

Cardiverse: Harnessing LLMs for Novel Card Game Prototyping

Danrui Li¹, Sen Zhang¹, Samuel S. Sohn¹, Kaidong Hu¹, Muhammad Usman¹, and Mubbasir Kapadia^{1,2}

¹Rutgers University, New Jersey, USA

²Roblox, San Mateo, California, USA

Abstract

The prototyping of computer games, particularly card games, requires extensive human effort in creative ideation and gameplay evaluation. Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) offer opportunities to automate and streamline these processes. However, it remains challenging for LLMs to design novel game mechanics beyond existing databases, generate consistent gameplay environments, and develop scalable gameplay AI for large-scale evaluations. This paper addresses these challenges by introducing a comprehensive automated card game prototyping framework. The approach highlights a graph-based indexing method for generating novel game designs, an LLM-driven system for consistent game code generation validated by gameplay records, and a gameplay AI constructing method that uses an ensemble of LLM-generated action-value functions optimized through self-play. These contributions aim to accelerate card game prototyping, reduce human labor, and lower barriers to entry for game developers.

Key Words: Card games, Large Language Models, Game prototyping, Game mechanics, Gameplay intelligence, Program synthesis

1 Introduction

Computer game development is a creative endeavor that requires significant human effort. To address this, extensive research has been conducted to automate or assist these processes through computational methods [9]. Recent advances in Large Language Models (LLMs) have further expanded the possibilities in this domain, enhancing tasks such as game mechanic design [4], programming [34, 23], and game AI development [36]. More importantly, the robustness of LLMs in processing diverse text inputs shows the potential to integrate these subtasks into a comprehensive game development pipeline, especially for card games that can be represented purely in text. Such integration could streamline workflows and make game development more accessible. However, LLMs face the following significant challenges [9].

(1) **Novel design in game mechanic:** Game mechanics, defined as the “actions, behaviors and control mechanisms afforded to the player” [13], are essential game design topics where novelty are often encouraged. Prior work used LLMs to compose game mechanics [4], which showcased the potential for novel designs through the controllable randomness of LLMs. However, it remains unclear how to encourage a more intentional novelty such that LLM outputs are neither too similar to existing games nor self-repeating.

(2) **Consistent game generation:** Translating game mechanics into consistent game code is critical for prototyping. To improve the consistency, prior work used LLM-generated I/O examples [20] to validate the generated code for short functions. This approach is not suitable for long programs with multiple rounds of interactions (such as card games), where the difficulty of generating correct I/O examples increases with the number of interactions.

(3) **Scalable evaluation with game AI:** Evaluating and refining game mechanic designs requires gameplay, which to be automated requires the support of AI agents with sufficient intelligence to explore game dynamics [14]. However, existing methods, ranging from reinforcement learning to LLM-based agents, come with significant drawbacks, including high hardware requirements [21], long training times [27], costly inference [32], and specialized training needs [19]. These methods are costly and impractical for rapid prototyping of diverse games.

To address these challenges, we propose **Cardiverse**, an LLM-based pipeline designed to assist human designers in card game prototyping. Our work integrates game mechanic design, code generation, and gameplay AI creation into a cohesive framework. The key contributions are as follows:

(1) We propose an indexing method to represent games as game mechanic graphs. By clustering, summarizing, and designing new game mechanics as graph nodes, this approach enables new game mechanics design with a global understanding of existing databases. This enables the generation of novel games distinct from any existing designs.

(2) We employ an LLM-based agent system that generates game code and iteratively reflects on its consistency by self-generated gameplay records. We transfer the reflection techniques on self-reported action trajectories, which are used in robotic task planning [12], into game code generation. It improves the consistency between code and game mechanics, minimizing human labor in game prototyping.

(3) We introduce a scalable method for generating gameplay AI. Using a pool of action-value code functions produced by our framework, stepwise inclusion determines which functions to include based on win rates during self-play. Without calling LLMs in each game decision, it still achieves similar performance as LLM agents in prior work [36, 27]. Therefore, it can conduct large-scale evaluations on new games generated by our pipeline, completing a cycle that enhances both creativity and efficiency in card game prototyping.

2 Related Work

2.1 Game Mechanics Design

Assisting human in game mechanics design has been a long time topic, where early work applied search-based methods to optimize game mechanics in a predefined parameter space [31]. Later, with the help of large-scale game data in domain specific languages, prior work framed game mechanics design as a recommendation problem [22]: game mechanics is represented as entities (e.g. shooter, enemy) and the interaction rules between them. Then, the framework recommend additional mechanics by maximizing entity overlaps between mechanics input and mechanics in the database. Recently, as LLMs have shown its capabilities in creating content for interactive experience [1, 30, 17], prior work further enhanced the recommendation pipeline by using LLMs to composite retrieved entities into game mechanics in short phrases [4].

However, the following gaps exist: (1) Prior work fail to represent game mechanics with hierarchical dependency. For example, mechanics in platformer games are less dependent on each other: adding a double jump capability to the player will not affect the game experience when the player hit the trap. But in card games, adding a card stealing capability may contradict to a more fundamental mechanic where player wins by emptying its hand. Without a representation in hierarchical dependency, downstream tasks such as recommendation may not work well. (2) It remains unclear how to encourage novel mechanics design. We define “novel design” here as creating game mechanics that are not seen in databases, which differs from “recommendation” that retrieves existing game mechanics from databases [22]. To propose game mechanics that differ from database, it is necessary to gain a global understanding over the entire database, which has not been well discussed in prior game design studies.

Our method offers two improvements: (1) considering the prevalence of hierarchical dependencies in card game mechanics, we propose a new method to represent and extract game mechanics in directed graphs. (2) Inspired from [6] that gains a global understanding of the database by summarizing and querying in entity clusters, we group similar game mechanics across all games into clusters, which are summarized, mutated, and retrieved in novel game design.

2.2 Program synthesis in games

Traditionally, many works focus on generating short code snippets in a specific domain such as matrix operations [26] or list processing [7]. However, it is challenging to apply similar approach to game code generation, as it involves much larger search space, which does not suit iteration-based methods. Recently, large language models (LLM) have emerged as strong methods for program synthesis, where domain-specific fine-tuning [34], in-context learning [10], LLM agent systems [23], and LLM pipelines [35] are heavily studied. These methods have greatly improved code generation quality in many aspects, ranging from code snippets to real-world software engineering tasks [15].

However, it remains unclear how to validate the consistency between user instructions and generated code for interactive code environments, since I/O examples [20] are hard to generate in these cases.

2.3 Game Intelligence

Creating AI systems capable of playing games intelligently has been a long-standing research focus. Early approaches relied on manually crafted game features, optimized through combination processes [28]. Over time, neural networks have automated both feature extraction and policy formulation [24, 38, 3]. While these neural network-based approaches demonstrate exceptional gameplay intelligence, their model structures and game representations are often tailored to specific cases, limiting scalability across diverse games.

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) offer a promising solution to this limitation. Using natural language for inputs and reasoning, LLMs can adapt to a wide variety of games without case-specific customization. In related studies, LLMs have been employed as gameplay agents, wherein the models are invoked at every game turn [36], optionally supported by external storage for long-term memory or reflection [11, 27, 39]. Other studies combine LLMs with other neural networks by using LLMs to design reward functions [21, 2], using neural networks to narrow down the search space for LLMs [37], or training LLMs from scratch to predict game actions using real gameplay data [25].

