

Fragility of Chess positions: measure, universality and tipping points

Marc Barthelemy^{1,2}

¹ *Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, CEA, Institut de Physique Théorique, 91191, Gif-sur-Yvette, France and*

² *Centre d'Analyse et de Mathématique Sociales (CNRS/EHESS) 54 Avenue de Raspail, 75006 Paris, France*

We introduce a novel metric to quantify the fragility of chess positions using the interaction graph of pieces. This fragility score F captures the tension within a position and serves as a strong indicator of tipping points in a game. In well-known games, maximum fragility often aligns with decisive moments marked by brilliant moves. Analyzing a large dataset of games, we find that fragility typically peaks around move 15, with pawns ($\approx 60\%$) and knights ($\approx 20\%$) frequently involved in high-tension positions. Remarkably, average fragility curves show a universal pattern across a wide range of players, games, and openings, with a subtle deviation observed in games played by the engine Stockfish. Our analysis reveals a gradual buildup of fragility starting around 8 moves before the peak, followed by a prolonged fragile state lasting up to 15 moves. This suggests a gradual intensification of positional tension leading to decisive moments in the game. These insights offer a valuable tool for both players and engines to assess critical moments in chess.

I. TOWARDS A QUANTITATIVE THEORY OF THE CHESS GAME

Richard Réti, one of the world's top players in the early 20th century and a leading proponent of hyper-modernism in chess (alongside Nimzovich), gave a series of lectures on chess in Buenos Aires in 1924. These lectures were published in Spanish [1] under a title that could be translated as 'Scientific Lectures on Chess'. In the preface, Réti outlines three stages toward developing a scientific understanding of chess. The first stage involves the empirical collection of data, the second focuses on constructing typologies, and the third aims to establish laws based on these typologies. While this ambitious program remains unfulfilled, a parallel approach, driven largely by advances in computer science, has since come to dominate the field. Prominent scientists such as Turing [2], Shannon [3], Simon, Newell [4] and others discussed about 70 years ago the importance of chess as a prototype for testing algorithms and artificial intelligence (see the compendium [5]). Indeed, the study of chess offers a rich intersection between computational science and complex systems analysis. With its simple rules yet vast strategic depth, chess provides an ideal platform for developing and testing algorithms in artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and decision theory. Its deterministic nature allows for the application of various computational techniques, from heuristic searches to neural networks, which offer insights into optimization and problem-solving. Chess has historically been central to AI research, exemplified by landmark events like IBM's Deep Blue defeating Garry Kasparov in 1997, a milestone in AI's capabilities [6]. More recent innovations, such as AlphaZero, further highlight the game's importance in advancing computational methods [7]. Chess also extends beyond algorithms, introducing psychological complexity as players engage in predicting and concealing strategies, adding layers of depth to the game.

However, chess, when viewed as a relatively simple

complex system governed by the interactions of a small number of constituents, could serve as a testbed for many ideas developed in complex systems science. Mathematically, chess can be represented as a decision tree where each branch leads to a win, loss, or draw, and the challenge lies in selecting the best move amid the vast combinatorial complexity, especially during the middlegame, where the goal is to navigate toward favorable branches. It is thus surprising that complexity science—and in particular, statistical physics—has had relatively little to say about this system. However, the recent rise of online chess platforms has enabled large-scale data analysis, changing this situation to some extent and allowing for the gradual introduction of concepts and tools from statistical physics and complex systems [8–17]. Researchers have identified patterns such as power-law distributions in opening move frequencies, reflecting the self-similar nature of the game tree [9, 10]. Long-range memory effects in game sequences, which vary according to player skill levels, have also been observed [12, 13] and the impact of chess experts' knowledge was discussed in [18]. Additionally, the response time distribution in rapid chess was analyzed in [19], and the decision-making process of chess players was examined in [20].

