophies.

TD TIP:** One popular announced method is to have a series of speed game playoffs for non-divisible prizes such as trophies. **See also 34E12, Speed play-off game(s).

Variation 32F2. School grade or age trophy and place trophy.

The winner of a school grade or age trophy may also win a place or class trophy. This addresses the common problem of young children who consider any first place better than any lower place regardless of the category. The use of this variation should be posted or announced at the tournament before the first round.

32G. Other non-cash prizes.

No player shall receive more than one non-cash, non-trophy prize, the most valuable to which he or she is entitled. **See Also 33D1 one non-monetary prize per player.**

32G1. Tiebreaking.

Unless another method has been announced in advance, tiebreaking (see [34, Breaking ties](#)) will be used to resolve ties for merchandise, memberships, or free entries, to determine which player wins any title at stake or qualifies to advance into another contest, or for any purpose other than the awarding of money prizes.

TD TIP: One popular method is to have a series of speed game playoffs for non-divisible prizes such as trophies. This should be announced in advance. See also [34E12, Speed play-off game\(s\)](#)

33. Some Notes About Prize Funds

These are recommendations, rather than rules or mandates, but are included since some less-experienced organizers may find them useful.

33A. First prize.

A ratio of about ten to one between first prize and the entry fee is typical for serious tournaments, as opposed to club events or other tournaments organized to provide experience. This ratio should be even greater in an event designed to attract top players.

33B. Place prizes and class prizes.

When there is apt to be a number of players in a rating class competing in an event, it is frequently the case that some sort of class prize is offered. This should be at least as much as the entry fee paid. Generally, place prizes should be higher than class prizes, both to reward the relative excellence of the chess played and to avoid distribution problems.

In major tournaments, the top prizes for classes or rating-based lower sections are often higher than the lower place prizes, but most organizers consider it inappropriate for any class prize or rating-based lower section prize to be as large as the corresponding overall or top section prize.

TD TIP: One correct example: 1st = \$1000, 2nd = \$700, 3rd = \$500, Class X = \$400. One problematical example (the class prize equals or exceeds the lowest place prize): 1st = \$1000, 2nd = \$700, 3rd = \$500, Class X = \$600 (or even Class X = \$500).

33C. Classes.

A common variation on class prizes is the use of *under* prizes for players below a specified rating. There is a difference between a Class A prize and an Under 2000 prize, since only a Class A player may win the former, while a Class A, B, C, D, or E player can qualify for the latter. If a prize is intended for a restricted group, it should be named by the class or by both ratings boundaries, e.g., Class A or 1800-1999.

33D. Non-monetary (indivisible) prizes.

Non-monetary prizes, such as trophies, clocks, medals, and the like are sometimes offered. These are especially popular at scholastic tournaments, where they are offered in place of monetary prizes. In non-scholastic tournaments, these are sometimes offered alone or sometimes with monetary prizes. See Example 4 in [33D2a](#) below, where the A prize is "\$100 + clock."

Indivisible prizes present certain problems because they are, well, indivisible. This often necessitates tie-breaking procedures. See also [34, Breaking Ties](#)

33D1. One non-monetary prize per player.

No winner shall receive more than one non-monetary award. Prizes such as *biggest upset*, *best game*, or *brilliancy* are standard exceptions from this rule. Any other special prizes should be announced and designated as such. A clear winner of more than one non-monetary prize must be awarded the highest-ranked prize (*ranking* is described below).

33D1a. Ranking of prizes.

Ranking prizes becomes important when a player qualifies for more than one non-monetary prize. This often leads to the question of which non-monetary prize should be awarded to the player and which left for someone else. For instance, is second Under 2000 ranked ahead of first Under 1800, or is any first place higher than any second place?

If each of the prizes also has a monetary component, the choice of rankings is easy: The prize with the higher cash award is ranked higher. If monetary components of prizes are equal (e.g., 3rd place, 2nd Under 2000, and 1st Under 1800 each has a \$100 monetary component along with a trophy), the rankings become more difficult. In this situation, it is recommended that all top prizes be ranked first, then all class prizes for the highest class, then all class prizes for the next highest class, etc., but this may be varied. If the rankings are varied from the recommendation, the director should post the actual rankings at the tournament site in advance and include them in pre-tournament publicity if possible. Example: 1st Under 1800 is ranked as a higher prize than 2nd Under 2000.

***TD TIP:** For scholastic tournaments, age- or grade-based prizes are usually considered equivalent to class prizes when determining the rank of a prize.*

33D2. Monetary and non-monetary prizes calculated separately.

