

Heuristic Analysis for Isolation Game

John Carpenter

March 2, 2017

1 Isolation Analysis

For this isolation game, a game agent was built that was able to defeat a variety of different computer opponents roughly 85% time. The game agent used a combination of minimax and alphabeta pruning to search through the game space for the correct moves.

1.1 Discussion

Performance

After running the tournament a number of times one of the important factors in the outcome was the depth of search that the program was able to complete. Turns must be completed in 150ms or the game was forfeited with a loss. To this end the performance of the `get_move` determined how often the program was able to win. Optimizing this method was important to a successful run. While there wasn't any global metrics collected a cursory calculation showed that the number of searches that went to full-depth was less than 40% and those were likely near the end of the match only

In creating the game agent we implemented a tree-node architecture with the `GameNode.py` class. That architecture allowed for flexible tree configurations and separated the construction of the tree with it's scoring/pruning functions. However, considering the unittest were written first we had to modify some of the code to function within the parameters and it lost some of its effectiveness.

It would be worthwhile to continue some optimization on the `get_move` in order to see it's impact on the solution. The first step might be collecting better metrics on the performance of the search and scoring routines and profiling the method calls in more depth.

1.2 Heuristics

In order to evaluate the board state at each we created 4 heuristics as a measure of the quality of the board. The goal of this section was to arrive at a

heuristic that was able to statistically outperform the ID_Improved model that was provided.

- Heuristic 1 - Baseline Low Performance
- Heuristic 2 - Moves Left (ID_Improved model)
- Heuristic 3 - Warnsdorf's rules
- Heuristic 4 - Modified Moves Left

Notes: The results and analysis here are based upon a limited run of a couple hundred game instances. As shown in the sections below there is a large variation in the winning percentages. Given the variability and small sample size the results may not be statistically significant

The details of each of the repective measures are in their sections below.

1.2.1 Heuristic 1 - Baseline Low Performance

The first heuristic was done to provide a baseline for the remaining test cases. This should allow us to understand how much a change in the scoring heuristic is expected to impact the testing performance.

Results

As expected, the results from the first heuristic performed worse than the ID_Improved model.

```
*****  
Evaluating: ID_Improved  
*****
```

Playing Matches:

Match 1:	ID_Improved vs	Random	Result: 19 to 1
Match 2:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Null	Result: 18 to 2
Match 3:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Open	Result: 13 to 7
Match 4:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Improved	Result: 17 to 3
Match 5:	ID_Improved vs	AB_Null	Result: 18 to 2
Match 6:	ID_Improved vs	AB_Open	Result: 18 to 2
Match 7:	ID_Improved vs	AB_Improved	Result: 17 to 3

Results:

ID_Improved 85.71%

```
*****
```

```
Evaluating: Student
*****
```

```
Playing Matches:
```

```
-----
Match 1: Student vs Random Result: 17 to 3
Match 2: Student vs MM_Null Result: 16 to 4
Match 3: Student vs MM_Open Result: 13 to 7
Match 4: Student vs MM_Improved Result: 13 to 7
Match 5: Student vs AB_Null Result: 17 to 3
Match 6: Student vs AB_Open Result: 13 to 7
Match 7: Student vs AB_Improved Result: 10 to 10
```

```
Results:
```

```
-----
Student 70.71%
```

1.2.2 Heuristic 2

The second heuristic was identical to the ID_Improved model. We ran this model to demonstrate some of the variability in the win %. Even within the tests in this document we see the range of win % from the ID_Improved vary between 82% and 90%.

Results

```
*****
Evaluating: ID_Improved
*****
```

```
Playing Matches:
```

```
-----
Match 1: ID_Improved vs Random Result: 20 to 0
Match 2: ID_Improved vs MM_Null Result: 20 to 0
Match 3: ID_Improved vs MM_Open Result: 17 to 3
Match 4: ID_Improved vs MM_Improved Result: 15 to 5
Match 5: ID_Improved vs AB_Null Result: 20 to 0
Match 6: ID_Improved vs AB_Open Result: 16 to 4
Match 7: ID_Improved vs AB_Improved Result: 15 to 5
```

```
Results:
```

```
-----
ID_Improved 87.86%
```

```
*****
```

Evaluating: Student

Playing Matches:

```

-----
Match 1:  Student  vs  Random    Result: 19 to 1
Match 2:  Student  vs  MM_Null   Result: 20 to 0
Match 3:  Student  vs  MM_Open   Result: 18 to 2
Match 4:  Student  vs  MM_Improved Result: 17 to 3
Match 5:  Student  vs  AB_Null   Result: 19 to 1
Match 6:  Student  vs  AB_Open   Result: 18 to 2
Match 7:  Student  vs  AB_Improved Result: 17 to 3

```

Results:

```

-----
Student          91.43%


```

1.2.3 Heuristic 3

The third heuristic attempted to utilize a slightly different approach to scoring the model.

