

Discarding Like Pieces

Article

Published Version

Haworth, G. M. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9896-1448>
(2001) Discarding Like Pieces. ICGA Journal, 24 (3). p. 161.
ISSN 1389-6911 Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/4594/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

Published version at: <http://ticc.uvt.nl/icga/journal/>

Publisher: The International Computer Games Association

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

DISCARDING LIKE PIECES

G.McC. Haworth¹

UK

ABSTRACT

The guideline of ‘discarding like men’ to estimate the merit of a chess position is well known. This note corrects a previous reference to a citation of it – and compares it with some statistics.

After discussing 5-man positions, Beasley and Whitworth (1996) cite a commonly-held guideline: “More complicated positions can usually be evaluated by ignoring like pieces.” They did so after stating the caveat “It is assumed that the position is ‘typical’: in other words, that both sides have organized their forces to reasonable advantage and that neither King is trapped against the side of the board”.

Previously (Nalimov, Wirth and Haworth, 1999), I accidentally misquoted this excellent source, omitting both the ‘usually’ and the *typical positions* caveat. With fulsome apologies to Beasley and Whitworth for the displaced misquote, this note examines to what extent the guideline holds good. The web (Tamplin, 2001) provides full statistics for the 2/4- and 3/5-man comparisons, some statistics, q.v. Table 1, for the 4/6-man comparison from the best estimates available (Wirth, 2000; Hyatt, 2001; Thompson, 2001), and the density of won positions in KQKQ and KQQKQQ after shallow wins are discounted.

Similarities between the 4/6-man percentages are not obvious, so indeed, *untypical positions* should be discounted. These are arguably positions where White or Black can or must force conversion to a successor endgame in a few plies. Current endgame tables show forced wins but not forced draws: some relatively short computations remain to be done to enable these “drawn positions with depth” to be discounted as well.

		4-man Wh. win %	+Q %	+R %	+B %	+N %
KQKQ	wtm	41.74	61.10	67.74	41.81	41.07
	btm	0.45	20.01	19.85	5.43	3.57
KQKR	wtm	99.01	81.84	90.18	----	----
	btm	65.51	37.86	48.28	57.51	59.11
KRKR	wtm	29.12	67.74	47.56	----	----
	btm	0.67	19.85	6.13	2.54	1.78
KRKB	wtm	35.12	----	57.63	52.69	----
	btm	3.23	2.14	9.41	8.22	14.35
KBKN	wtm	ε	45.52	----	11.70	1.69
	btm	0.00	5.70	2.74	0.98	0.05

Table 1. Some 4-man/6-man comparisons of White’s winning chances.

REFERENCES

- Beasley, J. and Whitworth, T. (1996). *Endgame Magic*. Batsford, London, UK. ISBN 0-713-47971-X.
- Hyatt, R. (2001). <ftp://ftp.cis.uab.edu/pub/hyatt/TB/>. Server providing Nalimov’s tables and statistics.
- Nalimov, E.V., Wirth, C., and Haworth, G.McC. (1999). KQQKQQ and the Kasparov-World Game. *ICCA Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 195-212.
- Tamplin, J. (2001). <http://chess.jaet.org/endings/>. Chess endgame site.
- Thompson, K. (2001). <http://cm.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/who/ken/chesseg.html>. 6-man EGTs, maximal positions, maximal mutual zugzwangs and endgame statistics.
- Wirth, C.W. (2000). Personal communication.

¹ 33, Alexandra Rd., Reading, Berkshire, RG1 5PG, UK. email: guy.haworth@icl.com