If monetary and non-monetary prizes are offered together, such as “\$100 + trophy,” the monetary and non-monetary prizewinners should be calculated separately. In case of ties, monetary prizes should be combined and divided equally, as described in 32B5, while tie-breaking procedures should be used to award non-monetary prizes, as in 33D. No player should receive more than one non-monetary prize, except for the standard exceptions listed in 33D1.

***TD TIP:** As in the TD TIP above, for scholastic tournaments, age- or grade-based prizes are usually considered equivalent to class prizes when determining the rank of a prize.*

Variation 33D2a. Monetary and non-monetary prizes calculated together.

If monetary and non-monetary prizes are offered together, such as “\$100 + trophy,” the non-monetary prize must be awarded to the same person who is awarded the monetary prize, or, if there is a tie for the prize, to the player with the greatest tiebreak points qualifying for the prize. TDs who use this variation should do so consistently and post it at the tournament.

Examples of 33D2 and 33D2a:*Example 1:*

1st	\$200 + trophy
2nd	\$100 + trophy
3rd	\$50 + trophy
Top A	\$40 + trophy
Player 1 (2250)	5 points
Player 2 (2225)	4.5 points, 20 tiebreak points
Player 3 (1940)	4.5 points, 18 tiebreak points
Player 4 (1865)	4 points, 16 tiebreak points
Player 5 (1990)	4 points, 14 tiebreak points

Player 1 gets \$200 and the 1st place trophy.

Player 2 gets \$75 + the 2nd place trophy (\$75 as an equal share of 2nd and 3rd money, plus the 2nd place trophy because 2's tiebreaks are better than 3's).

Player 3 gets \$75 + the 3rd place trophy (\$75 as an equal share of 2nd and 3rd money, plus the 3rd place trophy because 3's tiebreaks are worse than 2's). This assumes that the director has ranked top prizes ahead of class prizes.

Player 4 gets \$20 + the Top A trophy (\$20 as an equal share of the Top A money, plus the Top A trophy because 4's tiebreaks are better than 5's).

Player 5 gets \$20 (\$20 as an equal share of the Top A money; all trophies have been awarded to other players).

Example 2:

1st	\$200 + trophy
2nd	\$100 + trophy
3rd	\$50 + trophy
Top Under 2200	\$40 + trophy
Top Under 2000	\$30 + trophy

Player 1 (2250)	5 points
Player 2 (2225)	4.5 points, 20 tiebreak points
Player 3 (1940)	4.5 points, 18 tiebreak points
Player 4 (2375)	4 points, 16 tiebreak points
Player 5 (1990)	4 points, 14 tiebreak points
Player 6 (2125)	3.5 points, 19 tiebreak points
Player 7 (1865)	3.5 points, 10 tiebreak points

Player 1 gets \$200 + the 1st place trophy.

Player 2 gets \$75 + the 2nd place trophy (an equal share of 2nd and 3rd money, plus the 2nd place trophy because 2's tiebreaks are better than 3's). This assumes that the director has ranked top prizes ahead of class prizes.

Player 3 gets \$75 + the 3rd place trophy (an equal share of 2nd and 3rd money, plus the 3rd place trophy because 3's tiebreaks are worse than 2's). This assumes that the director has ranked top prizes ahead of class prizes.

Player 4 gets nothing (because player 4 does not qualify for the Top Under 2200 prize or the Top Under 2000 prize).

Player 5 gets \$40 + the Top Under 2200 trophy (\$40 because the money for Top Under 2200 is greater than the money for Top Under 2000, and the Top Under 2200 trophy because Top Under 2200 is ranked higher than Top Under 2000).

Player 6 gets nothing (because the Top Under 2200 prize has already been awarded and 6 is ineligible for the Top Under 2000 prize).

Player 7 gets \$30 + the Top Under 2000 trophy.

Example 3:

(Top prizes – already awarded)	
1st Under 2000	\$200 + trophy
2nd Under 2000	\$100 + trophy
1st Under 1800	\$200 + trophy
2nd Under 1800	\$100 + trophy

Player 1 (1650)	5, 20 tiebreak points
Player 2 (1750)	5, 18 tiebreak points
Player 3 (2020)	4.5, 23 tiebreak points
Player 4 (1675)	4.5, 19 tiebreak points
Player 5 (1920)	4.5, 17 tiebreak points
Player 6 (1700)	4.5, 16 tiebreak points
Player 7 (1845)	4.5, 15 tiebreak points

Player 1 gets \$200 + the 1st Under 2000 trophy (because 1st Under 2000 is ranked higher than 1st Under 1800).