To achieve scalable gameplay AI large-scale evaluations, we explore the following techniques that minimize the cost and latency in both construction and application stages: (1) we aim to get a gameplay policy in code [18, 19] rather than leveraging LLMs in each game decision. (2) We do not optimize the policy by LLM-based reflections with gameplay data [27], as it can hardly be paralleled and introduce large noises. (3) We directly use win rate as optimization target rather than any fine-grained signals (such as reward by MCTS [19]), as they may not be effective in certain games (e.g. extremely unbalanced game state trees).

3 Method

Our work composites an LLM-based card game prototyping pipeline by three components: In 3.1 we leverage game mechanic graphs to enable novel game mechanic design, producing new games in text descriptions. In 3.2 we use the text descriptions from the previous step to generate code for the game. In 3.3, gameplay AI is created using the generated code, thus enabling game evaluations for human designers.

3.1 Game Mechanic Design

The design problem is defined as below: given a card game database, where games are represented in text descriptions, we aim to create game mutations that avoid high resemblance to the database. We tackle this by applying a mutation instruction to LLMs, where we propose game mechanic replacements explicitly. Specifically, our approach begins with extracting mechanics from existing card game descriptions. The mechanics are subsequently clustered, and new mechanics are generated within each cluster using LLMs. Finally, for a game to be mutated, mechanics that frequently appear in the database are suggested to be replaced by newly-designed ones within the same cluster.

3.1.1 Mechanics extraction

To encourage a comprehensive and interconnected mechanics extraction from the text description, we propose a game mechanic graph representation. As illustrated in Figure 1, game mechanics represented in short text phrases are stored as nodes, where all games share the root node “the game ends”. The control flow between the nodes are represented as directed edges. The edge direction denotes the game effect contribution. For instance, in the game UNO, “empty the hand” is a downstream child of the root node because it directly leads to game ending.

We adopt a backtracking approach to extract the graphs. Starting with the shared root node, we use LLMs to expand the search frontier like a breadth-first search. Specifically, we input the game description and expansion history to LLM and instruct it to identify all mechanics that directly leads to the mechanics to expand. In the same way we recursively expand all expanded nodes, where expansion are terminated by both LLM’s judgment and a manually set depth limit. It should be noted that while the mechanics are extracted in a tree search (thus the depths of nodes are recorded), we allow new nodes to be connected to any existing nodes so the extracted results may not be a tree.




Figure 1: **Game mechanic graphs of two games.** Two games are represented in game mechanic graphs in different colors. They share the same root node (“the game ends”) in dark gray. The mechanics are distributed in an embedding space of their text descriptions. The lower right corner showcase a concept cluster (transparent blue) where its members share similar semantic meaning. A new mechanics (with plus symbol) can be generated from the cluster by our method.

3.1.2 Mechanics Clustering and Designing

We aggregate all mechanics from the game database and cluster them by semantic similarities and tree depth. Semantic similarity is measured using cosine similarity of text embeddings, with the `text-embedding-3-large` model serving as the embedding generator. A hierarchical clustering algorithm is employed, with a manually set similarity threshold of 0.4.

For clusters containing more than 3 mechanics, we input LLMs with all mechanic descriptions to summarize their shared themes and generate new mechanics adhering to these themes. To enhance diversity in the results, we vary the system prompts using techniques outlined in [8].

3.1.3 Retrieval-augmented Game Design

The newly generated mechanics can be utilized to create game mutations that differ significantly from existing database entries. Given a game description, we extract its game mechanic graph and map the mechanics to existing graph clusters. Mechanics from clusters with high occurrences in the database are identified as candidates for mutation. Our framework then proposes replacing these frequently occurring mechanics with newly generated ones from the same cluster. An LLM applies this proposal to the game description, using a self-reflection process to resolve potential ambiguities or conflicts in the game mechanics. This approach ensures that the mutated game remains coherent while introducing novel elements.

3.2 Game Code Generation

Similar to [35], we adopt a workflow where LLM function calls are assembled into a predefined procedure. It receives game mechanics description in natural language as input, outputting game code for the given game.

3.2.1 Structure, draft, and debug

The framework starts by converting a text description into a structured markdown format by LLMs, detailing game states, deck initialization, legal actions, and gameplay process. Then, the structured description, together with retrieved examples and game engine templates (see Appendix 7.1) is fed to LLMs to draft game code. After a fixed number of LLM self-refinements, the draft moves to debugging.




Figure 2: **Extraction, design, and application of game mechanics.** (Left) Indexing process: game graphs are extracted from game descriptions, where mechanics are clustered across games, with new mechanics generated within each cluster. (Right) Mutation process: after the input game is converted to a graph, proposals are created by replacing existing game mechanics with newly designed ones.

In debugging phase, the game code is tested iteratively to eliminate runtime errors using randomized player actions to explore the state space. The game code is executed 10 times in each iteration. If errors occur in any trial, feedback from the game engine guides LLM’s code fixes. This cycle continues until the code runs error-free.

3.2.2 LLM-based validation

Once the code produces no errors, 5 gameplay records are sampled from the previous phase, where the gameplays are produced by generated code. The record includes the information from the last 6 game rounds and the game ending. In each round, the information includes the observation and the action of the current player, which are converted from the game state dictionary to natural language by a fixed parser. To make the record more legible, game comments are also generated along the observation. Rather than generated directly from LLMs, game comments are generated from the commentary function inside the game code, where the function is designed by LLMs.




Figure 3: **Use gameplay records to validate code.** Gameplay records, generated by game code, are used to validate and refine the consistency of game code.

For each record, we send it to LLM with the structured game description, asking if the game play record violates any rule in the game description. If so, the violated rule, which is quoted by the LLM, is used as a query to a code snippet database. This database contains exactly the same games as the previous one in 3.2, except the game description are interweaved into game code as comment lines. In this way, this database retrieves related code snippets rather than entire code scripts. The retrieved code snippets act as the correct implementation of the rules that resembles the violated ones. It is fed to LLM with the previous violation analysis to refine the existing game code. After the refinement, the game code is sent back to the debugging phase to test its executability again. This refinement loop continues until the maximum iteration is reached, or the game code passes all validations from the records.

3.3 Gameplay AI Generation




Figure 4: **Gameplay AI as a Q-function ensemble.** When making decision among the legal action space, our gameplay agent choose the action with maximum score (left). Given a proposed action under the current state, the score is derived by averaging an ensemble of Q-functions (middle), which target at different perspectives in a form of code (right).

Treating LLMs as simply feature extractors, we use LLMs to propose a pool of policy components. Then we step-wisely select best components using self-play data, leaving the optimization to non-LLM processes (shown in Figure 4). The policies are represented as Q-functions in code, that return a score given the current game state and proposed action. During the game, the final score of a proposed action is averaged over all policy component outputs:

$$a_T = \operatorname{argmax}_{a \in A} \mathbf{E}_{i=1}^n Q^{\pi_i}(s_T, a) \quad (1)$$

where A represents the legal action space that is generated by game environment. Q^{π_i} is the LLM-designed policy code component. s_T is the current game state.

3.3.1 Construct Policy Pool

To create a diversified policy pool, we firstly let LLMs to propose high-level strategies in text using different prompts. Then, we augment the policy pool by a mutual inspiration process, where strategies from different prompts are remixed into new ones by LLMs. Next, all high-level strategies in text are converted to python functions, which take game state and proposed action dictionaries as inputs, returning a score that represents the quality of the action. Finally, we conduct a second augmentation by creating negative policies, where we multiply -1 to the output of all policy components. In this way we get a policy pool with original, mutually-inspired, and negative components, which are all fed to optimization process.