Chess is traditionally divided into three phases: the opening, middlegame, and endgame, with extensive study dedicated to each. A key focus in chess discussions is on 'critical points' (also referred to as 'turning' or 'tipping points')—positions where the choice of move can significantly influence the outcome of the game (see, for example, [21]). These critical positions are often unstable, and a small mistake can lead to dramatic shifts in the game's trajectory. One of the enduring challenges in chess is identifying the best move, particularly in the middlegame when the combinatorial possibilities are vast. In this study, we address the problem of identifying these pivotal positions that largely determine the course of the game. The existence of such turning (or tipping) points is linked to how quickly a position can change, often

within just a few moves. This concept relates to the ‘fragility’ of a position, which we aim to quantify by analyzing piece interactions through graph theory. We define fragility based on the betweenness centrality of pieces under attack. Our objective is to calculate a fragility score for each position, aggregate these scores across multiple games, and analyze the statistical properties of fragility over time. The paper is structured as follows: we first define the interaction graph of a position, which allows us to quantify its fragility and to define a fragility score. We then apply this metric to different games, demonstrating that it can identify turning points and, interestingly, reveals a universal pattern when averaged over a large number of games.

II. CHARACTERIZING THE FRAGILITY OF A POSITION

A. The interaction graph

We construct the interaction graph that describes, for a given position, how the different pieces on the board attack or defend each other. More precisely, the interaction graph $G(V, E)$ consists of nodes V , representing the pieces on the chessboard, and directed edges E , representing the interactions between these pieces. Let $P = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n\}$ be the set of pieces on the board (both black and white), and will be the nodes of G (in this graph, nodes are labelled by their pieces which are represented in uppercase for white and lowercase for black pieces). An edge $e_{ij} \in E$ is drawn from node p_i to p_j if:

- Attack interaction: p_i can legally capture p_j (in red color in Fig. 1). This edge is directed as the attack is in general not bi-directional.
- Defense interaction: p_i defends p_j where both pieces are of the same color). A defense link is then a directed edge between two pieces of the same color, indicating that one piece can move to defend another, implying it could potentially retake the opponent if the defended piece is captured (in Fig. 1, these edges are colored blue for white pieces and green for black pieces).

This graph is directed as an attack by piece p_i on piece p_j is not symmetric; p_i can attack p_j , but p_j may not necessarily attack p_i . Similarly, defense interactions (where one piece defends another) are also directional, where one piece is protecting another, but the reverse is not true. We show in Fig. 1 an example of an interaction graph and the corresponding position.

An important piece in the position - namely one whose disappearance will modify in depth the position - is then characterized by a large number of interactions with other pieces. Centrality measures appear therefore to be very relevant for identifying key pieces in this position. In this study, we use betweenness centrality (BC) to quantify importance, as it captures how frequently a piece lies




FIG. 1: **Interaction graph.** Example on a position taken from Mehdlishvili - Van Forrest (see Data for more details). (a) Board Interaction graph at the ply 49 after the move Nd4 (which happened after the excellent move Rd4!!). (b) The key piece is here the white knight and has the largest betweenness centrality. In this graph, we denote the corresponding pieces of nodes with uppercase letters for white pieces and lowercase for black pieces.

on the shortest paths between other pieces in the interaction graph. The BC g of a piece p_i is defined as [22]

$$g(p_i) = \sum_{s \neq p_i \neq t} \frac{\sigma_{st}(p_i)}{\sigma_{st}} \quad (1)$$

where σ_{st} is the total number of shortest paths from node s to node t , and $\sigma_{st}(p_i)$ is the number of those paths that pass through node p_i . Since betweenness centrality measures the frequency at which a node (a piece) lies on the shortest paths between pairs of other nodes, it is important to respect these directed interactions when computing the centrality. In chess, the directed nature of these relationships is crucial because it reflects the actual dynamics of the game. Thus, we will here compute the betweenness centrality for the directed interaction graph G , where the edges between pieces represent directed interactions (attacks or defenses). Computing BC for the undirected graph would ignore the directionality, potentially losing critical information about the nature of attacks and defenses.

We note that other centrality measures could be considered. Specifically, we tested the simplest one—the degree of a node—but found that it yields less precise results and overlooks some key positions. The superiority of betweenness centrality (BC) likely stems from the fact that it is not a local measure and accounts for more than just a single move. BC captures cascades of exchanges, while degree centrality is primarily tied to a single half-move, limiting its ability to identify crucial positions.

