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1 e4 e5 2 f4

2...c5

This natural developing move is the traditional way to decline the King's Gambit, though in recent years some interesting alternatives have appeared:

a) 2...c6 3 f3 f5 (3...exf4 4 d4 d5 5 exd5 xd5 brought about a position in which Black's knight has come to c6 a tad too early in Henris,L–De Wit,M/Belgian Interclubs League 2000 (24)) 4 exf5 (4 d4!? should be met by 4...exd4, but Black played 4...fxe4?! 5 xe5 xf6 in Rechel,B–Wohl,A/West Bromwich ENG 2002 (11), 4 d3 is a solid setup, 4...d6 5 c3 f6 6 g3 g6 7 g2 g7 Ivanchuk,V–Nakamura,H/Cap d'Agde FRA 2010) 4...e4 5 e5 (For 5 g5 see Acunzo,D–Craig,T/Luis Paucar Perez Memorial 1990 (23)) 5...f6 6 d3 e7 7 xc6 dxc6 8 dxe4 xe4+ 9 e2 xf5 gave Black free and easy development in Zouaghi,N–Markidis,K/European U–20 Ch. 1999 (33).

b) 2...h4+ tries to weaken White's queenside, but after 3 g3 e7 White has a promising gambit line in 4 c3 exf4 5 d4 fxg3 6 f4 as in Guthrie,M–Larsen,K/Phoenix, Arizona 1993 (17).

3 f3 d6
Black can also consider 3...\texttt{c6}! in order to meet 4 fxe5 (Other possibilities include 4 c3 \texttt{d5}!?, and 4 \texttt{b5} \texttt{d4}, though both 4 \texttt{c3}, and 4 \texttt{c4} deserve serious consideration) with 4...\texttt{xe5}! 5 \texttt{xe5} \texttt{h4}+ as in Reuben,S–LeMoir,D/Club match, London 1972 (22).

4 \texttt{c4}

White's other plan is to build a broad pawn center with 4 c3 after which 4...\texttt{b6} (4...\texttt{c6} 5 \texttt{b5} was better for White in Verheyden,J–Thierrens,F/Leuven, Belgium 1999 (16), 4...\texttt{f6} is probably Black's best and transposes into 4...\texttt{b6} after 5 d4 exd4 6 cxd4 \texttt{c4} 7 fxe5 dxe5 8 \texttt{xe5} \texttt{d5} leads to sharp play as in Prates,F–Roselli Mailhe,B/Santana do Livramento BRA 2002 (21),) 7 \texttt{e3} \texttt{f6}?! (7...\texttt{d5} is better) 8 \texttt{c3} \texttt{xe4} 9 \texttt{xe4} \texttt{e7} 10 \texttt{c2} gave White an edge in Murey,J–Marcelin,C/Saint Quentin 2000 (38).

4...\texttt{f6} 5 \texttt{c3} \texttt{c6}

Black can also try to counterattack in the center by playing 5...0-0 6 d3 \texttt{c6} (6...\texttt{g4} doesn't achieve anything after just 7 \texttt{e2} – Steinitz,W–de Vere,C/London 1872 (18),) intending ...\texttt{d6}–\texttt{d5}. But White has a good answer to this in 7 fxe5 dxe5 8 \texttt{e2} when in Senff,M–Jirka,J/World Junior Ch., Erevan, Arme 2000 (18) Black's c6 pawn stops him from getting counterplay with ...\texttt{b8}–\texttt{c6}–\texttt{d4}.

6 d3

6...\texttt{g4}

For 6...\texttt{e6} see Carmes,M–Boonekamp,M/Chambery FRA 2002 (10).

Whilst 6...\texttt{a6} 7 fxe5 dxe5 8 \texttt{g5} gave White a slight pull in Bathie,N–McLelland,A/Richardson Cup, Scotland 1988 (25).

7 \texttt{a4}!
The modern preference.

7 h3 $xf3 8 $xf3 $d4 (8...exf4 is Marin's preferred solution, 9 $xf4 $d4 10 $g3? $h5) 9 $g3 $xc2+(9...$e7 is safer as in Marshall,F−Lasker,E/USA 1923 (50), but 9...0-0! is best, 10 $xe5 $dxe5 11 $b3 $d6) 10 $d1 $xa1 11 $xg7 produced a wild game in Chigorin,M−Pillsbury,H/Hastings 1895 (51).