Player 2 gets \$200 + the 1st Under 1800 trophy.

Player 3 gets nothing.

Player 4 gets \$50 + the 2nd Under 2000 trophy (because 2nd Under 2000 is ranked higher than 2nd Under 1800).

Player 5 gets \$50.

Player 6 gets \$50 + the 2nd Under 1800 trophy.

Player 7 gets \$50.

This example illustrates the difference between Class prizes and Under prizes. If the Under 2000 prizes were Class A prizes instead, they would go to Players 5 and 7, as both 5-pointers and the 4.5-pointers in Class B would be ineligible for the Class A prizes.

Example 4:

1st prize = \$300

2nd prize = \$200

A prize = \$100 + clock

Player 1 (Expert) scores 5-0, player 2 (A) scores 4.5-0.5, player 3 (A) scores 4-1.

Player 1 wins \$300 as a clear 1st place finisher.

Player 2 wins \$200 as a clear 2nd place finisher.

Player 3 wins \$100 as clear winner of the A prize, since the other A player has already taken 2nd prize.

Who wins the clock depends on which rule is being followed. If mainline rule [33D2](#) is being followed, Player 2 gets the clock, as the top finisher in Class A. If Variation [33D2a](#) is being followed, Player 3 gets the clock, as the clock follows the money for the Class A prize.

Example 5:

1st Under 2200 \$100 + trophy

2nd Under 2200 \$50 + trophy

1st Under 2000 \$80 + trophy

Player 1 (1900) 4.5, 20 tiebreak points

Player 2 (2100) 4.5, 18 tiebreak points

Player 3 (2150) 4.5, 16 tiebreak points

Player 4 (1900) 3.5, 23 tiebreak points

Player 1 gets \$80 and a trophy. The \$80 is the 1st under 2000 prize, which is the greatest monetary prize for which Player 1 is eligible. (If all three listed prizes are summed and divided equally, Player 1 would only receive \$76.67.)

Which trophy Player 1 receives depends on which rule is being followed. Under mainline rule [33D2](#), Player 1 gets the 1st Under 2200 trophy, the highest-ranked trophy for which he qualifies. Under Variation [33D2a](#), Player 1 gets the 1st Under 2000 trophy, because the trophy follows the money and Player 1 received the 1st under 2000 money (see above for explanation).

Player 2 gets \$75 and a trophy. The \$75 is an equal share of 1st Under 2200 and 2nd Under 2200 money, as the 1st under 2000 money has already been awarded.

Which trophy Player 2 gets depends on which rule is being followed. Under mainline rule [33D2](#), Player 2 gets the 2nd under 2200 trophy, because the 1st under 2200 trophy has already been awarded and 2's tiebreaks are better than 3's. Under Variation [33D2a](#), Player 2 gets the 1st Under 2200 trophy because this trophy is still available and 2's tiebreaks are better than 3's.

Player 3 gets \$75 and *might or might not get a trophy depending on which rule is being followed*. The \$75 is an equal share of 1st Under 2200 and 2nd Under 2200 money.

If mainline rule [33D2](#) is being followed, Player 3 gets no trophy, because both Under 2200 trophies have already been awarded. If Variation [33D2a](#) is being followed, Player 3 gets the 2nd Under 2200 trophy, because this trophy is still available and 3 has more points than 4.

Player 4 gets no money, as it has all been awarded. If *mainline rule* [33D2](#) is being followed, Player 4 gets the *1st Under 2000 trophy*, as this trophy is still available. If *Variation* [33D2a](#) is being followed, Player 4 gets *no trophy*, as they have all been awarded.

Trophy prizes for Example 5 under the two rules (monetary prizes are the same under the two rules):

	<u>33D2</u>	<u>33D2a</u>
Player 1	1st U2200	1st U2000
Player 2	2nd U2200	1st U2200
Player 3		2nd U2200
Player 4	1st U2000	

TD TIP: *The prize Player 1 received in this example shows how money is taken out of a pool to be split if a player in the tied group would get more money by taking a particular prize, 1st under 2000 in this example, for which others in the tie are ineligible. In this case the \$80 is removed from the pool that is split by the remaining players in the tie (Player 2 and Player 3). See also [32B3](#), *Ties for more than one prize*.*

33E. Prizes based on points.

Some organizers base prizes on points scored rather than place. Such events often award prizes to all plus scores, a popular feature for players who doubt their ability to win the top-place prizes.