B. The fragility score

We can now define the fragility score F of a position. Each piece p_i for each color has a BC computed from the interaction graph defined for a given position. A

piece with a large BC value is pivotal in the position as its capture would modify in depth the structure of the position. If such a piece is under attack, the position could potentially be modified in the next moves and can thus be qualified as fragile. It is thus natural to define the fragility score of the position as

$$F = \sum_{p \in P} g(p)a(p) \quad (2)$$

where $a(p) = 1$ if the piece p is under attack and $a(p) = 0$ otherwise. This score thus computes the total betweenness centrality of attacked pieces. If the large betweenness centrality pieces are attacked, the position is unstable and can be very dynamically changing. Here, we compute the total fragility score but note that it could be defined for white and black separately. This total fragility score represents the overall vulnerability of the position, taking into account the importance of the pieces under attack and their centrality within the interaction graph. By tracking the total fragility score throughout the game, we can identify critical moments when positions become particularly fragile, reflecting the dynamics of attack and defense.

For a single chess game, the total fragility score is computed for every half-move (or ply). Additionally, the maximum fragility point is identified (i.e., the ply where the fragility score reaches its peak). We show an example in Fig. 2 (the corresponding chessboard and interaction graph at the maximum fragility point, highlighting the position and the key pieces contributing to the fragility, are shown in Fig. 1).




FIG. 2: **Fragility score.** Fragility score F computed from the betweenness centrality of attacked pieces. We show here the score versus the ply for the game Mehedlishvili - Van Forrest (see Data for more details). We indicate the maximum value obtained at ply 49 (after the move Nd4) and the corresponding position is shown in Fig. 1.

Interestingly, the maximum fragility score often highlights the most critical and notable moves in a game. While we cannot conduct a large-scale comparison between human analysis and fragility predictions, we can

examine specific cases. We analyzed the top 10 games ever played, as ranked by chess.com [23], and computed the fragility score for each. For each game, we identified the move corresponding to the maximum fragility. The results are presented in the Table I). In most cases—except for two—the maximum fragility

Game	Move (ply) at max F	Notable moves (ply)
Jinshi vs. Liren Chinese League 2017	Kg3 (45)	40 Rd4
Kasparov vs. Topalov Wijk aan Zee 1999	Kb6 (50)	Rxd4 (47) Re7+ (49) Bf1 (71)
Morphy vs. Allies Paris Opera 1858	c7c5 (14)	Nxb5 (19) Rxd7 (25) Qb8+ (31)
Aronian vs. Anand Wijk aan Zee 2013	Bg4 (33)	Nde5 (32)
Karpov vs. Kasparov (16) World Championship 1985	Bd6 (38)	g5 (42)
Byrne vs. Fischer New York 1956	Bc4 (29)	Na4 (22) Be6 (34)
Short vs. Timman Tilburg 1991	Kg3 (63)	Kh2 (60) Kg3 (63)
Rotlewi vs. Rubinstein Lodz 1907	Bd3 (21)	Rxc3 (44) Rxd2 (46)
Geller vs. Euwe Zurich 1953	e4e5 (44)	Rh8 (44)

TABLE I: Selection of the ten best game of chess (according to chess.com [23]). The first column indicates the game, the second column the ply and the corresponding move leading to the maximum of the fragility score (of the game). The last column indicates the brilliant move(s) discussed in [23].

aligns with brilliant and decisive moves, suggesting that during these high-tension phases, creativity and skill play a key role in determining the outcome of the game.

III. STATISTICAL RESULTS FOR MANY GAMES

The result shown in Fig. 2 is obtained for one specific game and to gain statistical insights, we extend the analysis across multiple games. We consider here a total of 20,685 games played by world top players: Alekhine (1661 games), Capablanca (597 games), Carlsen (1730 games), Fisher (1053), Karpov (3079 games), Kasparov (4049 games), Morphy (211 games), Nakamura (686 games), Polgar (2398 games), Reti (646 games), Spassky (4176 games), and also for the Stockfish engine (413 games). The datasets are freely available from [24].