7...0-0

Probably best.

A solid alternative is 7...$b6 when 8 $xb6 (8 $b5 didn't give White much in Minasian,A−Mamedyarov,S/Batumi 2002 (44). 8 c3 $xf4 9 $xb6 transposes) 8...axb6 9 c3 $xf4 (9...d5?! 10 exd5 $xf3 11 $xf3 $e7 12 $xf4 $xf4 13 0-0 0-0 14 $xf4 $xf4 15 $xf4 left Black under strong pressure in Todorovic,G−Blagojevic,D/Herceg Novi 2001) 10 $xf4 0-0 11 0-0 d5!? see Axelrod,A−Mikhailovski,A/Ashdod 2004.

Less good is 7...exf4 8 $xc5 dxc5 9 0-0 $h5 (9...$e7 10 h3 $xf3 11 $xf3 was also better for White in Shabalov,A−Stamnov,A/Philadelphia 2000 (54)) 10 $e3 $e7 11 $b5 f5 12 $xc6+ when Black had inadequate compensation for his weak pawns in Alekhine,A−Tenner,O/Cologne 1911 (23).

8 $xc5 dxc5 9 0-0

9...$h5

Another good move is 9...$d6 as in Fedorov,A−Marin,M/Eforie Nord 2000, but 10 $d2!? might promise a slight edge.

10 h3 $xf3 11 $xf3 $xf4 12 $xf4
12...d4 13 xe5?!

13 wh5 exf4 14 exf4 g6 15 eg4 threatens to draw by perpetual.

13...xf3+ 14 xf3 h8 15 c3 f6!

and White had inadequate compensation for the queen in Forster,R−Mikhalevitch,A/Leipzig 2002 (40).
King's Gambit 2...d5 [C31]

Last updated: 14/08/03 by Nigel Davies

1 e4 e5 2 f4 d5

Trying to exploit the weakening aspects of 2.f4 by smashing open the center.

3 exd5 c6

3...e4 is the Falkbeer Gambit — C32

4 ¼e2

A simpler way to play it is with 4 ¾c3 exf4 5 ¾f3 cxd5 6 d4 ½b4 7 ½xf4 as in Holusova, T—Savic, M/Goa IND 2002 (17).

4...cxd5 5 fxe5 ½c6 6 ½f3 ¾e5 7 c3 d4

and Black had good compensation for the pawn in Spassky, B—Motwani, P/Glasgow Simul 1987 (22).
The Falkbeer Gambit, which hopes that the e4 pawn will be a thorn in White's flesh.

4 d3 ¤f6

4...£xd5 is better for White after 5 £e2 ¤f6 6 ¤d2 ¥f5 or (6...g4 7 ¤gf3) 7 dxe4, the point being that after Black recaptures at e4 with a knight or bishop, then 8 g4! is very strong.

5 dxe4 ¤xe4 6 ¤f3

6 ¤e3 ¥h4+ 7 g3 ¤xg3 8 ¤f3 ¥e7 9 h×g3 ¥xe3+ 10 ¥e2 is arguably a more comfortable endgame for White, as in Soupizon,R–Thorsteinsson,E/Reykjavik Open, Iceland 2000 (17).

6...¤e5 7 ¥e2
7...f5

7...f5 8 c3 also favours White.

8 c3 f2+ 9 d1

and Black's attack had come to nothing in Alapin, S–Marshall, F/Ostende 1905 (14).
**Bishop's Gambit [C33]**

Last updated: 01/12/10 by Victor Mikhalevski

1.e4 e5 2.f4 exf4 3.¥c4 ¤f6

Theory has long held that this is Black's best, aiming to hit the bishop on c4 with ...d7–d5. There are of course a number of alternatives:

a) 3...£h4+ displaces White's king, but loses time with the queen. After 4.¢f1 ¤f6 (4...b5 was played in the classic encounter, **Anderssen,A**−**Kieseritzky,L/London 1851** (23), and 4...g5 was **Henris,L−Rubinstein,S/Brussels 1979** (8)) 5.¤f3 £h5 6.¤c3 c6 7.¥e2 8.e5 g4 9.¢e4 was good for White in **Westerinen,H−Hebden,M/NatWest Masters, London 1988** (19).