For example, in a 5-round Swiss with an entry fee of \$30, it could be announced that 5 points will win \$100, 4.5 points will win \$50, 4 points will win \$30, 3.5 points will win \$20, and 3 points will win \$10. With a fee of \$60, prizes might be 5 points will win \$300, 4.5 point will win \$150, 4 points will win \$90, 3.5 points will win \$60, 3 points will win \$30. These levels provide relative safety for the organizer, since even with a poor turnout prizes will often be less than entry fees.

Prizes based on points have proven more popular with Experts and below than with Masters, so organizers should consider not using them in top sections. It is desirable to have such events in sections of no more than two 200-point classes each or to offer supplementary prizes for lower classes unlikely to make plus scores. A separate section for each class is ideal if the expected turnout is sufficient.

The based-on-points method has a unique advantage over prizes that are guaranteed or based on entries. The announced prizes are never reduced, but their total varies according to the turnout. This protects the organizer against financial loss without the player disappointment sometimes caused by prize reduction. *See also [32C4](#), [Minimum prizes in based-on-entries tournaments](#).*

33F. Unrateds.

Note that many players who are playing in their first US Chess tournament, although they have no US Chess ratings, are by no means beginners. Some have high ratings or categories in other countries, and not all reveal these to

directors as required. Unrated players should generally not be eligible for any prizes of value other than place or unrated prizes. Prizes such as “D/E/Unrated” are not recommended.

When substantial cash prizes are offered in sections for lower-rated players, unrateds are often ineligible to enter or have a prize limit far below that of rated players. *See also 29J, Unrateds in class tournaments.*

34. Breaking Ties

34A. Introduction.

There is no perfect tiebreak system; each has its faults. In some events, especially large ones, ease and speed of calculation is a concern. In other events where time is not pressing, playoffs provide a better alternative to traditional tiebreak systems. Playoffs are often conducted at a faster time control than the tournament; even five-minute games have been used.

34B. Announcement.

When used, tiebreak systems should be posted at the site before the first round. There are several tiebreak systems that provide good and objective methods for directors to break ties for indivisible prizes.

Frequently, one tiebreak method alone will not break the tie, and it is necessary to use a secondary and sometimes even a tertiary method to produce a decision. Thus, at least the first two tiebreak systems should be posted. The director should be prepared to explain how the tiebreak systems work, as time permits.

34C. Monetary prizes.

Tiebreaks are not used for cash prizes, which are divided evenly among the tied players. An exception is a playoff, which may be used to determine cash prizes if notice of this is given in all detailed pre-tournament publicity. *See also 32B, Distribution.*

34D. Choice of tiebreak methods.

Different systems will yield different results, but the systems discussed here are not capricious or random. Each seeks to discover the *first among equals*, the player who has a somewhat better claim to a prize than those who earned the same score based on the strength of his or her opposition. Which system to choose depends on the nature of the tournament, its traditions, and the qualities required for the specific situations and conditions at hand.

34E. Calculating Swiss tiebreaks.

This section deals with various systems that have been used successfully at all levels of play. For team events see [34G, Team tiebreaks](#).

Unless a different method has been posted or announced before the start of the first round, players will expect the following sequence of tiebreak systems to be employed as the first four tiebreakers. Any variation to be used within the various systems should be posted also. These systems (and some additional ones) are explained in detail following the list.

1. Modified Median
2. Solkoff
3. Cumulative
4. Cumulative of Opposition

TD TIP: *Pairing software can calculate tiebreaks automatically.*

TD TIP: *The TD should realize that in the unique case of multiple players all finishing the tournament with perfect scores (winning the maximum number of games possible in a tournament), the standard tiebreaking systems would not have the same relevance as they would in outcomes where the players finished with less-than perfect scores, and could have otherwise done better. It is impossible to improve on a perfect score. Therefore, in the special case of more than one player finishing with a perfect score, the TD should make every effort possible to have a playoff*

among all players with perfect scores to determine the winner of the event. The playoff does not have to be rated, and the time control can be faster than the time control used for the tournament (but should allow at least five minutes per player). A special playoff to break perfect-score ties does not need to be announced in the tournament publicity, but should be announced to the players at the beginning of the tournament.

34E1. Modified Median

The Median system, also known as the Harkness system for inventor Kenneth Harkness, evaluates the strength of a player's opposition by summing the final scores of his or her opponents and then discarding the highest and lowest of these scores.

In the Modified Median system, players who tie with even scores (an even score is equal to exactly one half of the maximum possible score), have the highest- and lowest-scoring opponents' scores excluded. The system is modified for players with non-even scores to disregard only the least significant opponents' scores: the lowest-scoring opponent's score is discarded for tied players with plus scores and the highest-scoring for tied players with minus scores.

