Alphabeta Player depth 1 0.0 0.0 10.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 10.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total: 20.0

Alphabeta Player depth 2 20.0 0.0 0.0 10.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total: 30.0

Alphabeta Player depth 3 10.0 20.0 0.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 20.0 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total: 82.0

Alphabeta Player depth 4 20.0 10.0 10.0 0.0 20.0 20.0 0.0 1.0 0.0 0.0 2.0 0.0 Total: 83.0

Alphabeta Player depth 5 20.0 20.0 10.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 10.0 3.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total: 63.0

Alphabeta Player depth 6 20.0 20.0 10.0 0.0 20.0 0.0 10.0 5.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total: 85.0

Alphabeta Player depth 7 10.0 20.0 0.0 20.0 10.0 10.0 0.0 6.0 5.0 7.0 1.0 4.0 Total: 93.0

Monte Carlo 100 20.0 20.0 18.0 19.0 17.0 15.0 14.0 0.0 3.0 2.0 4.0 3.0 Total: 135.0

Monte Carlo 200 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 15.0 17.0 0.0 6.5 9.5 2.5 Total: 170.5

Monte Carlo 300 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 13.0 18.0 13.5 0.0 9.0 5.0 Total: 178.5

Monte Carlo 400 20.0 20.0 20.0 18.0 20.0 20.0 19.0 16.0 10.5 11.0 0.0 8.0 Total: 182.5

Monte Carlo 500 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 20.0 16.0 17.0 17.5 15.0 12.0 0.0 Total: 197.5

So, we can see from our data that Monte Carlo outperforms Alphabeta for most cases, although, due to the randomness, it sometimes falters against the deeper depth AB players but sometimes comes out even or ahead. We also see that our MC player wins more games as the number of playouts increases, which is the expected behavior for MC, since given enough time, the random playouts will find the actual best move. Even at depth 500, the MC player takes less time to run than the depth 7 AlphaBeta searcher, and seems to be more successful.