Search	Heuristic	Time	Fairplay	Depth Limit	~Nodes	Games	Result
Alpha Beta	Liberties	150	Yes	9	50000	100	0.8
Alpha Beta	Custom Heuristic	150	Yes	9	50000	100	0.86
Alpha Beta	Liberties	300	Yes	9	100000	100	0.745
Alpha Beta	Custom Heuristic	300	Yes	9	100000	100	0.84
Baseline							
Using #my_mov	es - #opponent_	_moves heu	ristic, I achieve	e an 80% succe	ess rate, ov	er 100 gam	es
Search	Heuristic	Time	Fairplay	Depth Limit	Nodes	Games	Result
Alpha Beta	Liberties	150	Yes	9	50000	100	0.8
Custom Heuris	tic						
I assume that the higher success r		ore liberties	towards the ce	enter of the boa	rd should h	ave a	
I set a max dista	nce for each lib	erty availabl	le to each play	er, then reduce	distance fr	om the cen	iter
The player with	the highest total	remaining i	s considered t	o be winning (ie	e most liber	ties toward	s the center)
Using my custor	n heuristic I ach	ieve an 86%	% success rate	, over 100 gam	es		
Search	Heuristic	Time	Fairplay	Depth Limit	Nodes	Games	Result
Alpha Beta	Custom Heuristic	150	Yes	9	50000	100	0.86
What features o	•	-	-	orate, and why	do you thi	nk those f	eatures
I consider it is be	etter to have mo	re liberties to	owards the ce	nter of the boar	d		
The baseline hed		sures the dif	fference in libe	rties of players	considerin	g the locati	on of the
Having an edge picking the right		g can give a	better idea of	when the playe	er is winnin	g, hence m	ore likely
Analyze the sea matter more or		_		our custom he of your heuris		es search	speed

According to my analysis, having a better heuristic can be more effective than just going deeper.

For instance, doubling the time to 300ms, the baseline achieved a 82.5% - which was still lower than my custom heuristic at 150ms, and we had to go a lot deeper ~\*2 nodes

Given time restriction, it maybe unlikely to reach endgame just by going deep. So I believe it is important to have clever evaluation