3.3.2 Optimize Selection by Playing

As shown in Equation 1, the policy is composited by a linear combination of components, where the components are selected by self-play data. Considering the noise of the reward signal [19], we use a step-wise inclusion technique to build the selection set. Specifically, in the first iteration, we only include the component that achieves the highest win rate in the test environment. Then we start the second iteration where we try adding one another component to the current selection. In this way, we add one component at a time, until the win rate does not improve.

In this paper, the optimization process repeats twice: in the first trial, the policy is optimized by playing against random agents. In the later trial, the policy is optimized by playing against the mixture of random agents and the formerly-trained agents. We pick the results of the later trial as the final policy.

4 Results

We manually collected 106 commonly seen card games from the web as text descriptions, including 25 casino games (mostly poker), 27 trick-taking games, 11 rummy games, 10 solitaire-like games, and 33 others. These games are

used to initialize the database for all three tasks (game design, code generation, gameplay AI).

4.1 Novel Game Design

In this task, we use all card games to construct game mechanics database and compare the newly-generated games to them.

Our method can extract meaningful game mechanics from game descriptions. First, the extracted mechanic graphs can represent the semantic distances between the games. As shown in Figure 5a, the mechanic graphs of two poker games (*Bull Poker* and *Holdem*) are closer to each other than a card game from a different genre (*Go Boom*), which aligns to their text descriptions in the database. Also, our method reveals the dependency between game mechanics. In Figure 5b, the mechanics “Highest-ranking poker hand”, which frequently appears in poker games, is associated with relevant mechanics such as “showdown” and “poker hand rankings”.




Figure 5: **Extracted and newly-designed mechanics.** Mechanics are distributed in a 2D UMAP projection of a text embedding space, colored by its game ID in (a) or concept cluster ID in (b) and (c). (a) Three games, ‘hold-em’, ‘bull poker’, and ‘go boom’ are shown as mechanic graphs. (b) Starting from selected mechanic clusters at depth 0 (in bold text), their dependencies on supporting mechanics (depth 1, in normal text) are drawn in lines. (c) Newly-designed mechanics in depth 2 are shown in bigger markers with connection lines to their concept cluster centers. For each big cluster we randomly label one mechanic with its name and cluster ID in black text.

Based on the mechanic extractions, our method can produce new mechanics for a cluster of similar mechanics (see visualizations in Figure 5c). Here is an example where all mechanics that involve wild cards are summarized by their shared patterns and the variation. Then new mechanics are designed as below.

```

Wild Card Mechanics
Wild cards are special cards that can substitute for any other card in a hand or meld, offering strategic flexibility.

The variations involve the specific types of wild cards used (Jokers, Deuces) and the specific actions players can take, such as exchanging cards with
opponents or enhancing poker hands.

Existing Instances
- Use of Wild Cards: Wild cards, if implemented in the game, can substitute for any card to form a strong hand.
- Utilize Wild Cards Effectively: Jokers can be used as wild cards to complete or enhance poker hands.
- Exchange Wild Cards: Players may exchange a natural card from their hand with a 2 or Joker from an opponent’s meld.
...(more instances are not shown here)

- Mystic Wild Echoes (New): Wild cards in this game can echo the previous card played, not only mirroring its value but also granting players the added
strategic benefit of amplifying any special effects associated with that card.

- Ethereal Wild Convergence (New): In moments of convergence, players can use wild cards to merge two unrelated sequences or hands, forging powerful
combinations and unlocking hidden advantages in their decks.
...(more instances are not shown here)

```

We demonstrate that our method encourages novel game designs by measuring how its generated game mutations deviate from the original 106 games. We define Quantiled Max Similarity (QMS) as a metric. Given a base game g and a mutation method M , $QMS(g, M, p)$ represent the p th percentile of the closest cosine similarity scores between the mutations of g and every game in database D .

	p=0.75	p=0.50	p=0.25
<i>QMS to database</i>			
Vanilla	88.7± 5.8 †	87.2± 6.3	83.8± 8.2
PromptBreeder	88.3± 4.9 †	85.8± 4.5	81.1± 3.9 †
Ours	87.4± 4.5	84.8± 4.3	80.6± 3.7 †
<i>QMS within</i>			
Vanilla	95.4± 0.8	92.0 ± 4.0	86.7± 5.9
PromptBreeder	91.0± 2.1	85.5± 2.1 †	79.5± 2.5
Ours	89.6± 2.4	85.4± 2.8 †	81.3± 2.8

Table 1: **Novelty performance between methods.** Means and standard deviations of Quantile Maximum Similarity ($\times 10^{-2}$) are reported in two scopes and three percentiles p . The first scope denotes the similarity between the mutations and database. The second denotes the similarity within the mutations. Pairs with † denote the data entries from the same column are NOT significantly different (p-value of paired t-test ≥ 0.05)

$$QMS(M, q, g) = \mathbf{Q}_{v \sim M(g)}^p \max_{d \in D \setminus g} \zeta(v) \cdot \zeta(d) \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{Q}^p(\cdot)$ selects the quantile value at percentile p . $\zeta(\cdot)$ refers to the text embedding process. Due to limited computational resources, we choose 28 games from D as the evaluation set G . For each $g \in G$ we sample 33 mutations. In this way, we can compare mutation methods by examining their QMS distributions (through the interquartile range $p \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$) across all games in G .

We compare our method against two alternatives: (1) Vanilla: the game mutation is created by a fixed system prompt. Multiple mutations are sampled by repeatedly querying the LLM. (2) PromptBreeder: Game mutations are generated using a set of system prompts created by the approach proposed in [8]. For all methods, default temperature parameters are used in LLM callings.

Table 1 shows our method successfully penalizes game mutations that are highly similar to database items. For mutations that are in top 25% or top 50% on the similarity to database, our method outperforms PromptBreeder by achieving a lower similarity score. PromptBreeder on the other hand, shows no significant difference to the Vanilla method. For the rest of the mutations (p=0.25), our method shows similar performance as PromptBreeder.

We also argue that the penalization does not make the mutations to collapse to a limited number modes that leads to the loss of diversity. It is demonstrated by evaluating QMS within the generated mutations, where a good method shall produces mutations that differ from each other. To apply QMS within the mutations, we replace the $D \setminus g$ in Equation 2 with $M(g) \setminus v$.

As shown in the bottom section of Table 1, our method prevents high similarities than other methods (p=0.75). Our method offers fewer low-similarity mutations (p=0.25) than PromptBreeder, since it offers more controllable process, where the mutations are strictly directed by game mechanics replacements.

4.2 Consistent Code Generation

We use `gpt-4o-2024-08-06` as LLM backbone and `text-embedding-3-large` from OpenAI as text embedding model. We test our framework using 29 commonly-seen card games and 28 games that mutate from them using our method in 3.1 (detailed in 7.3).

The following metrics are used in our evaluation, where the second and third metric originate from [23]:

Generation Success (Succ) Given a fixed maximum number of iterations, the percentage of games that can be generated bug-freely in 10 randomized execution tests.

Executability (Exec) For games that pass the first criteria, the percentage of successful executions with 100 randomized seeds.

Embedding Consistency (EmbCon) Semantic embedding similarity between the code and the description of the game. Here we used structured description detailed in 3.2.

LLM-judged Consistency (LLMCon) We also use LLMs to score the consistency (scaled 1 to 10) between actual game play record and game description, which applies a similar implementation as 3.2.2. We use `claude-3-5-sonnet-202410` here to avoid the blind spots of one single LLM source.

