

AI Heuristic choices

I decided to use three different heuristic that closely resemble each to have a better understanding how they perform. I am fascinated in understanding how two particular heuristics that are very much opposites of each other can be combined to create a more performant heuristic. The first heuristic tried to improve the number of moves a player has available and uses that to optimize the score. This heuristic performed at 56% compared to the baseline of 62.86%. I was not too surprised at this results. Similarly I used a heuristic to calculate the score based on the number of moves an opponent has left (less is better) and got a 61%. I ran the test's a few times and there was some variance but overall the data points that these two heuristics performed worse than the score being used for comparison.

Then I decided to use the heuristic that utilized the following formula:

$\text{AvailableMoves} - (2 * \text{Opponents moves})$) This proved to be a more efficient algorithm, performing at 71%. I used this algorithm since it showcased the simplicity of using two other heuristics in an optimized way. In the future we might be able to create an agent that creates permutations of known heuristics to find more optimal solutions.

```
# Heuristic 1 Optimize for a score that improves players moves
```

```
*****
```

```
Evaluating: ID_Improved
```

```
*****
```

```
Playing Matches:
```

```
-----
```

Match 1:	ID_Improved vs	Random	Result: 17 to 3
Match 2:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Null	Result: 16 to 4
Match 3:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Open	Result: 10 to 10
Match 4:	ID_Improved vs	MM_Improved	Result: 11 to 9
Match 5:	ID_Improved vs	AB_Null	Result: 15 to 5

Match 6: ID_Improved vs AB_Open Result: 13 to 7
Match 7: ID_Improved vs AB_Improved Result: 11 to 9

Results:

ID_Improved 66.43%

Evaluating: Student

Playing Matches:

Match 1: Student vs Random Result: 15 to 5
Match 2: Student vs MM_Null Result: 12 to 8
Match 3: Student vs MM_Open Result: 8 to 12
Match 4: Student vs MM_Improved Result: 12 to 8
Match 5: Student vs AB_Null Result: 11 to 9
Match 6: Student vs AB_Open Result: 13 to 7
Match 7: Student vs AB_Improved Result: 10 to 10

Results:

Student 57.86%

Heuristic 2 Optimize for a score that reduced adversarial moves

Evaluating: ID_Improved

Playing Matches:

Match 1: ID_Improved vs Random Result: 17 to 3
Match 2: ID_Improved vs MM_Null Result: 15 to 5
Match 3: ID_Improved vs MM_Open Result: 13 to 7
Match 4: ID_Improved vs MM_Improved Result: 13 to 7
Match 5: ID_Improved vs AB_Null Result: 14 to 6
Match 6: ID_Improved vs AB_Open Result: 14 to 6
Match 7: ID_Improved vs AB_Improved Result: 14 to 6

Results:

ID_Improved 71.43%

Evaluating: Student

Playing Matches:

Match 1: Student vs Random Result: 16 to 4
Match 2: Student vs MM_Null Result: 13 to 7
Match 3: Student vs MM_Open Result: 12 to 8
Match 4: Student vs MM_Improved Result: 10 to 10
Match 5: Student vs AB_Null Result: 13 to 7

Match 6: Student vs AB_Open Result: 14 to 6
Match 7: Student vs AB_Improved Result: 8 to 12

Results:

Student 61.43%

Third heuristic. (playerMoves - (2 * Opponentmoves))

Evaluating: ID_Improved

Playing Matches:

Match 1: ID_Improved vs Random Result: 16 to 4
Match 2: ID_Improved vs MM_Null Result: 15 to 5
Match 3: ID_Improved vs MM_Open Result: 12 to 8
Match 4: ID_Improved vs MM_Improved Result: 12 to 8
Match 5: ID_Improved vs AB_Null Result: 15 to 5
Match 6: ID_Improved vs AB_Open Result: 11 to 9
Match 7: ID_Improved vs AB_Improved Result: 7 to 13

Results:

ID_Improved 62.86%

Evaluating: Student

Playing Matches:

Match 1: Student vs Random Result: 18 to 2
Match 2: Student vs MM_Null Result: 18 to 2
Match 3: Student vs MM_Open Result: 15 to 5
Match 4: Student vs MM_Improved Result: 13 to 7
Match 5: Student vs AB_Null Result: 13 to 7
Match 6: Student vs AB_Open Result: 11 to 9
Match 7: Student vs AB_Improved Result: 12 to 8

Results:

Student 71.43%