For each game, we compute the fragility score, identify its maximum and the corresponding ply and key piece

(attacked piece with the largest betweenness centrality). We first show the histogram of the ply at which the maximum occurs (Fig. 3(a)). Typically, we see that the most fragile positions arise around ply 32 (which correspond to the 16th move, or more generally to about 30% of the total number of plies). The histogram for the key pieces (Fig. 3(b)) shows that the key pieces involved in fragile positions are mostly pawns ($\approx 60\%$ of cases), followed by knights ($\approx 20\%$).




FIG. 3: **Properties of the maximum fragility score.** (a) Histogram of the ply at which the fragility score is maximum. On average, the maximum is at ply ≈ 32 (which corresponds to the move 160). (b) Histogram of the key piece (attacked piece with the largest BC). We observe that in about 60% of the games the pawns were the key pieces, and for 20% the knights are the key pieces. These results are obtained for a total of 20,685 games for a selection of world top players.

For each game, we compute the total fragility score versus the ply, and align the fragility scores around the ply with the maximum fragility, centering the maximum for comparison across games. The average fragility score is then computed across all games, providing an aggregate measure of how fragility evolves. We average over all the 20,685 games discussed above and which mix different (top) players and a large variety of different openings. The result is shown in Fig. 4. We observe a surprising universality: the average fragility score is the same for all players and for all openings. Interestingly, we observe a slight difference for the Stockfish engine, which is prob-




FIG. 4: **Average universal fragility score.** We show here the average aligned fragility score (we center the fragility score for each game around its maximum value and then perform the average over 20,685 games). Apart from small deviation observed for the engine Stockfish, all average fragility scores align almost perfectly.

ably related to the fact that games played by Stockfish have a larger total number of moves.

In order to investigate this universal average fragility score, we split it in two parts. The left part captures the behavior of fragility leading up to the maximum (i.e., before the maximum fragility ply), and the right part that describes the decay of fragility after the maximum. Both the left and right parts display a power law behavior with a sharp cut-off and we use the following fitting function

$$F(m) = \frac{C}{m^\beta} e^{-m/m_0} \quad (3)$$

For example, we show this fit for Carlsen’s games on the Fig. 5(a). We use this function and fit all the average curves obtained for all players considered here, and we find on average for the left part $\beta_l = 0.06 \pm 0.022$ and $m_{0l} = 19 \pm 1.75$, and for the right part $\beta_r = 0.23 \pm 0.04$, $m_{0r} = 29 \pm 10.7$. The histogram of these values are shown in Fig. 5(b). We note here that the values of m_0 are peaked around their average value, with the exception of Stockfish that represents an outlier with $m_{0l} = 24$, and $m_{0r} = 63$ ($r^2 > 0.98$), values that are larger than for human players (≈ 30 half-moves). The fragility thus lasts much longer than in human games, showing that the tension can be sustained much longer for an engine while human players will release the tension faster.

The power law exponents are relatively small which implies that the behavior of fragility is governed by the exponential cut-off. Basically, we thus observe on average an exponential of the form $\exp(-m/19)$ for the left part and a longer larger tail after the max fragility with a decay over almost 30 half-moves. The build up of the fragility then takes on average 8 moves, while fragility decays much slower with an average of 15 moves, indicating that the later phase of the game maintain a degree of fragility, possibly indicating prolonged positional




FIG. 5: **Fitting the average universal fragility score.** (a) We show here in the case of Carlsen’s games the fits with the function of Eq. 3. The fitting parameters are in this case $\beta_l \approx 0.05$, $\beta_r \approx 0.24$, and $m_{ol} \approx 19$, $m_{or} \approx 30$ (in all cases $r^2 > 0.99$). (b) Histograms of the parameters β and m_0 for the left and right parts for all games considered here.

tension or vulnerability. On average, before the maximum fragility, the game is ‘flat’ in terms of its fragility dynamics, players are building their positions with minimal risk or sharp changes. For the right part, the larger value $m_0 = 29$ indicates that the decay of fragility occurs more slowly in the late game compared to the early game. This suggests that fragility persists for longer in the later phases, which is consistent with the idea that every move becomes more critical. In the endgame, small inaccuracies can have a more pronounced effect on the outcome, but fragility remains present over more moves before it decays completely. These results quantitatively describe the evolution of fragility during a chess game. The early game is stable with the relatively quick appearance of a large fragility, while the late game is more fragile and tactically rich, with each move having a more significant impact. This reflects typical chess dynamics where the opening is balanced and the endgame is much more critical in determining the outcome.