Our method is compared against its ablated version, where LLM-based validation is skipped after the repeated debugging. We add the second ablated version, where validation is skipped and the LLM backbone is replaced by OpenAI `o1-preview` in code initialization.

Table 2 demonstrates a robust code generation using our method, as the mean executability is over 90%. Also, our method improves the code alignment to the game description, as LLM-judged consistency metrics in both game groups (common and mutated) are higher than its ablated version (-validation). While a stronger model (-validation \oplus) results in higher generation success rate, for games that can be successfully created, our method lifts the consistency of a weaker model to a strong one, indicating its potential to substitute stronger backbone models when they are not available.

	Common Games				Mutated Games			
	Succ \uparrow	Exec \uparrow	EmbCon \uparrow	LLMCon \uparrow	Succ \uparrow	Exec \uparrow	EmbCon \uparrow	LLMCon \uparrow
-validation	27/29	99.9 \pm 3.9	0.56 \pm 0.03 \uparrow^2	7.69 \pm 1.96 $\ast^{2,3}$	25/28	98.3 \pm 4.6	0.52 \pm 0.04 \ast	8.66 \pm 1.60
-validation \oplus	29/29	96.3 \pm 9.4	0.56 \pm 0.04 $\uparrow^{1,3}$	8.90 \pm 1.74 $\uparrow^{\ast 1}$	28/28	99.3 \pm 2.0	0.54 \pm 0.05 \ast	9.08 \pm 1.29 \uparrow
Ours	27/29	100.0	0.55 \pm 0.04 \uparrow^2	8.99 \pm 1.56 $\uparrow^{\ast 1}$	25/28	100.0	0.52 \pm 0.05	9.20 \pm 1.08 \uparrow

Table 2: **Code generation performance between methods.** Mean values of the metrics across all game instances are reported. The standard deviation is shown after \pm . \oplus represents `o1-preview` as the backbone LLM. \ast^i represents the metric are significantly different (p-value ≤ 0.05 in paired t-test) from i th entry, while \uparrow^i denotes the metric are unlikely to be different (p-value ≥ 0.7) from i th entry. No superscripts are used when there is only one symbol pair.

4.3 Gameplay AI Generation

After a manual verification on all generated games (both common and mutated) in the previous task, some games are excluded from the test set for gameplay AI, as they are either purely luck-oriented games with no strategies involved, or they are not completely consistent with the corresponding game description. Ultimately, we selected 13 common games and 6 mutated games for gameplay AI evaluation.

We benchmarked our method against prior works (Chain-of-Thought [33], ReAct [36], Reflexion [27], and Agent-Pro noted as BeliefAgent [39] detailed in 8.1). Although for our evaluation, we intended to use the most performant LLM model available for every method being compared, the number of LLM calls being made by other works is a polynomial order of magnitude greater than our work. For the number of games being compared, this token cost is prohibitively expensive (Fig 7). We have therefore opted for the most performant LLM within budget for other works (4o-mini, which boasts similar performance) and 4o for our work. Our model is limited in that it requires at least 4o for its coding accuracy. However, despite the difference between LLM backbones, the 4o-mini being used for other works is comparable if not better than the LLM backbones that were originally used in the respective works.

The win rate performance of a method is assessed by its advantage over competing policies. Specifically, we measure how effectively policy p_2 outperforms policy p_1 under identical contexts. In games with n players, the first $n - 1$ players act as defense, and the last player as the attacker. The win rate of an attacker using p_1 against defenders using p_2 is denoted as $\omega(p_2, p_1)$. The advantage of p_1 over p_2 is defined as:

$$A(p_1, p_2) = \omega(p_2, p_1) - \omega(p_2, p_2) \tag{3}$$

Table 3 shows that our agent achieves the highest win rate advantage ($p_2 =$ random agent), with significant differences over all the opponent agents in common games. Figure 6 also shows this result, as our agent covers the largest area and got the highest win rate on 10 out of 13 common games. For mutated games, our agent not only achieves the highest average win rate but also is the only agent that can beat the random agents.

In the cost analysis, we used OpenAI’s API token pricing as a reference. We take the average per-game token cost across all 19 games as the metric here. As our agent only requires one-time usage of tokens during the generation phase, our total cost becomes lower than prior work in just 50 game runs (see Figure 7), which suits better for

	Common Games	Mutated	All Games
CoT	1.4±15.8	-4.9±12.1	-0.5±15.0
ReAct	2.4±16.4	-3.1± 9.8	0.2±14.7
Reflexion	1.4±18.4	-3.6± 9.7	0.0±16.4
Belief	4.2±18.2	-2.8±17.6	2.3±17.9
Ours	14.6±19.3 *	12.5±24.8	16.3±22.6 *

Table 3: **Game AI win rate advantage between methods.** Means and standard deviations (shown after \pm) of win rate advantages ($\times 10^{-2}$) over random agents across all game instances. * represents our metrics are significantly different from those of prior work (p-value ≤ 0.05 in paired t-test).




Figure 6: **Gameplay AI win rate advantage by games.** Win rate advantage to random agents when different methods are applied. The performance of random agents ($A(p, p_{random}) = 0$) is shown as black dotted circles. (left) Common games (right) Mutated games, where the names of base games are shown in radial axis.

large-scale evaluations in game prototyping. Reflexion and Belief agent have a significantly higher cost during training phase.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce **Cardiverse**, an integrated pipeline leveraging the capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) to assist designers in card game prototyping. Our approach integrates three key components: (1) a graph-based representation of game mechanics that facilitates the extraction, clustering, and generation of novel game mechanics, promoting innovation in game design; (2) an LLM-driven code generation system that aligns game code more rigorously with textual game descriptions through iterative gameplay validation; and (3) a scalable gameplay AI that generates ensembles of action-value functions optimized through self-play.

Our work could inspire several directions for broader research. For example, the graph-based game mechanic representation could pave the way for better game design recommendation system, more explainable game distance metrics, and mechanic-driven game generation models. Additionally, our code generation pipeline can create synthetic data for domain-specific code generation models. Lastly, LLM reasoning skills are difficult to evaluate when the game strategies appear in its training corpus. Our work contributes to addressing this gap by reducing the human effort required for the design of novel games.




Figure 7: **Gameplay AI Token Cost.** Total LLM cost as a function of number of game runs, averaged across 19 games. The cost after 50th run is estimated by linear extrapolations.