For tournaments of nine or more rounds, the top two and bottom two scores are discarded for even-score ties, the bottom two scores for plus-score ties, and the top two scores for minus-score ties.

These scores are adjusted for unplayed games, which count a half point each, regardless of whether they were byes, forfeits, or simply rounds not played after an opponent withdrew. So an opponent who won the first two games, lost the third, withdrew and did not play rounds four or five would have an adjusted score of 3 points ($1+1+0+0.5+0.5 = 3$). These adjusted scores are used only to calculate the opponent's tiebreaks. The player's own score is not changed.

If the player involved in the tie has any unplayed games, they count as opponents with adjusted scores of 0.

34E2. Solkoff.

The Solkoff system is the same as the Median system (34E1) except that no opponents' scores are discarded.

34E3. Cumulative.

To determine cumulative tiebreak score, simply add up the cumulative (running) score for each round. For example, if a player's results were win, loss, win, draw, loss, the wall chart would show a cumulative score round by round as 1, 1, 2, 2.5, 2.5. The cumulative tiebreak total is 9 ($1+1+2+2.5+2.5 = 9$). If another player scored 2.5 with a sequence 1, 2, 2.5, 2.5, 2.5, the tiebreak points scored would be 10.5 ($1+2+2.5+2.5+2.5 = 10.5$). The latter player's tiebreaks are higher because he or she scored earlier and presumably had tougher opposition for the remainder of the event. One point is subtracted from the sum for each unplayed win or full-point bye (22B); likewise, one-half point is subtracted from the sum for each unplayed draw or half-point bye.

This system is ideal for large events, since it is very fast and easy to use. It also avoids the problem, common in Median and Solkoff, of having to wait for a lengthy last-round game between two non-contenders to end for top prizes to be decided. Another advantage is that last-round scores need not be included in calculating cumulative tiebreak points, since they have no effect on breaking the tie (both tied players will necessarily have the same last round score).

TD TIP: Cumulative tiebreaks can be calculated after the next to last round or while the last round is in progress.

Additional systems choose the stronger player by:

34E4. Median system (not modified).

See 34E1.

34E5. Result between tied players.

Self-explanatory if two tie, but useful only when they were paired and did not draw. If more than two tie, all results among tied players should be considered, with rank according to plus or minus, not percentage. For example, 3-1 (+2) beats 1-0 (+1).

34E6. Most blacks.

Also self-explanatory.

34E7. Kashdan.

This system rewards aggressive play by scoring 4 tiebreak points for a win, 2 for a draw, 1 for a loss, and 0 for an unplayed game. Note that if players with no unplayed games tie, the one with fewer draws will come out ahead.

34E8. Sonneborn-Berger.

See 34F. The disadvantage of using this system in a Swiss is that losses are disregarded, and a player losing to a strong opponent deserves more credit than one losing to a weak opponent. In a round robin, this problem does not exist, since everyone plays the same field.

34E9. Cumulative scores of opposition.

The cumulative tiebreak points of each opponent are calculated as in 34E3 and these are added together.

34E10. Opposition's performance.

This method averages the performance ratings of the players' opposition. Performance ratings are calculated by crediting the player with the opponent's rating plus 400 points for a victory, the opponent's rating minus 400 points for a loss, and the opponent's rating for a draw. Results of tied players against each other should not be included, since this would give one of the players an unfair advantage. After the performance rating for each tied players' opponents has been calculated, they are averaged. Both this system and 34E11 may be difficult to use when unrated players are in the tournament.

Example: A player who wins against a 1400 and a 1500, draws against a 1600, and loses to a 1700 would have a performance rating of 1650: $(1400+400) + (1500+400) + 1600 + (1700-400) = 6600$; $6600/4 = 1650$.

34E11. Average rating of opposition.

This system averages the ratings of players' opponents, the better tiebreak score going to the person who played the highest-rated average field. It sounds fair but has drawbacks. A tied player rated slightly above another will often have a very slightly higher-rated field and win the tiebreak by a statistically insignificant margin.

34E12. Speed play-off game(s).

The speed playoff, an exciting way to wind up a tournament, has been used as the first tiebreak to determine the title at several major events. See also 32F1, *Tiebreaking* and 32F, *Trophies*.

34E13. Coin flip

This breaks all ties.

TD TIP: One state chess association that has had a comprehensive list of tiebreaks for many years uses (in order): Modified Median; Solkoff; Cumulative; Result between tied players; Most blacks; Kashdan; Sonneborn-Berger; and Coin flip. Having an ordered list that goes this deep can be useful.

