# Heuristic analysis

## Udacity - Artificial Intelligence Nanodegree

#### - custom score1

In this function, I calculated the distance from center. Because I thought there are a lot of case in the center. So, I thought it could make more efficient move. And then, added basic score:  $own\_moves\_numver - opp\_moves\_number$ . And, when a player lost the game, the agent will get negative reward  $(-\infty)$ . Contrary, when a player win the game, the agent will get positive reward $(\infty)$ .

#### - custom\_score2

This function is very similar with 'AB\_improved'. I added *blank\_spaces*. The Blank spaces means the locations that are still available on the board. So I thought it can helpful for our score. Except this, all of things are same as AB\_improved.

### - custom\_score 3

In this case, I calculated same spaces in legal moves between own player and opponent player. I thought occupying same legal space first can make reduced opponent's legal moves number. So I thought it can be efficient measure.

## - Conclusion

		****	Playin			*			
		****	*****	H-0-12 H-0-12 H	***	194			
Match #	Opponent	AB_Im;	proved	AB_Ct	ustom	AB_Cus	ston_2	AB_Cus	stom_3
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Randon	15	5	16	4	18	2	16	4
2	MM_Open	12	8	11	9	14	- 6	10	19
3	MM_Center	15	5	13	7	13	7	15	5
4	MM_Inproved	13	7	12	8	11	ç	14	6
5	AB_Open	11	9	11	9	11	9	9	11
5	AB_Center	10	10	12	8	11	9	1.6	10
7	AB_Improved	19	10	12	8	10	16	12	8
Win Rate: 61.4% 62.1% 62.9% 61.						48			
*************									
			Playin						
		16 404 16	*** E *** E **	+ E +0+ E +0	# #30 E #30	100			
Match #	Opponent	AB Imp	proved	AB_C	uston	AB Cus	stom_2	AB_Cus	stom :
		Won	Lost	Wan	Lost	Won	Lost		Los
1	Random	14	ó	1.8	2	18	2	16	4
2	MM_Open	11	9	1.3	7	16	4	13	7
3	MM Center	16	4	1.1	9	1.7	3	2.4	6
4	MM_Improved	11	9	13	7	14	6	16	19
5	AB_Open	В	1.2	11	9	11	9	11	9
6	AB Center	9	11	9	11	12	8	13	7
7	AB_Improved	19	16	18	10	8	12	16	19
	Win Rate: 56.4% 69.7% 68.6%					62.1%			
		***	*****		*****	+			
			Playing	Match	nes				
		101310	*****	******	*****	*			
Match #	Opponent	AB Inc	roved	AB_Ct	uston	AB Cus	stom_2	AB_Cus	stom 3
		Won	Lost	Won		Won	Lost	Wan	Lost
1	Random	19	1	17	3	17	3	17	3
2	MM_Open	14	- 6	14	6	15	5	13	7
3	MM_Center	14	6	13	7	13	7	16	4
4	MM_Improved	11	9	12	8	14	6	13	7
5	AB_Open	9	11	12	8	13	7	12	8
6	AB_Center	11	9	11	9	12	8	9	11
7	AB_Improved	13	7	9	11	9	11	9	11
	Win Rate:		.9%		.9%	66.			.A%

I set number of matches in tournament.py as 10. And the following table is that summarized result.

	AB_Improved	distance from center	blank spaces	similar moves
Run 1	61.4%	62.1%	62.9%	61.4%
Run 2	56.4%	60.7%	68.6%	62.1%
Run 3	65.0%	62.9%	66.4%	63.6%
Average	60.9%	61.9%	66.0%	62.4%

In random algorithm, all of the scores are quite well. But in Minimax or Alpha-beta pruning, little different. Here is the result except random situation.

	AB_Improved	distance from center	blank spaces	similar moves
Run 1	59.2%	59.2%	58.3%	58.3%
Run 2	54.1%	55.8%	65.0%	59.2%
Run 3	60.0%	59.2%	63.3%	60.0%
Average	57.8%	58.1%	62.2%	59.2%

In this case, only custom\_score 2 has over 60.0% average. So in my case, added blank spaces is better than AB\_Improved. And this score is easy to understand and implement. Sometimes it had poor score than others. But, generally it was best. Actually I thought score 3 is better than others. So, I understood there is not perfect solution. It depended on situations.