References

- [1] Prithviraj Ammanabrolu, Ethan Tien, Wesley Cheung, Zhaochen Luo, William Ma, Lara J. Martin, and Mark O. Riedl. Story realization: Expanding plot events into sentences. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05):7375–7382, April 2020.
- [2] In-Chang Baek, Tae-Hwa Park, Jin-Ha Noh, Cheong-Mok Bae, and Kyung-Joong Kim. Chatpcg: Large language model-driven reward design for procedural content generation, 2024.
- [3] Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman AI for multiplayer poker. *Science*, 365(6456):885–890, August 2019. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [4] M Charity, Yash Bhartia, Daniel Zhang, Ahmed Khalifa, and Julian Togelius. A preliminary study on a conceptual game feature generation and recommendation system. In *2023 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, pages 1–5, 2023.
- [5] Anthony Costarelli, Mat Allen, Roman Hauksson, Grace Sodunke, Suhas Hariharan, Carlson Cheng, Wenjie Li, Joshua Clymer, and Arjun Yadav. Gamebench: Evaluating strategic reasoning abilities of llm agents, 2024.
- [6] Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization, 2024.
- [7] Kevin Ellis, Catherine Wong, Maxwell Nye, Mathias Sablé-Meyer, Lucas Morales, Luke Hewitt, Luc Cary, Armando Solar-Lezama, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. DreamCoder: bootstrapping inductive program synthesis with wake-sleep library learning. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation, PLDI 2021*, pages 835–850, New York, NY, USA, June 2021. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] Chrisantha Fernando, Dylan Banarse, Henryk Michalewski, Simon Osindero, and Tim Rocktäschel. Prompt-breeder: Self-Referential Self-Improvement Via Prompt Evolution, September 2023. arXiv:2309.16797 [cs].
- [9] Roberto Gallotta, Graham Todd, Marvin Zammit, Sam Earle, Antonios Liapis, Julian Togelius, and Georgios N. Yannakakis. Large language models and games: A survey and roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Games*, page 1–18, 2024.
- [10] Shuzheng Gao, Xin-Cheng Wen, Cuiyun Gao, Wenxuan Wang, Hongyu Zhang, and Michael R. Lyu. What makes good in-context demonstrations for code intelligence tasks with llms? In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, page 761–773. IEEE, September 2023.

- [11] Jiaxian Guo, Bo Yang, Paul Yoo, Bill Yuchen Lin, Yusuke Iwasawa, and Yutaka Matsuo. Suspicion-Agent: Playing Imperfect Information Games with Theory of Mind Aware GPT-4, October 2023. arXiv:2309.17277 [cs].
- [12] Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Harris Chan, Jacky Liang, Pete Florence, Andy Zeng, Jonathan Tompson, Igor Mordatch, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Tomas Jackson, Noah Brown, Linda Luu, Sergey Levine, Karol Hausman, and brian ichter. Inner monologue: Embodied reasoning through planning with language models. In Karen Liu, Dana Kulic, and Jeff Ichnowski, editors, *Proceedings of The 6th Conference on Robot Learning*, volume 205 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1769–1782. PMLR, 14–18 Dec 2023.
- [13] Robin Hunicke, Marc Leblanc, and Robert Zubek. Mda: A formal approach to game design and game research. *AAAI Workshop - Technical Report*, 1, 01 2004.
- [14] Aaron Isaksen, Dan Gopstein, and Andy Nealen. Exploring game space using survival analysis. In *International Conference on Foundations of Digital Games*, 2015.
- [15] Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [16] Joshua D. A. Jung and Jesse Hoey. Distance-based mapping for general game playing. In *2021 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, pages 1–8, 2021.
- [17] Danrui Li, Samuel S. Sohn, Sen Zhang, Che-Jui Chang, and Mubbasir Kapadia. From words to worlds: Transforming one-line prompts into multi-modal digital stories with llm agents. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM SIGGRAPH Conference on Motion, Interaction, and Games, MIG '24*, New York, NY, USA, 2024. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [18] Jacky Liang, Wenlong Huang, Fei Xia, Peng Xu, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Pete Florence, and Andy Zeng. Code as Policies: Language Model Programs for Embodied Control. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 9493–9500, May 2023.
- [19] Jonathan Light, Min Cai, Weiqin Chen, Guanzhi Wang, Xiusi Chen, Wei Cheng, Yisong Yue, and Ziniu Hu. Strategist: Learning strategic skills by llms via bi-level tree search, 2024.
- [20] Jiawei Liu, Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yuyao Wang, and LINGMING ZHANG. Is your code generated by chatGPT really correct? rigorous evaluation of large language models for code generation. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [21] Yecheng Jason Ma, William Liang, Guanzhi Wang, De-An Huang, Osbert Bastani, Dinesh Jayaraman, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Eureka: Human-Level Reward Design via Coding Large Language Models, October 2023. arXiv:2310.12931 [cs].
- [22] Tiago Machado, Dan Gopstein, Andy Nealen, and Julian Togelius. Pitako - recommending game design elements in cicero. In *2019 IEEE Conference on Games (CoG)*, pages 1–8, 2019.
- [23] Chen Qian, Wei Liu, Hongzhang Liu, Nuo Chen, Yufan Dang, Jiahao Li, Cheng Yang, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Xin Cong, Juyuan Xu, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Chatdev: Communicative agents for software development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07924*, 2023.
- [24] Martin Schmid, Matej Moravčík, Neil Burch, Rudolf Kadlec, Josh Davidson, Kevin Waugh, Nolan Bard, Finbarr Timbers, Marc Lanctot, G. Zacharias Holland, Elnaz Davoodi, Alden Christianson, and Michael Bowling. Student of Games: A unified learning algorithm for both perfect and imperfect information games. *Science Advances*, 9(46):eadg3256, November 2023. Publisher: American Association for the Advancement of Science.
- [25] John Schultz, Jakub Adamek, Matej Jusup, Marc Lanctot, Michael Kaisers, Sarah Perrin, Daniel Hennes, Jeremy Shar, Cannada Lewis, Anian Ruoss, Tom Zahavy, Petar Veličković, Laurel Prince, Satinder Singh, Eric Malmi, and Nenad Tomašev. Mastering board games by external and internal planning with language models, 2024.

- [26] Kensen Shi, David Bieber, and Rishabh Singh. Tf-coder: Program synthesis for tensor manipulations. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.*, 44(2), May 2022.
- [27] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Beck Labash, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning, June 2023. arXiv:2303.11366 [cs].
- [28] Nathan R. Sturtevant and Adam M. White. Feature Construction for Reinforcement Learning in Hearts. In H. Jaap van den Herik, Paolo Ciancarini, and H. H. L. M. (Jeroen) Donkers, editors, *Computers and Games*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 122–134, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer.
- [29] LCM team, Loïc Barrault, Paul-Ambroise Duquenne, Maha Elbayad, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Belen Alastruey, Pierre Andrews, Mariano Coria, Guillaume Couairon, Marta R. Costa-jussà, David Dale, Hady Elsahar, Kevin Heffernan, João Maria Janeiro, Tuan Tran, Christophe Ropers, Eduardo Sánchez, Robin San Roman, Alexandre Mourachko, Safiyyah Saleem, and Holger Schwenk. Large concept models: Language modeling in a sentence representation space, 2024.
- [30] Graham Todd, Sam Earle, Muhammad Umair Nasir, Michael Cerny Green, and Julian Togelius. Level generation through large language models. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games*, FDG 2023. ACM, April 2023.
- [31] Julian Togelius and Jurgen Schmidhuber. An experiment in automatic game design. In *2008 IEEE Symposium On Computational Intelligence and Games*, pages 111–118, 2008.
- [32] Shenzhi Wang, Chang Liu, Zilong Zheng, Siyuan Qi, Shuo Chen, Qisen Yang, Andrew Zhao, Chaofei Wang, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Avalon’s game of thoughts: Battle against deception through recursive contemplation, 2023.
- [33] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS ’22, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2024. Curran Associates Inc.
- [34] Hongqiu Wu, Xingyuan Liu, Yan Wang, and Hai Zhao. Instruction-driven game engine: A poker case study, 2024.
- [35] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint*, 2024.
- [36] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models, March 2023. arXiv:2210.03629 [cs].
- [37] Yauwai Yim, Chunkit Chan, Tianyu Shi, Zheyang Deng, Wei Fan, Tianshi Zheng, and Yangqiu Song. Evaluating and enhancing llms agent based on theory of mind in guandan: A multi-player cooperative game under imperfect information. 2024.
- [38] Daochen Zha, Jingru Xie, Wenye Ma, Sheng Zhang, Xiangru Lian, Xia Hu, and Ji Liu. DouZero: Mastering DouDizhu with Self-Play Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12333–12344. PMLR, July 2021. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- [39] Wenqi Zhang, Ke Tang, Hai Wu, Mengna Wang, Yongliang Shen, Guiyang Hou, Zeqi Tan, Peng Li, Yueting Zhuang, and Weiming Lu. Agent-pro: Learning to evolve via policy-level reflection and optimization, 2024.