b) 3...¤e7 4.d4 £h4+ 5.¢f1 g5 6.g3 was the ancient encounter, **Greco,G−Italian,A/Italy 1620** (13).

c) 3...¤e7 4.¤f3 d5 5.exd5 6.d5 ¥xh5 7.¤c3 ¥e7 8.d4 ¥e7 9.¥e4 gives White the freer game, for example **Motwani,P−Sokolov,I/Istanbul Olympiad, Turkey 2000** (41).

d) 3...d5 4.exd5 (Morozhevich preferred 4.¥xh5, which is more popular.) 4...£h4+ 5.¢f1 ¥h6 6.¤f3 ¥h5 6.¥h6 which was introduced by Shirov in 1997, scores extremely well for Black.) 7.¤c3 ¥e7 8.d4 0-0 **Polgar,J−Topalov,V/Mexico City MEX 2010**.

4.¤c3

4.d3 is not a bad move but after 4...d5 5.¤d5 ¥xh5 6.¤f3 ¥e7 7.0-0 0-0 8.¤xd5 ¥xd5 9.¥xf4 it led to rather sterile equality in **Polgar,J−Barle,J/Reykjavik 1988**.
4...b4

Probably Black's most reliable move, even if it hasn't been his most popular choice.
After 4...c6 5.d4 (There are several alternatives here: 5.b3 d5 6.exd5 cxd5 7.d4 d6 8.f3 e6 9.0-0 0-0 10.e5 c6 11.xf4 e8 was OK for Black in Short,N−Karpov,A/Buenos Aires 2000 (47), 5.f3 d5 6.exd5 cxd5 7.b5+? d7 8.e2+ e7 9.xd7+ bxd7 10.d4 0-0 11.xf4 b4 12.0-0 xc3 13.xc3 e8 left White poorly placed in Feletar,D−Palac,M/Neum BIH 2004 (37). 5.f3 d5 6.exd5 d6 7.e2+? e7 8.xd4 exd5 9.b5+ c6 10.xf4 0-0 was very comfortable for Black in Pridorozhnii,A−Geller,J/Krasnodar 2002 (35)). 5...b4 6.e5 e4 7.h5 (7.f3 h4+ 8.f1 d5 was fine for Black in El Kher,H−Belavsky,A/Copenhagen DEN 2002 (21). 7...d5 (7...g6 8.f3 h4+ 9.f1 d5 10.exd6 xc3 11.xc3 xd6 12.g3 g4 led to a balanced endgame in Westerinen,H−Hector,J/NOR 1992 (46). 8.exd6 0-0 9.g2 f6 10.h4 xd6 11.xf4 xf4 12.xf4 bd7 13.0-0 b6 and the game soon fizzled out to a draw in Westerinen,H−Flear,G/Oviedo 1992 (27).

5.e5

5.f3 0-0 (After 5...xc3 6.xc3 xe4 White has lots of attractive possibilities, such as 7.xf7+ (7.xf4?? is also worth considering) 7...xf7 8.d5+ e8 9.xe4+ e7 10.xe7+ xe7 11.xf4 with White's initiative persisting into the endgame.) 6.0-0 xc3 7.xc3 xe4 8.xf4 d6 (8...c6? is bad because of 9.d6 e8 (9...b6+ 10.h1 f2+ 11.xf2 xf2 12.xf8 xf8 13.d6+ followed by e1 or f1 is hopeless for Black.) 10.e5 etc.) 9.h4 c5 10.g5 and White had strong threats in Davis,M−Simpson,J/Correspondence 1994 (24).

5...d5 6.b5+

6.exf6 dx4 7.fxg7 g8 8.e2+ e6 9.f3 c6 10.e4 xg7 was not at all promising for White in Reinderman,D−Parker,J/Mondariz 2000 (71).

6.c6
7.exf6 cxb5 8.fxg7 £g8 9.£h5!?

Produced complex play in Koch,J–Payen,A/Port Barcares FRA 2005 (59).
This, the Bonsch–Osmolovsky Variation is quite interesting. Black wants to free his game with ...d7–d5 without having his knight attacked with e4–e5.

