

Overall performance

***** Playing Matches *****									
Match #	Opponent	AB_Improved		AB_Custom		AB_Custom_2		AB_Custom_3	
		Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost	Won	Lost
1	Random	137	63	136	64	131	69	130	70
2	MM_Open	128	72	138	62	124	76	120	80
3	MM_Center	150	50	139	61	151	49	149	51
4	MM_Improved	123	77	126	74	130	70	125	75
5	AB_Open	107	93	102	98	113	87	91	109
6	AB_Center	107	93	117	83	101	99	110	90
7	AB_Improved	100	100	103	97	108	92	117	83
-----									
Win Rate:		60.9%		61.5%		61.3%		60.1%	

As we can see from above, the three score functions' result is just above the `AB_improved` winning rate, which is the benchmark of the test. I set game number between each set players to be `200` , for minizing the variation on winning rate.

Custom 1

the score function I used in `custom 1` is

```
player_moves - opponent_moves + 0.1 * player_distance_to_center
```

This function combines both `AB_improved` and `AB_open` . We put less weight on the distance since the performance of `AB_improved` is better than `AB_open` , also the scale of the distance is from 0~5, and we don't want it to be the dominating part.

It turns out is slightly better than `AB_improved` , but not far ahead.

Custom 2

The score function in `custom 2` is

```
players_moves - 2 * opponent_moves
```

This function is similar to `AB_improved` , but we put more weight on minimizing the opponent's available moves. Its performance is slight worse than `custom 1` and better than `AB_improved` .

## Custom 3

The score function I used in `custom 3` is

```
min(player_moves - opponent_moves, player_distance_to_center)
```

This function is another combination of `AB_improved` and `AB_open`. It turns out is slightly worse than `AB improved`.