6 Discussion

Our work benefits the related research communities in the following ways:

Game mechanics Representation The new graph-based game representation in our work, along with the corresponding extraction method, can be applied in various downstream tasks in related domain. For example, compared to game distance metrics that builds on low-level code structure [16], our work could facilitate a more explainable distance metric, as its node units incorporates higher-level abstractions with increased legibility. Also, as our graph-indexed database reveals the dependency between game mechanics (in Figure 5b), it can be integrated into a game mechanics recommendation framework with friendly user interface as [22], thus enabling a human-in-the-loop game design. In addition, our work can pre-process game descriptions to graphs, paving the way to a concept-based game generation model with a structure like [29].

Game Code Data Generator Our work can be treated as a synthetic data generator specialized in creating programs with long and complex instruction. Its generated game code can be used to fine-tune domain specific code generative models [34], or be used as test case data for general program synthesis methods.

Scalable Gameplay AI Our experiments shows for a large proportion of card games, our method that does not require LLM calls during the gameplay, achieves similar performance as prior methods with gameplay LLM inference. Therefore, we could enable large applications of gameplay AI without the cost that increases with gameplay rounds, which benefits both consumer-oriented entertainment usse, and more affordable game prototyping.

Extendable Gameplay AI Benchmark Compared to prior work that focus on a small set of card games [5, 38], we provide a much larger scale game benchmark environment for gameplay AIs. Additionally, prior work in LLM-based gameplay AI suffers a limitation in evaluation: LLMs may have seen the game strategy during their training, making it challenge to evaluate the true performance of the gameplay framework. By designing and constructing novel game environments with minimal human effort, our work can help bridging this gap.

Limitation and Future Work In game mechanics design, the consistencies between game mechanics is a critical issue. While prior work [22] advocates a human-computer cooperation to solve the potential conflicts, our work relies on the reflection capability of LLMs to mitigate this problem. However, as our work can extract game mechanics graphs from text descriptions, it would be beneficial to explore whether the mechanics graph can help the advanced reasoning on potential game mechanics conflicts.

In game code generation, the current validation process is inefficient, making its token cost close to that of adavanced model (such as o1). Future work may aim to lower the token use by other agent pipeline designs.

Currently, our game AI does not explicitly consider other players' intention, which is a commonly-used component in prior work [39, 11]. Besides, it could also be promising to explore whether the reasoning results from LLM agents (such as Reflexion [27]) can be distilled to our policy-code-based results.

7 Code Generation Details

7.1 Game engine design

Instead of generating entire game code from scratch [23], we designed a card game engine in Python, converting the original generation task into completion tasks for several predefined functions. To enable maximum compatibility for various card games and easy integration with gameplay AI, we adopt a framework structure where (1) game state updates and gameplay AI are decoupled [38]; and (2) dependencies among game logics are minimized by a functional programming design [34]. The logic of card games are abstracted into 6 functions (initiation, initialize deck, initial dealing, proceed round, get legal actions, and get payoffs) running in a predefined procedure (see Figure 8). Each function, which modifies the game state in dictionary form, is what our pipeline will generate.

The gameplay AI is integrated into this system by receiving game observations and outputting game actions in dictionaries. While our gameplay AI directly handles dictionaries, for all LLM-based agents we compared against, the game state is converted to the following format. The example below shows the observation information in one game turn. LLM agents may receive concatenated information from the past several turns.




Figure 8: **Game Engine Framework Design.** The game engine, composed of 6 core functions (in light blue) in a fixed flow, interacts with external gameplay agent (in light green) through game observation and game action in dictionary forms.

Game Observation Example: Boat House Rum

```

# Gameplay since your last decision
Dealing 7 cards to each player
Player 0 decides to: draw-(source: discard_pile)
Player 0 draws cards from discard pile.
Player 0 decides to: discard-(card_idx: 6)
Player 0 discards A-diamonds.
Player 1 decides to: draw-(source: discard_pile)
Player 1 draws cards from discard pile.
Player 1 decides to: discard-(card_idx: 3)
Player 1 discards 9-diamonds.

# Common Information
num_players: 3
current_player: 2
has_drawn_cards_this_turn: False
discard_pile: [{'rank': '9', 'suit': 'diamonds'}]
stock_size: 30

# Player Information

## Player 0
score: 0
melds: []
hand_size: 7
recent_discard_draw_size: 0

## Player 1
score: 0
melds: []
hand_size: 7
recent_discard_draw_size: 0

## Player 2 (Self)
score: 0
current_player: True
melds: []
hand: [{'rank': '3', 'suit': 'diamonds'}, {'rank': 'Q', 'suit': 'spades'}, {'rank': 'Q', 'suit': 'hearts'}, {'rank': '3', 'suit': 'spades'}, {'rank': '4', 'suit': 'hearts'}, {'rank': '4', 'suit': 'spades'}, {'rank': '2', 'suit': 'diamonds'}]
recent_discard_draw: []

# Legal Actions
0: draw-(source: stock)
1: draw-(source: discard_pile)
  
```

7.2 Intermediate Results of LLM-based Validation

In the code validation process, our method compares the generated gameplay record with the game description, identifying whether there exists an inconsistency. The gameplay record follows the same format as the game observation above. But multiple consecutive observations from different players are concatenated together. Here is an example output of the validation process.

Consistency validation results

```

*Step by step evaluation*
1. Turn 0 (Player 0):
  
```




Figure 9: LLM Agent workflow of game code generation.

```

- Player 0 has cards K, 10, 10, K, K and chooses to request from Player 1 the rank 10. This is legal because Player 0 has cards of rank 10.
- Player 1 has 1 card; no information if it was 10. Assuming it wasn't, Player 0 should "GoFish," but the stock is empty. The turn ends.

2. Turn 1 (Player 1):
- Player 1 has only card 8 and requests rank 8 from Player 0.
- Since Player 0 does not have this card (as per observed hand K, 10, 10, K, K), the request fails, but again no stock to draw from. The turn ends.

3. Turn 2 (Player 2):
- Player 2 has cards 10, 10 and requests rank 10 from Player 0. This action is valid since they have rank 10 cards.
- Player 0 has two 10s to pass over-indicating a successful request. Player 2 should take another turn but this is not visible.

4. Turn 3 (Player 3) and Subsequent Observations:
- Player 3 requests rank 8 from Player 1. Since Player 1 does not have the rank (hand size is 1, card 8 not explicitly confirmed), the turn would typically result in "GoFish."
- The same cycle continues; player's actions become clearer, but crucial observations like drawn or obtained cards are missing, suggesting errors in turn execution.

5. Game End:
- Legal actions remaining for the player with hand K, K, K show remaining possibilities accurately. No correct handling of potential book formation or reattempts captured.

*Analysis Summary*
Summary:
'''text
The progression of the turns does not effectively simulate correct sequence dictated by rules, notably in request fulfillment and subsequent actions not following successful card claims due to incomplete turn handling. Data missing for card exchanges leads to incongruity with established gameplay mechanics.
'''
Quote (optional):
'''markdown
"Each turn consists of: Requesting cards from an opponent; Drawing from the stock if the request results in 'Go Fish'; Optionally revealing a book if completed; Passing the turn after drawing or failing to make a catch. Re-attempt: If a player successfully gets cards, they can continue asking for the same or different rank."
'''

```

Based on the validation results, code edits are proposed by LLM. Same as [35], partial replacement edits are returned to save LLM token usage.