34F. Round robin tiebreaks.

The most common method is the Sonneborn-Berger system, also known as the partial-score method. For each player in the tie, add the final scores of all the opponents the player defeated and half the final scores of all the opponents with whom the player drew. Nothing is added for the games the player lost, or for unplayed games. If the tie still remains, the results of the game(s) between the players involved in the tie are used.

34G. Team tiebreaks.**34G1. Game (or match) points.**

Since most team events in the United States are scored on match points, the easiest tiebreak is simply the total game points earned by the teams involved. However, it is of questionable value because the teams that face the weakest opposition are more likely to win their matches by large margins. If game scoring is primary, the number of matches won is a simple and fair tiebreak.

34G2. U.S. Amateur Team System.

For each round, the tiebreak points are the final score of the opposing team multiplied by the number of points scored against that team. For example, if Team A scored 2.5-1.5 against Team B, which finished the tournament with 3 match points, Team A's tiebreak for that round is $2.5 \times 3 = 7.5$. This system awards credit for an extra margin of victory without the drawbacks of using straight game points, and is preferable.

34G3. Other systems.

Most of the individual tiebreak systems described in 34E are also suitable for team play, but they have the drawback of making the margin of victory meaningless in match-point scoring. Many players find a team event more exciting when every game can affect the team standings, even after a match has been won or lost.

34H. Reentry tiebreaks.

- a. The reentered player must use the announced tiebreaks for the entry determined by [28S5](#), [Reentry scores](#).
- b. The opponents of reentered players can use only the scores of whichever entry (the original entry or one of the reentries) that they played, when calculating the announced tiebreaks.

See also [32C5](#), [Reentry prizes](#).

TD TIP: Due to the complexity of reentry tiebreaks directors and organizers need to consider very carefully the advisability of having both reentries and non-divisible prizes as options at the same event.

35. Rules for Disabled and Assisted Players**35A. Purpose.**

The purpose of these rules for players with temporary or permanent disabilities is to encourage them to play chess. Bearing in mind that there are many kinds of disabled individuals with a wide variety of challenges, the tournament director enjoys considerable discretionary authority to institute special rules.

35B. Equality of treatment.

Players with temporary or permanent disabilities that prevent them from fulfilling certain conditions of the *Official Rules of Chess* shall have special consideration in meeting those rules. Their opponents shall be offered the same, or equivalent in the judgment of the TD, consideration. The tournament director is responsible for seeing that both opponents know about and understand any special rules for that particular game. No player may refuse to play a disabled or assisted human opponent. For rules regarding computers see [36, Rules and Regulations For Computer Participants](#). For Internet rules regarding disabled players see [Rule 14. Players with Disabilities](#) (Chapter 10).

35C. Eligibility for US Chess events.

To be eligible to compete, a player must be able to communicate in some unambiguous manner his or her selection of moves, in a way that does not require prompting of any kind from any person. An interpreter may be employed.

35D. Analogous situations.

When there are doubts concerning provisions to make in the rules for disabled players, the tournament director should consult the following rules for visually impaired players, closely adapted from FIDE's rules for the visually impaired, and apply them analogously. These rules apply when one or both players are impaired.

35E. Access.

US Chess organizers should make every effort to secure sites for their tournaments that are accessible to disabled players and provided with accessible facilities for their comfort.

35F. Rules for visually impaired and disabled players.

TD TIP: These rules can be applied analogously to any case where a player is disabled. The director might also find it valuable to use these rules as a guide for dealing with cases in which the player has religious, philosophical, or practical concerns. See also 15A1, Players unable to keep score.

35F1. Special chessboard.

A blind, visually impaired, or disabled player is entitled to use a chessboard with securing apertures or other devices designed specifically for use by disabled players even if a non-disabled opponent prefers to use a normal board simultaneously. In a game between two unsighted or disabled players, each is entitled to individually use a separate board.

In a game involving a single disabled player, such player may use an additional special board, while the non-disabled player uses a normal board. In a game between two disabled players, either is entitled to use a special board, but the game may be played on a single special board if both players agree. In cases where there are two boards in use, the game position is maintained on both. A player or his assistant is responsible for physically moving the pieces on any board used by that player.

35F2. Announcement of moves.

Legal moves shall be announced clearly by the player, repeated by the opponent, and executed on the player's board. Failure to announce moves correctly may be penalized by the addition of two unused minutes to the opponent's remaining time.

TD TIP: If a move different from that announced and repeated is executed, the TD or his designee must stop the game and determine if the announced or executed move will be designated as the completed move. See Rule 35F8, Conflict between two positions.

