

Heuristic analysis:

First experiment:

Custom 1 is a variation of the Open heuristic, but instead of the bias towards number of legal moves of the current player, the heuristic is biased towards limiting number of moves of opponent by returning the negative value of opponent's legal moves. This heuristic performs well against the original Open heuristic both with Minimax with score 42/8 and Alphabeta with score 27/3. This heuristic is performing well against other competitors as well with total win probability of 66% and a good performance against AB_Improved with score 30/20. The defensive nature of the strategy combined with simplicity and high performance gives a good advantage.

Custom 2 tries to enhance the provided improved heuristic by adding a bias towards moves with larger number of open blocks in a 5x5 square. In practice this heuristic performed worse than improved evaluation with overall win rate of 59.7%

Custom 3 is using a hybrid approach with a strategy at the beginning different from the end of game. In this experiment we used the number of legal moves for the first 6 moves, then used improved heuristic for the rest. This heuristic seemed to perform well with win rate of 64.7% but with room for enhancement especially against vanilla improved evaluation.

Table 1: first experiment

AB_Custom: negative open AB_Custom_2: AB_Improved with open in proximity AB_Custom_3: First 6 moves: number of legal moves of player, later AB_Improved

| Match | Opponent | AB_Improved | | AB_Custom | | AB_Custom_2 | | AB_Custom_3 | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|------|-----------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|
| | | Won | Lost | Won | Lost | Won | Lost | Won | Lost |
| 1 | MM_Open | 39 | 11 | 42 | 8 | 36 | 14 | 37 | 13 |
| 2 | MM_Center | 41 | 9 | 39 | 11 | 43 | 7 | 39 | 11 |
| 3 | MM_Improved | 38 | 12 | 34 | 16 | 35 | 15 | 35 | 15 |
| 4 | AB_Open | 31 | 19 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 28 | 24 | 26 |
| 5 | AB_Center | 25 | 25 | 26 | 24 | 24 | 26 | 36 | 14 |
| 6 | AB_Improved | 24 | 26 | 30 | 20 | 19 | 31 | 23 | 27 |
| Win Rate: | | 66.0% | | 66.0% | | 59.7% | | 64.7% | |

Second experiment

Changing the hybrid heuristic by using the negative open moves as Custom_1 for the first 6 moves. This seems to enhance the results especially against vanilla improved. The overall win rate is 65% AB_Custom_3: First 6 moves: negative number of legal moves of opponent, later AB_Improved

| Match | Opponent | AB_Custom_3 | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Won | Lost |
| 1 | MM_Open | 39 | 11 |
| 2 | MM_Center | 42 | 8 |
| 3 | MM_Improved | 36 | 14 |
| 4 | AB_Open | 24 | 26 |
| 5 | AB_Center | 28 | 22 |
| 6 | AB_Improved | 26 | 24 |
| Win Rate: | | 65.0% | |

Third experiment

Changing the hybrid heuristic by using a defensive strategy towards the game end by subtracting double the opponent's move from player moves. The end result did not enhance though.

AB_Custom_3: First 10 moves: negative number of legal moves of opponent, later defensive AB_Improved

| Match # | Opponent | AB_Custom_3 | |
|---------|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Won | Lost |
| 1 | MM_Open | 34 | 16 |
| 2 | MM_Center | 44 | 6 |
| 3 | MM_Improved | 40 | 10 |
| 4 | AB_Open | 22 | 28 |
| 5 | AB_Center | 27 | 23 |
| 6 | AB_Improved | 26 | 24 |

Win Rate: 64.3%

Fourth experiment

Trying a different configuration for the hybrid heuristic by starting with a strategy favoring center blocks at the beginning, then a defensive negative number of opponent's legal moves, and ending with a defensive variation to the improved heuristic. The overall win rate increased to 66.3%

| Match # | Opponent | AB_Custom_3 | |
|---------|-------------|-------------|------|
| | | Won | Lost |
| 1 | MM_Open | 35 | 15 |
| 2 | MM_Center | 46 | 4 |
| 3 | MM_Improved | 38 | 12 |
| 4 | AB_Open | 26 | 24 |
| 5 | AB_Center | 27 | 23 |
| 6 | AB_Improved | 27 | 23 |

Win Rate: 66.3%

Fifth experiment

Running all agents at the same experiment with 50 matches against each of the provided heuristics. The hybrid heuristic still seems to perform best with a small margin. AB_Custom: negative open AB_Custom_2: AB_Improved with open in proximity AB_Custom_3: hybrid eval, center 6 moves, negative open 6 moves, then improved

| Match # | Opponent | AB_Improved | | AB_Custom | | AB_Custom_2 | | AB_Custom_3 | |
|---------|-------------|-------------|------|-----------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|
| | | Won | Lost | Won | Lost | Won | Lost | Won | Lost |
| 1 | MM_Open | 34 | 16 | 35 | 15 | 37 | 13 | 39 | 11 |
| 2 | MM_Center | 46 | 4 | 41 | 9 | 40 | 10 | 46 | 4 |
| 3 | MM_Improved | 32 | 18 | 30 | 20 | 34 | 16 | 33 | 17 |
| 4 | AB_Open | 31 | 19 | 29 | 21 | 29 | 21 | 28 | 22 |
| 5 | AB_Center | 28 | 22 | 26 | 24 | 20 | 30 | 25 | 25 |
| 6 | AB_Improved | 20 | 30 | 30 | 20 | 22 | 28 | 24 | 26 |

Win Rate: 63.7% 63.7% 60.7% 65.0%

Conclusion:

The hybrid approach is promising and make sense to adjust the strategy according to the game state. There is still room for improvement with further experimentation towards optimizing the hybrid evaluation function, but for now this is the selected function.