There is a mathematical problem, called the Knights Tour that is relevant to this game. In this problem the goal is to move a Knight around a chessboard such that you touch every point on the board without visiting the same point twice. In this problem, the mathematician H.C Warnsdorf determined that the solution involves always moving to the point with the fewest number of connected locations. It is called Warnsdorf's rule.

In order to implement a variant of that form, we want the program to choose a location with the minimum number of moves (greater than 0), and the opponent to choose the move with the most amount of moves. (Although the second part isn't as crucial to the formula). We based the quality of the board as:



```

if (player_moves_left >= 2):
    return 8 - float(player_moves_left)
else:
    return -1

```

See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knight's_tour##Warnsdorf.27s_rule

Results

Using the Warnsdorf heuristic proved to have a negative effect on the winning percentage. In the case below, the Warnsdorf won 80.7% to the ID_Improved at 91%. I suspect the reason behind this is that nearing the end of the game, the opponent will have taken the larger numbers near the center and forced the player to the corners. Since Warnsdorf's rule might require the larger numbers near the end of the game to allow it to work.

```
*****
Evaluating: ID_Improved
*****
```

Playing Matches:

Match 1:	ID_Improved	vs	Random	Result: 20 to 0
Match 2:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Null	Result: 20 to 0
Match 3:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Open	Result: 17 to 3
Match 4:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Improved	Result: 19 to 1
Match 5:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Null	Result: 17 to 3
Match 6:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Open	Result: 19 to 1
Match 7:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Improved	Result: 16 to 4

Results:

ID_Improved	91.43%
-------------	--------

```
*****
Evaluating: Student
*****
```

Playing Matches:

Match 1:	Student	vs	Random	Result: 18 to 2
Match 2:	Student	vs	MM_Null	Result: 19 to 1
Match 3:	Student	vs	MM_Open	Result: 14 to 6
Match 4:	Student	vs	MM_Improved	Result: 14 to 6
Match 5:	Student	vs	AB_Null	Result: 20 to 0
Match 6:	Student	vs	AB_Open	Result: 14 to 6
Match 7:	Student	vs	AB_Improved	Result: 14 to 6

Results:

Student 80.71%

1.2.4 Heuristic 4

The final heuristic measure is a variant on the ID_Improved model. In this model we weight the opponents remaining moves as more important in the calculation to by doubling its effect. This has the effect of trying to minimize the opponents available moves while not being as concerned about the programs number of moves.

```
return float(player_moves_left) - 2*float(opponent_moves_left)
```

Results

This heuristic model is the first of the collection that seems to consistently perform better than the default ID_Improved model. The model typically averaged 5-6% higher win percentage although that is still within the statistical variance we have seen in the tests.

```
*****
Evaluating: ID_Improved
*****
```

Playing Matches:

Match 1:	ID_Improved	vs	Random	Result: 17 to 3
Match 2:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Null	Result: 19 to 1
Match 3:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Open	Result: 16 to 4
Match 4:	ID_Improved	vs	MM_Improved	Result: 13 to 7
Match 5:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Null	Result: 19 to 1
Match 6:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Open	Result: 16 to 4
Match 7:	ID_Improved	vs	AB_Improved	Result: 16 to 4

Results:

ID_Improved 82.86%

```
*****
Evaluating: Student
*****
```

Playing Matches:

Match 1:	Student	vs	Random	Result: 16 to 4
Match 2:	Student	vs	MM_Null	Result: 18 to 2
Match 3:	Student	vs	MM_Open	Result: 16 to 4

Match 4:	Student	vs	MM_Improved	Result: 18 to 2
Match 5:	Student	vs	AB_Null	Result: 20 to 0
Match 6:	Student	vs	AB_Open	Result: 17 to 3
Match 7:	Student	vs	AB_Improved	Result: 17 to 3

Results:

Student	87.14%
---------	--------

1.3 Recommendations

The game playing agent was successful in competing in the simulated tournament against a small variety of simple opponents. However competing against a stronger opponent such as the `ID_Improved` model the results are not as conclusive. Here are some recommendations that would improve the strength of the game agent model.

1. Improve the speed of the `get_move` function. The speed of this function determines the depth to which the algorithm can search. Through a combination of method profiling and optimizations the function will be able to search deeper into the game producing a more certain outcome.
2. Improved Heuristics. The 4th heuristic that puts a higher weight on the opponents position versus the players position showed to have a marginal increase in winning percentage.
3. Better Metrics and Analysis. In order to measure the increase from the previous two items, we need an accurate, statistically valid baseline. We will also need better visibility into the algorithms performance and the impact any changes have on the outcome. Metrics such as the % of searches going to full-depth, and the average depth at timeout would go a long way in determining which changes are beneficial for the algorithm.