Code Edit Proposal Example

```

<<<<<< SEARCH
def proceed_round(action: dict, game_state: Dict, logger) -> DotDict:
    """Process the action and update the game state."""
    current_player = game_state.common.current_player
    logger.info(f"Player {current_player} takes an action: {action}")

    if action['action'] == 'request':
        process_request(action, game_state, logger)
    elif action['action'] == 'draw':
        if game_state.common.facedown_cards.stock:
            card = game_state.common.facedown_cards.stock.pop()
            game_state.players[current_player].facedown_cards.hand.append(card)
            logger.info(f"Player {current_player} draws a card.")
        else:
            logger.info("Stock pile is empty, no card to draw.")

    check_for_books(game_state.players[current_player], game_state, logger)

    # Check if the game is over
    if is_game_over(game_state, logger):
        return game_state

    game_state.common.current_player = next_player(game_state, logger)
    return game_state
=====
def proceed_round(action: dict, game_state: Dict, logger) -> DotDict:
    """Process the action and update the game state."""
    current_player = game_state.common.current_player
    logger.info(f"Player {current_player} takes an action: {action}")

    if action['action'] == 'request':
        if process_request(action, game_state, logger):
            return game_state # Successful request allows player to continue.
    elif action['action'] == 'draw':
        if game_state.common.facedown_cards.stock:
            card = game_state.common.facedown_cards.stock.pop()

```



```

        game_state.players[current_player].facedown_cards.hand.append(card)
        logger.info(f"Player {current_player} draws a card.")
    else:
        logger.info("Stock pile is empty, no card to draw.")

    check_for_books(game_state.players[current_player], game_state, logger)

    # Check if the game is over
    if is_game_over(game_state, logger):
        return game_state

    game_state.common.current_player = next_player(game_state, logger)
    return game_state
>>>>>> REPLACE

```

7.3 Evaluation on Code Generation

We test our pipeline using two sets of game descriptions: (1) we choose 29 from the 106 games that we collected. (2) Using the novel game design method in 3.1, we mutate each game with 33 variants and select the one that has the smallest closest cosine similarity to the game database. One of the games cannot be mutated by our method, since none of its extracted game mechanics belongs to a large-enough cluster, where new mechanics are designed. Therefore, we add 28 mutated games as our second part of testing set.

For the code draft phase and debugging phase, we construct an example database containing 5 game descriptions and their game code (“crazy-eights”, “california-jack”, “boat-house-rum”, “bull-poker”, “baccarat”). These games are selected from the 106 games without overlaps to our test set.

It is important to note that LLM-based validation process improves the code alignment, rather than ensuring 100% correct code. We conducted a manual verification to all generated games where LLM detects no misalignment, where we still find minor inconsistencies. For instance, there are simplified implementation of complex rules: for poker games with a large number of card evaluation standards (such as Straight Flush, Four of a kind, Full House, etc.), there are cases where our method does not implement all the standards mentioned in the game description. Also, incorrect information visibilities may occur: sometimes, private information for specific players may be leaked to the public by game state outputs. However, the validation process still minimizes human effort in code development, which benefits the overall prototyping process.

8 Gameplay AI Details

8.1 Evaluation on Gameplay AI

Although some previous work demonstrates satisfactory performance in several popular games, they are excluded from our comparative analysis as their primary contributions focus on specific game genres [32] or particular attributes of game mechanics [19]. For example, methods that learn directly from reward signals at MCTS leaf nodes [19] can hardly work on games with extremely unbalanced search trees. Because it is challenging to reach all terminal states with reasonable computational resources. As a result, one has to estimate the reward without reaching the terminal nodes, which introduces more uncertainties to the reward signals.

Consequently, we focus on prior work that are scalable. We choose Chain-of-Thought [33], ReAct [36], Reflexion [27], and AgentPro [39] as our baselines. As AgentPro is particularly noteworthy for its application of Belief-aware Decision-Making imperfect information game scenarios, we specifically implement the Belief-aware part for comparison.

The evaluation protocol involved training Reflexion agents across all games, with performance measured using a rolling average winning rate calculated over windows of 40 games. This measurement was repeated for 10 distinct windows across all games in our test set. The optimal reflection step was subsequently determined by selecting the iteration that yielded the highest mean winning rate across the entire game suite.

8.2 Ablation Study

We demonstrate the effect of the two major components in our gameplay AI method by comparing our method against two ablations: (1) No ensemble: rather than creating an ensemble of action-value functions, we generate only one comprehensive policy with its corresponding function. (2) No optimization: after the first augmentation stage, we skip the rest of the pipeline and use all policy components to create the ensemble.

The result (see Table 4) shows both components are essential for our method. The advantage over random agents cannot be achieved if either of the component is absent.

	Common	Mutated	All Games
- ensemble	-3.2± 7.0	-2.7± 9.2 †	-2.9± 7.5 †
- optimize	0.1± 9.9	-2.0± 5.9 †	-0.4± 8.7 †
Ours	14.6±19.3	12.5±24.8	16.3±22.6

Table 4: **Game AI win rate advantage between our method and its ablations.** Means and standard deviations (shown after \pm) of win rate advantages ($\times 10^{-2}$) across all game instances. All metrics between our method and its ablations show statistically significant difference (p-value ≤ 0.05 in paired t-test). † represents two metrics are unlikely to be different (p-value ≥ 0.7 in paired t-test).

8.3 Intermediate Results

During the construction of gameplay AI, our method produces policy components in text form first, which is converted to code during the second augmentation process.

Gameplay AI policy component as texts

```

Prioritize Building Melds
Focus on arranging cards in the hand into matched sets of either three or four of a kind, or sequences of three or more cards of the same suit. Discard cards that do not contribute towards completing a meld.

Draw from Discard Pile Judiciously
Only draw from the discard pile when the top two cards can be directly used to form a meld or significantly improve the hand. Otherwise, prefer drawing from the stock pile to maintain unpredictability.

Reserve Key Cards
Keep hold of high-value cards like aces and face cards only if they are part of an ongoing strategy to complete a meld or if they are necessary to win the game soon. Otherwise, discard them to minimize penalty points.

PotentialMeldCreationValue
A metric that assesses the potential of forming new melds after drawing two cards, either from the stock pile or discard pile. It evaluates the likely improvement in the hand's structure, considering both the draw options and the current meld opportunities.

UnmatchedCardPenalty
A metric that evaluates the penalty incurred from holding high-value unmatched cards. This metric helps in deciding the priority of discarding high-value cards from the hand to lower potential score penalties.

Refined Meld Building Strategy (Mutually inspired policy)
To refine the strategy for building melds, the AI player should incorporate the following steps: prioritize drawing from the source that maximizes 'PotentialMeldCreationValue.' When choosing cards to discard, evaluate based on 'UnmatchedCardPenalty,' preferably discarding high-penalty cards unless they significantly contribute to potential melds. Use 'MeldCompletionLikelihood' to assess laying off opportunities. Lastly, factor in 'OpponentInterferenceRisk' to prevent assisting opponents with your discards. These criteria ensure strategic decision-making based on the game state, maximizing winning potential and minimizing penalties.

