HEURISTIC ANALYSIS

ISOLATION PLAYING AGENT

Artificial Intelligence Nanodegree

<u>Heuristic 1:</u>

```
moves_left_player - aggression_factor*moves_left_opponent;
```

The first heuristic computed the number of moves left for the player and subtracted the number of moves left for the opponent multiplied by a constant value. The aggression_factor was experimented with and kept at 3, 4, 5 or 20 with the following results. The rows correspond to the respective values

		****	*****	*****	*****	*			
			Playing	g Match	nes				
		****	******	*****	*****	*			
Match #	Opponent	AB Improved		AB Custom		AB Custom 2		AB Custom 3	
		Won	Lost	_	Lost	_	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Random	6	4	8	2	8	2	8	2
2	MM_Open	5	5	7	3	7	3	6	4
3	MM_Center	7	3	7	3	8	2	6	4
4	MM_Improved	7	3	5	5	5	5	7	3
5	AB_Open	5	5	4	6	6	4	6	4
6	AB_Center	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
7	AB_Improved	6	4	3	7	6	4	6	4
	Win Rate:	58	.6%	55	.7%	64	.3%	62.9%	

		****	*****	*****	*****	*				
			Playin							
		****	******	*****	*****	*				
Match #	Opponent	AB_Improved		AB_Custom		AB_Custom_2		AB_Custom_3		
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	
1	Random	8	2	10	0	10	0	10	0	
2	MM_Open	5	5	7	3	6	4	5	5	
3	MM_Center	7	3	10	0	9	1	7	3	
4	MM_Improved	5	5	7	3	4	6	5	5	
5	AB_Open	6	4	4	6	5	5	5	5	
6	AB_Center	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	4	
7	AB_Improved	3	7	6	4	4	6	3	7	
	Win Rate:	55.	55.7%		70.0%		61.4%		58.6%	

An aggressive play using a factor as 4 gave a stable win rate of around 60-64% whereas increasing it further, reduced the win rate.

<u>Heuristic 2:</u>

```
Moves_left_player / blanks_left
```

In this heuristic, the number of blanks were considered and the evaluation function returned what fraction of the blanks were the next moves for the player. AB_Custom_3 represents this evaluation function in both the pictures given below. AB_Custom represents heuristic 1 with aggression value 4.

Match #	Opponent	AB_Imp	3_Improved AB_Custom AB_Custom_2		stom_2	AB_Custom_3			
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Random	8	2	9	1	9	1	8	2
2	MM_Open	7	3	6	4	7	3	7	3
3	MM_Center	8	2	7	3	7	3	8	2
4	MM_Improved	7	3	7	3	6	4	8	2
5	AB_Open	5	5	6	4	5	5	5	5
6	AB_Center	6	4	4	6	6	4	6	4
7	AB_Improved	3	7	5	5	3	7	2	8
	Win Rate:	62	.9%	62	.9%	61	. 4%	62	.9%

M-4-1-4		AD T	oco de octor	AD C		AD C		AD C	
Match #	Opponent	_	proved	AB_Custom		_	stom_2		
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Random	9	1	7	3	9	1	8	2
2	MM_Open	6	4	7	3	7	3	6	4
3	MM_Center	5	5	7	3	8	2	8	2
4	MM_Improved	5	5	6	4	6	4	6	4
5	AB_Open	6	4	8	2	2	8	5	5
6	AB_Center	4	6	6	4	4	6	4	6
7	AB_Improved	6	4	6	4	4	6	4	6
	Win Rate:	58.6%		67.1%		57.	. 1%	58.6%	

<u>Heuristic 3:</u>

```
Moves_left_player / 1 + Moves_left_opponent
```

This heuristic, represented by AB_Custom_3 was tried out to factor in the moves left by opponent in the denominator, to give a lower score when more moves for the opponent were left.

As can be seen from the result, it performed at the same level as the previous heuristic.

Match #	Opponent	AB_Improved		AB_Custom		AB_Custom_2		AB_Custom_3	
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Random	9	1	9	1	9	1	8	2
2	MM_Open	8	2	9	1	6	4	5	5
3	MM_Center	6	4	6	4	8	2	8	2
4	MM_Improved	6	4	5	5	6	4	5	5
5	AB_Open	3	7	5	5	4	6	5	5
6	AB_Center	5	5	6	4	4	6	6	4
7	AB_Improved	4	6	8	2	5	5	5	5
	Win Rate:	58.6%		68.6%		60.0%		60.0%	

Conclusion:

In all the games played, AB_Custom represented the first heuristic and always did better or the same as AB_Improved. Hence, that heuristic was chosen as the evaluation function.