The Fischer Defence with 3...d6 is under pressure after

a) Another possibility is 4 ♂c4 h6 5 h4!? (5 d3 g5 6 g3 ♂c6 7 gxf4 g4 gave Black the initiative in Nory,P–Flear,G/Avoine 1993 (26)) 5...♘f6 6 ♞c3 ♘g4 7 d4 ♘e7 8 ♘xf4 ♞h5 9 ♘e3 ♘g3 10 ♗h2 followed by Qd3 and castling long was good for White in Grabarczyk,M–Shetty,R/Koszalin 1998 (25)

b) 4 d4 4...g5 5 h4 g4 6 ♘g1! f5 7 ♘c3 (7 £e2 looks artificial — see Jackson,A–Stephenson,N/Redcar 1997 (19)) 7...♘f6 8 ♘xf4 fxe4 9 d5!? cut the coordination between Black's pieces and left him with problems in Fedorov,A–Ibragimov,I/Katrineholm 1999 (22).

After 3...♗f6 4 e5 ♘h5 (Averbakh liked to play 4...♘e4 which is actually quite a solid defence — 5 d3 ♘g5 6 ♘xf4 ♘e6 7 ♘e3 d6 8 d4 is the game Yuldashev,S–Vladimirov,E/Kelamabakkam, India 2000 (28)) 5 d4 d6 (5...d5 is more solid) 6 ♗e2 ♘e7?? (6...d5) 7 exd6 ♘xd6 8 ♘b5+ winning the knight on h5 as in Kleinschroth,R–Kjaer,P/Copenhagen DEN 2001 (9).

The attempt to meet Becker's 3...h6!? with 4 b3 was strongly met by 4...♗f6 5 e5 ♘e4 in Russell,D–Mannion,S/Oban Premier, Scotland 1995 (15).

4 d4
White can also play 4 \( \text{c4} \) \( \text{g6} \) (4...d5 5 \( \text{exd5} \) \( \text{cxd5} \) 6 \( \text{xd5} \) \( \text{xd5} \) 7 d4 transposes into C36) 5 0-0 \( \text{e7} \) 6 d4 d6 7 \( \text{c3} \) \( \text{c6} \) 8 \( \text{d5} \) \( \text{g4} \) 9 \( \text{xf4} \) and now 9...\( \text{h4} \)? 10 \( \text{xf7+} \) was good for White in Walsh,G−Gawalli,A/Loughborough 2001 (23).

4...d5

4...\( \text{g6} \) 5 h4 \( \text{e7} \) 6 h5 \( \text{h4} \) 7 \( \text{xf4} \) d5 8 \( \text{xh4} \) \( \text{e4} \)+ 9 g3 \( \text{g5} \) (9...\( \text{e7} \)) 10 \( \text{d2} \) favoured White in Vinokurov,E−Tolstich,A/Voronesh Open, Russia 2001 (23).

5 \( \text{e2} \)

5 \( \text{c3} \) dxe4 6 \( \text{xe4} \) \( \text{g6} \)? 7 h4! was strong in Kindermann,S−Walter,G/German Ch. 1999 (20).

5...\( \text{g6} \) 6 h4 dxe4

6...h5!? 7 \( \text{c3} \) c6!? was the creative approach used by Michael Adams in Hoffmann,M−Adams,M/Dutch Interclubs Team Ch., Bre 2000 (37).

7 \( \text{xe4}+ \) \( \text{e7} \) 8 \( \text{xe7}+ \) \( \text{xe7} \) 9 \( \text{c3} \) c6 10 \( \text{c4} \)!

was awkward for Black in Morozevich,A−Sokolov,I/Sarajevo super−GM tournament 2 2000 (38).
Cunningham Defence – 3.Nf3 Be7 [C35]

Last updated: 15/08/03 by Nigel Davies

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 Nf3 Be7

The Cunningham Defence. Black develops his kingside whilst keeping open the option of giving a check on h4.

4 c4

White's other option is 4 c3 after which 4...h4+ sends White's king to e2.

4...d6

Alternatively Black might try 4...h4+ 5 f1 d5 6 xd5 d6 as in Fontaine,A–Motwani,P/Blitz game, Brussels 2001 (8).

5 e5

5 c3 x e 6 x f7+ x f7 7 x e 4 d5 8 e5+ g 8 9 f3 dxe 10 +b3 + 1-0 was the finish of Verheyen,N–Dom,W/Belgian Junior, 2000 (10).

5...g4 6 0-0 0-0
Better than 6...d5 7 exd6 ♕xd6 8 d4 which was played in Yurtaev,L–Rozentalis,E/Riga 1977 (13).