This universal curve is obtained by averaging over many games, but each game has specific fluctuations. We show in Fig. 6 two different games. For the first game (Kasparov-Karpov 1985), we indeed observe the average behavior with a gradual building of the fragility up to a maximum followed by a gradual decrease. In contrast, for

other games, such as Kasparov-Topalov (1999), the behavior is further away from this simple image and reflects the turbulent nature of this specific game with ferocious fight from both players with numerous tactical themes and a king hunt that led the king all the way to the other side of the board. While these fluctuations may




FIG. 6: **Fragility scores for specific games.** (a) Game Kasparov-Karpov (World Championship 1985), and (b) Kasparov-Topalov (Wijk aan Zee 1999).

slightly reduce the practical significance of the average universal fragility curve, they underscore the importance of the fragility score in capturing the dynamic nature of a chess game.

IV. DISCUSSION

Despite recent advancements in AI and computational power, the scientific analysis of chess remains an evolving field. Two major breakthroughs have significantly enhanced our understanding of the game. First, the rise of AI engines surpassing human capabilities has revisited traditional chess theory, challenging long-held strategic principles and opening up new possibilities [6]. Second, the availability of large game databases now allows for extensive statistical analysis, revealing novel patterns and

insights across many games.

In this paper, we introduce a new approach to chess analysis by quantitatively measuring the fragility of positions using graph-theoretic concepts. The fragility score, based on the interaction graph of the pieces, captures the tension within a position, serving as an indicator of critical transitions or turning points. Our analysis reveals universal patterns across games, regardless of the player or opening. Specifically, we find that fragility builds up approximately 8 moves before the most fragile position and remains elevated for about 15 moves afterward. These results suggest that positional fragility follows in general a common trajectory, with tension peaking in the middlegame and dissipating toward the endgame. Interestingly, fragility scores in games played by the engine Stockfish show slight deviations from the observed universal patterns, hinting at differences in optimal play by AI compared to humans. Moreover, in famous games, the maximum fragility often coincides with pivotal moments, characterized by brilliant moves that decisively shift the balance of the game.

The consistent behavior of fragility scores across diverse games reflects the underlying structure of interaction graphs, which capture the strategic significance of piece relationships. The gradual decay of fragility indicates a prolonged state of tension, where small inaccuracies can dramatically shift the balance of power. This analysis highlights the complex dynamics of chess, where the interaction between attack and defense shapes the game’s overall structure. Our study offers a new tool for understanding positional dynamics and provides a foundation for future research in chess analysis. By bridging traditional chess theory with quantitative methods, we aim to further refine our understanding of the game and its critical moments.

Code availability

The Python codes used to analyze the games and compute the fragility score are available upon request.

V. METHODS

A. Data

The standard format for games is the Portable Game Notation (PGN) format, which includes metadata (e.g., date, location, opponent) and the moves in algebraic notation (e.g., a2a4, b7b8).

We used publicly available data from online resources for chess games, in particular from <https://www.pgnmentor.com> that proposes the games (in pgn format) for each player [24] or sorted by openings.

In particular, we discuss in this paper the game Mehdlishvili - Van Forrest (0-1) played at the 44th FIDE Chess Olympiad Chennai 2022 Open, and the games Kasparov-Karpov (played at the World Championship 1985), and the famous game Kasparov-Topalov (Wijk aan Zee 1999). We also studied the top 10 games as defined by the chess.com website [23]. The pgn files for individual games can be found on the chessgames.com website [25].

B. Software

We used the python-chess library (v1.9.4) for move generation, validation, and analysis [26]. This library includes a Stockfish class for easy integration with the Stockfish chess engine [27].

