

Ruihan Zou

Custom_Score:

The heuristic1 is trying to restrict the opponent's moves and maximizing the player's moves:

Supposing we have

$\text{my_moves ratio} = \text{len}(\text{my next possible moves}) / \text{len}(\text{opponent next possible moves})$,
 $\text{opponent_moves ratio} = \text{len}(\text{opponent next possible moves}) / \text{len}(\text{my next possible moves})$
separately.

Then in order to make $\text{my_moves ratio} - \text{opponent_moves ratio} > 0$, we need to multiply $\text{len}(\text{opponent next possible moves}) * \text{len}(\text{opponent next possible moves})$

Then it can be derived to :

$\text{score} = \text{len}(\text{my next possible moves}) * \text{len}(\text{my next possible moves}) - a * (\text{opponent next possible moves}) * (\text{opponent next possible moves})$ where $a = 1.8$

Custom_Score2:

The heuristic2 is trying to remove those corner moves from my moves which means the corner moves would get negative scores. The factor a would be 4 when the spaces are less than 25%:

$\text{score} = (\text{len}(\text{my moves}) - a * \text{len}(\text{my moves in corner})) - \text{len}(\text{opponent moves})$ where $a = 4$

Custom_Score3:

The heuristic3 is trying to maximize player's moves:

$\text{score} = a * (\text{len}(\text{my moves}) - \text{len}(\text{opponent moves}))$ where $a = 1.8$

The above factors are modified to get the best results according some experiences

Below is the test result after executing tournament.py.

```
+ deepening (ID) called 'AB_Improved'. The three 'AB_Custom' agents use
X ID and alpha-beta search with the custom_score functions defined in
  game_agent.py.

*****
      Playing Matches
*****

Match #   Opponent   AB_Improved   AB_Custom   AB_Custom_2   AB_Custom_3
              Won | Lost   Won | Lost   Won | Lost   Won | Lost
-----
1         Random      9 | 1       10 | 0        8 | 2        8 | 2
2         MM_Open     4 | 6        8 | 2        7 | 3        6 | 4
3         MM_Center    8 | 2        9 | 1        8 | 2        9 | 1
4         MM_Improved  6 | 4        6 | 4        6 | 4        4 | 6
5         AB_Open      6 | 4        5 | 5        3 | 7        5 | 5
6         AB_Center    8 | 2        7 | 3        4 | 6        5 | 5
7         AB_Improved  5 | 5        6 | 4        5 | 5        4 | 6

-----
Win Rate:   65.7%       72.9%       58.6%       58.6%

(/Users/ruihanzou/anaconda3/envs/aind) → AIND-Isolation git:(master) ✕
```

AB_Custom uses heuristic1 as evaluate function, AB_Custom2 uses heuristic2 as evaluate function and AB_Custom_3 use heuristic2 as evaluate function

We can see that heuristic1 has the best results with factor $a = 1.8$, the worse performance match is the game played with AB_Open which is a 50/50 win and lost.

Here is the table to show the lost times while playing against to opponent agents

| win rate | AB_Improved | AB_Custom Lost | AB_Custom_2 Lost | AB_Custom_3 Lost |
|----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 65.7% | 72.9% | 58.6% | 58.6% |

Heuristic 1 has the best performance on losing the least games. It proves that our strategy works. So simply removing the corner moves in heuristic 2 and maximizing the players move are not quite efficiency.

From the experience result, we can see heuristic 1 has the better result. I think it is because It not only restricts the opponent's moves but also tries to maximize the player moves. It is like a combination strategy but not a single one.

That's why we have 72.9% win rate which is higher than other heuristics being considered. Also, heuristic 1 is really easy to be understood and explained to people though it is not a straightforward idea at the beginning. The code is easy to implement and following the lecture which is giving higher score if the player has better options.