7 h3 d5 8 ♖b3 c5!

gave Black powerful counterplay in Holmes,D–Motwani,P/Edinburgh 1994 (20).
King's Gambit 3.Nf3 d5 [C36]

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4
2...d5 3 exd5 exf4 4 ♙f3 transposes.

3 ♙f3 d5

I've always considered this an 'easy' but non−critical response, Black gets free development and two open central files, but White's extra central pawn and open f−file promise him a lasting edge, sometimes even into the endgame.

4 exd5 ♙f6

This natural move is Black's standard response, though he does have alternatives:
4...c6 5 ♙c3 ♙d6 6 d4 (The artificial looking 6 b3 proved to be ineffective in Szalapaj,P−Motwani,P/Aberdeen Weekend Congress 1987 (22)) 6...♕e7 7 ♙c4 cxd5 (or 7...0−0 8 0−0 ♙g4 9 dxc6 ♙xc6 as in Sprenger,D−Kuba,A/Mitropa Cup 2002 (16)) 8 ♙xd5 0−0 9 0−0 ♙bc6 10 ♙b3 ♙g4 11 ♙e4 ♙c7 12 c3 ♙g6 led to sharp play in Sowray,P−Van Perlo,G/CC Olympiad Final 1992 (38).
4...♕xd5!? 5 d4 ♙f6 6 ♙xf4 ♕e4+!? heads for the ending, but it is far from easy to defend, see Zvjaginsev,V−Wang Hao/Taiyuan CHN 2007.

5 ♙c4
This simple move has been causing Black some problems. At one time 5 \( \text{b}5+ \) was considered critical.

5...\( \text{xd}5 \) 6 0-0

White can also capture immediately with 6 \( \text{xd}5 \) \( \text{xd}5 \) 7 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 8 \( \text{d}4 \) \( \text{d}6 \) 9 \( \text{e}2+ \) \( \text{e}7 \) 10 \( \text{xe}7+ \) \( \text{xe}7 \) 11 \( \text{xf}4 \) \( \text{xf}4 \) 12 \( \text{d}5+ \) and White recovered the piece with a slight initiative in Fedorov,A–Yusupov,A/European Team Ch. 1999 (30).

6...\( \text{e}7 \) 7 \( \text{xd}5 \)

White exchanges his bishop in order to gain some tempi for fast development. 7 \( \text{d}4 \) used to be the main line and was used by many good players, see Jackson,O–McMahon,P/British Championship 1999 (22).

7...\( \text{xd}5 \) 8 \( \text{c}3 \) \( \text{d}8 \) 9 \( \text{d}4 \) 0-0 10 \( \text{xf}4 \)

Carlsen,M–Wang Yue/Medias ROU 2010.
Muzio Gambit 3...g5 [C37]

Last updated: 12/10/06 by Olivier Renet

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 ∆f3 g5 4 ∆c4

4 ∆c3!? g7 (4...g4 is risky: 5 d5 e5 6 g3 fxg3 7 hxg3) 5 d4 d6 6 g3 ∆c6 a very logical move. Black continues his development, 7 ∆b5 (Black is not afraid of 7 gxf4 because he can always reply 7...g4) 7...a6 Black forces White to take the knight and at the cost of one tempo he gets the control of the light squares and of the very important d5-square, Zeller–Renet/Cht de Suisse 2006.

4...g4 5 0-0

The distinguishing move of the Muzio. White has several other possibilities including 5 d4 and 5 ∆c3

5...gxf3 6 xf3 f6 7 e5 xe5 8 xf7+ xf7 9 d4 xd4+

9...xf5 may be Black's only move here, with wild complications after 10 g4

10 ∆e3 ∆f6 11 ∆xf4

with a powerful attack in the game Shirov,A–Lapinski,J/Daugavpils 1990 (17).
King's Gambit 3...g5 4.Bc4 [C38]

Last updated: 25/04/07 by Olivier Renet

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 f3 g5 4 c4

4...g7

Alternatively Black can play 4...c6, for example 5 0-0 g7 6 d4 d6 7 c3 h6 8 a4 (8 e1 proved unsuccessful in Huisman,H−Lejarre,L/Avoine FRA 2002 (18)) 8...f8 9 a3 (9 d3 e7 10 bd2 g6 saw Black consolidate his position in Lane,M−Bell,I/PCL Div 1 2002 (31)) 9...e7 (9...f6! is much more direct) 10 d2 and Black had long term problems with his king in Ernst,S−Brenninkmeijer,J/Groningen 2002 (32).

