Trideo

Stefano Cavanè, 2015, published at Gerhards Spiel und Design

Each player receives tokens in three different colors and puts one directly on the sidebar in front of him, so as not to forget what colors he has to use and which he has to pay special attention to. Namely, that of the opponent, who in turn faces the same dilemma. Of each color, each player has exactly three tokens distributed on the field. The further starting line is predetermined and is only looked up at the beginning of the first games in the rule booklet – after that it is actually internalized. Then it's already starting.

It is played alternately, whereby a token of the own color is pulled over any number of fields in any direction. Neither own nor foreign stones may be skipped. A change of direction would require a train of its own.

Game goal. The three pieces of a color must be placed in one of three winning positions. These are then three identical stones in a horizontal or horizontal row or in an L-shape at right angles over corner. A diagonal series of three is not considered a winning position.

Review by Philip DeWalt:

My primary reason for doing a review of *Trideo* is I'm a little surprised that as of this date there has been zero discussion regarding this interesting game here on BGG so I wanted to rectify that.

I have very little interest in games that aren't in the category of abstract strategy, and *Trideo* looked interesting. I took a risk on it because I wanted to boost my order with *The Wooden Wagon* up over $100 to get free shipping, and this little game did the trick. By Gerhards game standards it's relatively inexpensive as is.

The box this comes in is very plain, but I don't mind:

As with all Gerhards games when set up it looks almost like a work of art. To be honest, it IS a work of art.

Because it's somewhat small and looks a little like one of those old *Hi-Q* puzzles the initial impression is this is some kind of a light, filler type abstract. This is not the case at all.

The playing field consists of 64 holes where small painted wooden *minion* shaped pieces are moved. Three holes are included on each end for you to insert your colors to help keep track of which pieces you move. Generally the play is colored pieces (yellow, orange and red) verses non-colored (white, grey and black) though you could, technically, mix up the colors any way you like.

Setting up the board is confusing at first because other than an obvious straight line of alternating white and yellow cutting across diagonally, the remaining pattern isn't apparent. After a little pondering the system does emerge and once you grasp it, it become easy to set up the game with multiple different color combinations if you so choose. This doesn't really change the game play though.

The object of the game is to get three of the same colors, one of your colors, in a straight line or into an "L" shape - diagonals don't count though the pieces CAN move diagonally.

Three different winning combinations:

To do this, players take turns moving pieces in a straight line as far as they like, but no jumping is allowed. At first this restricts most pieces to just being able to move one space at a time, but depending on position, much further distances can happen on the second move.

Strategy in this game is surprisingly deep. The first few times we played wins were almost discovered by accident, however, after a while you begin to figure out how it's possible to force a winning position several moves ahead of time. This means you have to keep a wary eye out for long-range traps from your opponent as you strategize. The trick, and the real genius of this game, is the fact that an "L" shape works as well as a straight horizontal or vertical line for a win. The "L" shape makes it possible to position a piece in such a way that your opponent simply cannot block a win on the next move.

Grey moves next but cannot prevent a win by yellow:

As we played the game continued to display increasing depth, to the point where it became a little exhausting to be honest. The first few games it took quite a few moves for anybody to win, and that was mostly by accident, but once we got the hang of it, we discovered really wicked traps could be set and if your opponent didn't catch them, they were doomed. The downside of this is it's really not the kind of game you want to play with somebody whose not already familiar with it, because you'll mop the floor with them and they won't really have much fun. Against a player with any degree of experience the smallest error and you're finished.

Some abstract strategy games are fun right out of the box even if you don't really get the game play at first. This isn't really the case with *Trideo*. At first its virtues were not apparent. It took several games before we started to get it. If you're looking for a light and casual abstract, skip this game. From my perspective though, so far the game displays all the characteristics one looks for in a really good abstract strategy game, however, it takes patience and persistence to discover them.

Quinn Swanger comment: *The winner is the first player to get *two sets* of their pegs into a winning configuration (not just one). The catch is, after the first time you create a winning pattern, you must remove all three associated pegs from the board. This affords a bit of a catch-up mechanism and possibly an additional strategic layer of sacrificing one pattern to better set yourself up for winning two in succession. Removing all three sets did not seem quite viable (though I am not completely sure) as once there is a 2-0 lead, the side that is behind has enough pegs remaining to effectively blockade the last three from forming a winning pattern.*