-
- [1] Four conferences given in Buenos Aires in 1924 were published in Spanish under the title ‘Curso Superior de Ajedrez’. A french version of it was published with the title ‘Cours scientifique d’Echecs’, Payot, 1998.
 - [2] A.M. Turing, ‘Chess’, in *Faster than thought*, (B.V. Bowden Editor), pp. 286-295. London, Pitman 1953.
 - [3] C.E. Shannon, ‘Programming a Computer for Playing Chess,’ *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 41(314): 256-275 (1950).
 - [4] A. Newell, ‘The Chess Machine: An example of dealing with a complex task by adaptation’, *Proceedings of the Western Joint Computer Conference*, 1955, pp 101-108.
 - [5] D.M. Levy, *Computer Chess Compendium*. Springer, New York, NY, 1988.
 - [6] M. Sadler, N. Regan, *Game Changer: AlphaZero’s Groundbreaking Chess Strategies and the Promise of AI*. New in Chess, Alkmaar (2019).
 - [7] D. Silver et al., ‘A General Reinforcement Learning Algorithm that Masters Chess, Shogi, and Go Through Self-Play,’ *Science* 362, 1140-1144 (2018).
 - [8] J.I. Perotti, H.H. Jo, A.L. Schaigorodsky, O.V. Billoni, ‘Innovation and Nested Preferential Growth in Chess Playing Behavior,’ *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* 104(4): 48005 (2013).
 - [9] B. Blasius, R. Tönjes, ‘Zipf’s Law in the Popularity Distribution of Chess Openings,’ *Physical Review Letters* 103(21): 218701 (2009).
 - [10] S. Maslov, ‘Power Laws in Chess,’ *Physics* 2: 97 (2009).
 - [11] H.V. Ribeiro, R.S. Mende, E.K. Lenzi, M. del Castillo-

- Mussot, L.A.N. Amaral LA. Move-by-move dynamics of the advantage in chess matches reveals population-level learning of the game. *PLoS One*. 8(1):e54165 (2013).
- [12] A.L. Schaigorodsky, J.I. Perotti, O.V. Billoni, Memory and Long-Range Correlations in Chess Games, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications* 394: 304-311 (2014).
- [13] A.L. Schaigorodsky, J.I. Perotti, O.V. Billoni, A Study of Memory Effects in a Chess Database, *PLoS One* 11(12): e0168213 (2016).
- [14] A. Atashpendar. T. Schilling, T. Voigtmann T. Sequencing chess. *Europhysics Letters*. 2016 Nov 22;116(1):10009.
- [15] S. Chowdhary, I. Iacopini, F. Battiston, ‘Quantifying Human Performance in Chess,’ *Scientific Reports* 13(1): 2113 (2023).
- [16] M. Barthelemy, Statistical analysis of chess games: space control and tipping points. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11425* (2023).
- [17] G. De Marzo, V.D.P. Servedio, ‘Quantifying the Complexity and Similarity of Chess Openings Using Online Chess Community Data,’ *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.1431* (2022).
- [18] P. Chassy, F. Gobet, Measuring chess experts’ single-use sequence knowledge: an archival study of departure from ‘theoretical’ openings. *PLoS One*, 16;6(11):e26692 (2011).
- [19] M. Sigman. P. Etchemendy, D.F. Slezak, G.A. Cecchi, Response time distributions in rapid chess: a large-scale decision making experiment. *Frontiers in Decision Neuroscience*. 4:60 (2010).
- [20] A. Chacoma, O.V. Billoni, Emergent Complexity in the Decision-Making Process of Chess Players. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15463* (2024).
- [21] I. Dorfman, *The Method in Chess*, *Game Mind* (2001).
- [22] Freeman LC. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 40:35-41 (1977).
- [23] Chess.com website, the best chess games of all time: <https://www.chess.com/article/view/the-best-chess-games-of-all-time>
- [24] Database of pgn files for players and openings: <https://www.pgnmentor.com/files.html#players>
- [25] Chessgames website that contains the pgn files for numerous games <https://www.chessgames.com>
- [26] Python-chess library. <https://pypi.org/project/chess/>
- [27] Python package for Stockfish. <https://pypi.org/project/stockfish/>