5 h4

5 g3 g4 (5...fxg3 6 hgx3 would give White good attacking chances.) 6 h4 d6 (Paul Motwani suggested 6...d5!? 7 xd5 fxg3 8 hgx3 d6! with counterplay for Black.) 7 d4 f3 8 c3 c6 9 e3 and White had good attacking chances in Asauskas,H−Sarakauskas,G/Lithuanian Ch., Vilnius 2002 (19).

5 0-0 Leone,C−Millican,P/Correspondence 1988.

5...h6 6 c3 c6 7 d4 d6 8 0-0
8...e7! 9 b3 g4!

For 9...f6 see Michalek,J–Minc/P/Correspondence 1991
9...d7?! Ponkratov,P–Rakhmanov,A/Saint Petersburg RUS 2007.

10 h2

10 e1? xd4! 11 cxd4 xd4+-+

10...f3

11 f4 xe4!

Played without fear! Whose king is in the most danger? Haimovich,T–Fressinet,L/Biel SUI 2006.
Kieseritzky & Allgaier Gambits [C39]

Last updated: 31/12/04 by Nigel Davies

1 e4 e5 2 f4 exf4 3 ¤f3 g5 4 h4 g4 5 ¤e5

White can also sacrifice at this point with 5 ¤g5!?, the so-called Allgaier Gambit. After 5...h6 (5...d5 6 exd5 h6 7 ¤e2+ ¤e7 8 ¤e4 f5 9 ¤bc3 gave White some compensation for the piece in Neffe,A–Bronstein,D/Wrexham 1995 (30), but he could also play 6.d4, transposing into the main lines,) 6 ¤xf7 ¤xf7 7 ¤c3 d5 (For 7...d6 see Westerinen,H–Kivijarvi,J/Turku 1995 (30). Black's other main alternative is 7...¤c6 as in Glazkov,I–Soloviev,V/Moscow 1975 (29)) 8 d4 f3 (8...b4 was Maslak,K–Meissner,B/Olomouc 2002 (28)) 9 ¤xd5 ¤f6 10 ¤xf6 f2+ 11 ¤xf2 ¤xf6+ 12 ¤g3 and White had an excellent game in Bosboom,M–Teichmann,E/Ramsgate/Margate 1984 (37).

5...¤f6

Alternatively Black can play 5...d6 6 ¤xg4 ¤f6 7 ¤f2 (7 ¤xf6+ may be better) 7...¤g8 as in Fedorov,A–Shirov,A/Polanica Zdroj, Poland 2000 (22).
Another possibility is 5...e7 but after 6 ¤c4 ¤xh4+ 7 ¤f1 d5 8 ¤xd5 ¤h6 9 d4 White was very nicely centralized in David Fryer's book analysis (see Fryer,D–Book,A/Book analysis 2000 (17)).

6 d4

Nowadays this is preferred to 6 ¤c4 d5 7 exd5 ¤d6 when black has a good game. For example 8 d4 ¤h5 9 0-0 (9 ¤b5+ c6 gave Black strong play in Rosanes,J–
Anderssen, K/Breslau 1863 (23) 9...0-0 10 \( \Box \times g 4 \) \( W \times h 4 \) 11 \( \Box \times h 2 \) \( \Box g 3 \) and White had serious problems in Hoeksema, E−Ernst, S/Groningen 2002 (21).

6...d6 7 \( \Box d 3 \) \( \Box c 6 \)!

Cleverly getting White to play the passive 8.c3 before capturing on e4.
7...\( \Box h 5 \)!? 8 \( \Box \times f 4 \) \( \Box g 7 \) 9 c3 0-0 10 \( \Box d 2 \) f5! was the interesting continuation of Shabalov, A−Smagin, S/Bad Wiessee 1999 (30).
Both these lines seem more promising than the book 7...\( \Box x e 4 \)

8 c3 \( \Box x e 4 \) 9 \( \Box x f 4 \) d5 10 \( \Box d 2 \) \( \Box d 6 \)!

and Black was a pawn up with a lead in development in Fedorov, A−Ivanchuk, V/Wijk aan Zee 2001 (34).