35F3. Touch-move rule.

On the blind, visually impaired, or disabled player's board, a piece shall be deemed *touched* when it has been taken entirely out of the securing aperture or other device on the special chessboard. See also Rule 10, The Touched Piece and 35F1, Special chessboard.

35F4. Determination of a move.

A move shall be deemed determined (Rule 9, Determination and Completion of the Move) when all of the following procedures have occurred:

- a. A piece is placed into a securing aperture or other device on a special chessboard (35F1).
- b. In the case of a capture, the captured piece has been removed from the board of the player who is on move.
- c. The move has been announced (35F2).

Only after completing these procedures shall the opponent's clock be started. The move is completed (Rule 9, Determination and Completion of the Move) when the clock is pressed (5H). Pressing the clock before the move has been determined by these procedures may be penalized by the addition of two minutes to the opponent's remaining time.

TD TIP: Often players will press the clock after determining the move on their own board but before announcing the move to the opponent. This would violate the procedures outlined in 35F4 and 35F2. The offending player should be penalized.

35F5. Special clock.

A chess clock made especially for the blind, visually impaired or disabled player shall be admissible for use in that player's game. Rule 16B2a does not apply to such a clock.

35F6. Scorekeeping options.

An unsighted player or disabled player may keep the score of the game in Braille, by using a tape recorder, or by using any other specially-designed device. See also 35F10, Optional assistance.

35F7. Correction of erroneously stated move.

A slip of the tongue in announcing a move must be corrected immediately and before starting the clock of the opponent.

35F8. Conflict between two positions.

If different positions arise on the two boards during a game, such differences must be corrected with the assistance of the director and with consultation of both players' game scores. In resolving such differences, the player who has recorded or announced one move but has made another one may be penalized by the addition of two minutes to the opponent's remaining time. **See also** [35F2, Announcement of moves](#) and [35F9, Conflict between positions and game scores](#).

35F9. Conflict between positions and game scores.

If discrepancies such as those described in [35F8](#) occur, and the two game scores are also found to differ, the game shall be reconstructed up to the last point of agreement, and the director shall adjust the clocks accordingly.

35F10. Optional assistance.

A blind, visually impaired, or disabled player shall have the right to make use of an assistant, who shall have any or all of the following duties:

- a. to make the moves of the blind or disabled player on the board of the opponent;
- b. to announce the moves of the non-disabled player;
- c. to keep score for the blind or disabled player and to start the opponent's clock;
- d. to inform the blind or disabled player, on request, of the number of moves made and the time consumed by either or both players;
- e. to claim a win on time for the blind or disabled player or inform the blind or disabled player when the opponent has touched a piece without moving it;
- f. to carry out the necessary formalities in cases when the game is to be adjourned;
- g. to pause the clock and summon a tournament director at the request of the blind or disabled player.

If the blind, visually impaired, or disabled player uses such assistance, the non-disabled player is entitled to and must provide his or her own parallel assistance should he or she so desire.

***TD TIP:** Though not required to do so, the TD should do everything possible to help both the disabled and non-disabled players (opponents) to secure assistants. Often spectators or players with byes are willing to act as assistants.*

35F11. Assistance for the non-disabled player.

If the blind, visually impaired, or disabled player uses a special chessboard and does not require any assistance, the non-disabled player may make use of an assistant, provided by the non-disabled player, who shall announce either one or both players' moves and make the blind or disabled player's moves on the non-disabled player's board. Note that if acceptable to both players, they may both use the same assistant.

***TD TIP:** As in the TD TIP above, though not required to do so, the TD should do everything possible to help both the disabled and non-disabled players (opponents) to secure assistants. Often spectators or players with byes are willing to act as assistants. same as tip above.*

35F12. Certification of visual impairment.

US Chess accepts a state's certification of a person's legal blindness as sufficient evidence of eligibility for tournaments for the visually impaired and for special considerations under these rules except if that person holds a valid driver's license.

36. Rules and Regulations for Computer Participants

36A. Membership.

The originator or the legal owner of a computer program may register the computer program as a member of US Chess. The dues for computers are the same as for regular members. The rights of computer members are: the right to play in US Chess-rated tournaments, subject to possible restrictions; the right to acquire an official US Chess rating; and a subscription to *Chess Life* magazine. Specific identification and registration procedures shall be determined administratively.

36B. Purchase of membership.

Computer program owners may purchase memberships only directly from US Chess office. Owners are required to sign a statement agreeing to specific rules. The memberships are available only for experimental programs, and owners are required to sign a noncommercial-use agreement.

