

**Dear Mr.Strydom,**

Thank you for your letter and the possibility for me to learn the report of **Kenneth Regan**. I also appreciate Prof. Regan for his scrupulous work.

In spite of the absence of Mr. Regan's articles about his "anti-cheating method" ( at least I did not manage to find any of them even at his web page <https://www.cse.buffalo.edu/~regan/> ) I would believe that the assistants of cheaters (operators) well understand the principles on what a usual screening test of Mr. Regan is based.

In 2015 there were certain GMs who had argued on the efficiency of "Regan Method" after the "playing honestly" verdict in "Sandu case". These GMs suspected that this case was so called "intelligent cheating" when an operator (a high-level player) transmits to a cheater not directly first lines of Rybka, Stockfish or Komodo but can deliberately choose lower lines indicated by chess engines. These chosen lines definitely will be worse than the excellent line of an engine and worse more than one tenth of pawn. Such a "method" finally should guarantee the "completely normal" range of the screening results of a real cheater.

(Speaking about "one tenth of pawn" I refer to the interview of Mr. Regan himself where he reflects about the measure of a significant error <https://www.chess.com/blog/SamCopeland/an-interview-with-im-and-anti-cheating-expert-dr-ken-regan> ).

If we speak about women chess, it is obvious that poor moves occur between female players much more often than in the games of experienced GMs. The fatal crash down of the position I would estimate by the value about  $\pm 1.00$  what means the losing at least of a pawn. For the operator who uses the intelligent cheating method is enough just to hold the actual game in the range of  $-0.5 / +0.5$  by choosing third-fourth lines of an engine until the female opponent herself will fatally crash down the position.

In my opinion "Regan Method" can be effective against single cheaters who cheat by using smartphones during a game. To approach the efficiency of the Method against cheaters who cheat with the help of an operator it is necessary IMHO to introduce in the mathematical model such a factor as distribution of time during a game. When we normally play a game, the distribution of the time depends on the complicity of the position during critical moments. Mostly the distribution of time is unbalanced. It produces the time trouble quite often. And vice versa, the operator as usual needs approximately the same time to lead position at a certain depth of Rybka, Stockfish or Komodo in order to choose a necessary line depending on the circumstances of the current situation. Besides that, for women chess I would think a good idea to adjust a "position crash down" factor. Just count if a female player during a tournament makes or does not make moves which diminish the evaluation of the position immediately on the amount of pawn or more.

I believe that if a "distribution time" factor and a "position crash down" factor would be taken in account by Mr. Regan in his model, the IPR of WFM Bibisara Assaubayeva for example at RUS chW HL will be likely more than 3000.

As I see in the report of Prof. Kenneth Regan, he sometimes agrees with my arguments (see the following extracts) despite we have different views on priority of factors.

*"The game Yip-Assaubayeva from the Millennials match. Solozhenkin starts by saying, \_The series of moves 16\_29 would be from a player rated minimum 2500.\_ My IPR results averaged from the whole summer show a player of that level"....*

*"Assaubayeva-Mangalam, Montevideo round 2. The key game. Indeed, turns 18\_27 are high quality by White"....*

Conclusions of Mr. Regan are always based on the first line of an engine (that is his main argument when he speaks on my chess examples). I suppose that first line of an engine should not be recognized as the main argument when we deal with "intelligent cheating". I believe that reasonable avoiding of first-second lines allow to the cheating group of an operator and a cheating player not to fall outside of the z-score.

I would like to express my special thanks to Mr. Regan for given information about the value of z-score for games of RUS chT U14G in Sochi (3,23) which lays outside the completely normal range according to Regan Method. To tell the truth, it is quite surprising for me to read that games of WFM Bibisara Assaubayeva against girls with low rating are "outside the completely normal range". Especially if we count occurred several "position crash down" factors in her games. Here they are:

- Ilyina - Assaubayeva 19...h4? crushes down position from 0.00 to 1.00  
(here and below the engine is Stockfish 8, depth 28)

- Yakimova-Assaubayeva 17...Bc6? crushes down position from -1.48 to 0.20

In several games there was no real fight because of the very weak play of the 400-500 lower rating opponents of WFM Bibisara Assaubayeva.

Anyway Regan's Method recognizes the level of Assaubayeva in the games of RUS chT U14G in Sochi as "outside the completely normal range". In other words as "abnormally strong". What comes in the logic contradiction given by me above.

I do not know Mr. Kenneth Regan personally but I would suppose two things:

1. Prof. Regan is an honest scientist and man.

Proof: RUS chT U14G tournament was not mentioned in my article. The value of z-score affects the correctness of Regan Method, but Prof. Regan is not afraid to publish the results which are not favorable for his theory.

2. Prof. Regan is a passionate person of his method of revealing of cheaters.

Proof: Those fact that WFM Bibisara Assaubayeva had troubles in several games against rather weak players and in some games there was no real fight because of pretty poor play of her opponents makes anyone hard to speak about her level in this tournament as "outside the completely normal range". But the z-score does so. Nevertheless Prof. Regan does not doubt about the correctness of the method in general. He finds an explanation ("two-sigma", etc) for looking a little (or perhaps not so little) absurd 3,23 z-score.

But IMHO the "doubt" is much better than the "passion" if we speak about the debugging of the mathematician model which is to be taken as official instrument, assigning "guilty" or "innocent".

Thank you, Mr. Strydom, to give me the possibility to realize my right of the "last word of defendant".

**I do not consider myself guilty.**

Against my will I was put in the situation where two possible solutions (to declare publicly about conversation of WFM Bibisara Asaubayeva with somebody in Montevideo WC or not to declare) both would bring me damage. The same I can say about my daughter, WIM Elizaveta Solozhenkina. She is a victim in that story. Elizaveta honestly told me about heard conversation, she is ready to confirm her words anywhere. And now she as young girl of 14 years old does not understand why the truth leads to the troubles (my troubles).

Whom I consider guilty in that story is the entourage of WFM Bibisara Assaubayeva. The entourage who forced Ms. Asaubayeva to do forbidden by the rules things - receiving the information about the evaluation of the current position during the game from unknown assistant. The entourage who put me in the situation where my choice was between "bad" and "bad".

And the most hell-bent representative of that entourage Mme Liana Tanzharikova now absurdly demands to declare me "guilty" and make me sanctioned by the Ethics Commission in spite of making the honest acknowledgment that my words written in the anti-cheating complaint about the conversation in Montevideo WC were truth.

Respectfully, **GM Evgeniy Solozhenkin.**

Saint Petersburg, 28.12.2017