36C. Computer participation must be advertised in advance.

Computers may not participate in rated tournaments unless that participation is prominently advertised in all pre-tournament publicity. Tournament announcements in *Chess Life* must specify that computers are eligible to participate by using the symbol “C” for computer participation. If this symbol does not appear, computers may not enter. Entries must be arranged in advance with the director’s or organizer’s consent.

36D. Player may not object.

A player may not object to being paired against a chess-playing computer program in a tournament that advertised computer participation.

TD TIP: Because computer participation must be advertised in advance, players will know before they decide to enter a tournament that there is a possibility that they will be paired against a computer program; therefore, by entering the event they have given their implied consent to being paired against any possible computer program. It would be wise to post this at the site and to give players an opportunity to withdraw from the event if they do not wish to give their consent to such a pairing.

36E. Computer vs. computer.

Computers shall not be paired against each other unless the event is for computers only.

36F. Prize eligibility.

Computers may win only prizes specifically designated for them. Other prizes shall be distributed as though computers were not entered.

36G. Commercial computers.

Commercially available computers and computer programs may acquire ratings only through US Chess’s Computer Rating Agency. Interested manufacturers should write to US Chess for details.

36H. Consultation.

Players who consult a computer for advice about their games shall be subject to the same penalties that would be imposed for asking advice from another person. *See also 20D, Use of additional chessboard or computer prohibited.*

36I. Rules for play involving computers.

Following are rules for US Chess-rated tournaments in which one player is a computer. In matters not governed by these rules, play is governed by applicable human rules, as interpreted by the director. In the following, the term *computer* refers to a chess program running on a computer. The term *opponent* refers to the computer’s opponent. The term *operator* refers to the person running the computer.

36I1. Parameter settings.

Before play begins, the operator shall do all initial setting up of the computer. At that time, the operator may freely specify any operating parameters, such as rate of play, suggested openings, value of a draw, etc. After play begins, the role of the operator is passive. During the game, the operator is not allowed to alter any parameter settings that might affect the course of the game.

36I2. Communication of moves.

During play, the operator is to communicate the opponent's moves to the computer.

36I3. Execution of moves.

The operator is to execute the computer's specified move on the chessboard. *Touch* rules do not apply to the operator, but excessive handling of pieces may violate other rules, such as those against distracting the opponent. A piece shall be deemed touched by the computer when a move involving that piece has been communicated by the program to its output device, except that displays of moves it is considering shall not be considered communication of a move. A move for the computer shall be deemed completed when the operator, in accordance with normal rules, has executed it on the board.

36I4. The clock.

After the computer's move is executed, the operator is to start the opponent's clock.

36I5. Reconciliation of positions.

If different positions should arise on the playing chessboard and the computer's representation of same, such difference shall be corrected with the assistance of the director. The director may choose either to accept the playing chessboard as official or retrace the moves to the point of departure. If the director chooses to back up the game, then clocks shall be adjusted accordingly. The director shall penalize the computer if the score indicates that the computer or its operator has caused the discrepancy of position.

36I6. Resetting the computer.

If the computer is unable to accept a legal move because of discrepancies, communication trouble, or computer trouble, then the operator may reset the current board position and status on the computer, along with clock times. Other parameters set must be the same as those in effect at the start of the game. The clocks are not stopped during the resetting of the computer nor for any other "down time" (time when the computer is unable to function despite the efforts of its operator).

36I7. Clock times.

There shall be a clock at the chessboard whether or not there is an internal clock in the computer. The operator and the opponent shall use the external clock, which shall be the official timer for the game.

The operator may communicate the clock times to the computer only if the computer initiates the request.

36I8. Memory-unit exchange.

The operator may change or insert memory units when the computer requests this and identifies the unit to be inserted, by description or by generating a coded signal or message with a single, predetermined meaning. Diskettes, disk cartridges, tapes, ROM cartridges ("program modules" in commercial machines), and the like are all considered equivalent forms of memory units.

36I9. Draw offers and resignation.

The operator may offer a draw, accept a draw, or resign on behalf of the computer, either with or without consulting the computer or humans of any playing strength about the decision. Humans so consulted should be disinterested as to the result of the game.

36I10. Time forfeits.

The operator may claim a win on time (13C) if the opponent has exceeded the time limit.

36I11. Adjournments.

The operator shall carry out the necessary adjournment formalities.

36I12. Score.

The operator and/or the computer must keep a score of the game.

36I13. FIDE warning.

An event with a non-FIDE registered computer cannot be FIDE-rated even for humans who are not paired against the computer.