```

Gameplay AI policy component in code

```

def score(state: dict, action: str) -> float:
    # Helper function to calculate the potential meld creation value
    def calculate_potential_meld_creation_value(hand, card):
        value = 0
        # Check for potential sets (three or four of a kind)
        rank_count = sum(1 for c in hand if c['rank'] == card['rank'])
        if rank_count == 2: # possibility to make a set of three
            value += 0.3
        if rank_count == 3: # possibility to make a set of four
            value += 0.5

        # Check for potential sequences
        card_ranks = {'A': 1, '2': 2, '3': 3, '4': 4, '5': 5, '6': 6,
                     '7': 7, '8': 8, '9': 9, '10': 10, 'J': 11, 'Q': 12, 'K': 13}
        hand_ranks = [card_ranks[c['rank']] for c in hand if c['suit'] == card['suit']]
        hand_ranks.append(card_ranks[card['rank']])
        hand_ranks.sort()

        # Look for consecutive cards
        for i in range(len(hand_ranks) - 2):
            if hand_ranks[i+1] == hand_ranks[i] + 1 and hand_ranks[i+2] == hand_ranks[i] + 2:
                value += 0.4

        return value

    # Helper function to calculate unmatched card penalty
    def calculate_unmatched_card_penalty(hand):
        penalty = 0
        for card in hand:
            penalty += {'A': 11, 'K': 10, 'Q': 10, 'J': 10,
                       '10': 10, '9': 9, '8': 8, '7': 7,

```

```

        '6': 6, '5': 5, '4': 4, '3': 3, '2': 2}[card['rank']]
    return penalty

    # Extract relevant information
    current_player_index = state['common']['current_player']
    current_player = state['players'][current_player_index]
    hand = current_player['facedown_cards']['hand']
    discard_pile = state['common']['faceup_cards']['discard_pile']

    # Initialize the result score
    result_score = 0.0

    # Calculate potential meld creation value of the action
    if action == "draw":
        draw_source = state['legal_actions'][0]['args']['source'] # assuming we're provided with actions arguments

        # Check both stock and discard pile for card drawing
        if draw_source == "stock":
            # Assuming uncertainty based draw, hence less score boost
            result_score += 0.1 # a relatively small optimistic boost for drawing
        elif draw_source == "discard_pile":
            if discard_pile:
                top_discard_card = discard_pile[-1]
                result_score += calculate_potential_meld_creation_value(hand, top_discard_card)
            else:
                result_score += 0.05 # minor score addition when discard pile is empty

    # Evaluating penalty for unmatched cards
    unmatched_penalty = calculate_unmatched_card_penalty(hand)
    result_score -= unmatched_penalty * 0.01 # reduce score proportionally to the penalty

    # Make sure that the final score is between 0 and 1\n    result_score = max(0, min(1, result_score))

    return result_score

```

9 LLM System Prompts

9.1 Game Mechanics Design

System Prompt for game logic extraction (depth 1)

You are a wonderful card game designer who extract game logic chains from the game description. You will be given a game description and you need to extract the game logic chains step by step.

Task

Read the following game description and answer the questions: how to win this card game? Please respond with all direct mechanics that contribute or hinder to this. for example: discard all the cards, get highest hand score. Your output should be a JSON object with the following format:

```

'''json
[
  {
    "name": "Name of the game mechanic",
    "type": "<only choose among: Contribute, Hinder, Mixed>",
    "description": "A concise explanation of how the mechanic works",
    "reasoning": "Explain how this mechanic contributes to the goal"
  },
  ...
]
'''

```

Remember to extract mechanics that DIRECTLY relate to the goal. Examples:

```

'''
input: <a UNO game description>
correct extraction: "Empty the hands"
wrong extraction: "Play a matching card" or "Draw 4 cards".
analysis: "Play a matching card" or "Draw 4 cards" should be extracted in future steps.
'''

```

```

'''
input: The main purpose of the game is to remove all cards from the table, assembling them in the tableau before removing them. Initially, 54 cards are dealt to the tableau in ten piles, face down except for the top cards. The tableau piles build down by rank, and in-suit sequences can be moved together. The 50 remaining cards can be dealt to the tableau ten at a time when none of the piles are empty.
correct extraction: "Remove all cards from the table"
wrong extraction: "Move sequences strategically".
'''

```

Game Description
{game_description}

System Prompt for game logic extraction (depth 2+)

What are the game mechanics/concept that directly trigger/stop this mechanic: {goal}? Please respond with the direct mechanic that contributes to this.

- Try your best to extract ALL direct mechanics.
- When evaluating, pay special attention to mechanics that are interesting or unique.
- You can choose from previously extracted mechanics: {previous_mechanics}. But you can also extract new mechanics/concepts.
- Use the same format as before.

```

- Usually there are always mechanics or concepts to extract, unless you have reached the end of the chain such as card design or very basic elements.
- If there are no more mechanics or concepts to extract, respond with:
'''json
[]
'''

```

System Prompt for reflecting on logic extraction

Check and refine your results based on the following criteria:
(1) Are there any mechanics that are not DIRECTLY related to the goal?
Respond a complete result in the same format as before.

System Prompt for concept summary

```

**Role**: You are an assistant tasked with summarizing game concept from a list of gameplay mechanics.

**Instructions**:
1. **Input**: You will receive a list of gameplay concept instances. These concepts are often centered around a theme or have similar mechanics.
2. **Output**: Your response should include:
'''json
{
  "name": "<The name of the game concept>",
  "description": {
    "common": "<A concise statement that generalizes the core concept or theme common across the listed gameplay concept instances.>",
    "variation": "How the description of given instances vary from the shared common themes."
  }
}
'''

# Your input
{input_text}

```

System Prompt for designing new logic instances

```

{prefix_prompt}. Now design the novel concept instance based on your summary.
- The concept should center around the summary you have concluded.
- The concept should be different from all given instances.
- You should specify its name and description.
- You should follow this format:
'''json
{
  "name": "Name of the game concept (e.g., Dynamic Wild Card, Critical Threshold).",
  "description": "A short concise explanation, following the writing style of the previous instances."
}
'''

```

Prefix Prompts for designing new logic instances (partially shown)

"You are tasked with designing a novel card game concept. Reflect on all aspects of this challenge, including understanding core elements, researching existing games, defining game objectives, developing themes, innovating mechanics, player interaction, rule-setting, prototyping, gathering feedback, and iterating on your design. Confirm your comprehension before proceeding with design suggestions.",

"Before diving into the problem, take a moment to clear your mind and approach it with a fresh perspective. With a clear mind, you can create more innovative solutions.\n\nYou are a skilled card game designer. With these fresh insights, please design a novel game concept instance based on your experience and expertise.",

"As an experienced designer of card games, create an innovative game concept inspired by your prior insights.",

"To design a novel card game concept, first ensure you have a clear understanding of the essential elements: game objectives, rules, mechanics, and player dynamics. Identify what information might be missing or unclear, such as game balance issues, potential for player engagement, or themes. Use this review to innovate and develop an improved or entirely new game concept that enhances the player's experience and meets the outlined objectives. Focus on creating unique mechanics or themes that differentiate it from existing games.",

"You are a skilled card game designer. Please design a novel game concept instance, emphasizing teamwork and open communication. Seek input on the implications and potential impact of different design elements on gameplay. Leverage the diverse perspectives and expertise of the group to enhance the creativity and effectiveness of the game design.",

9.2 Code Generation

Prompts for description structurization

Design a structured ruleset for implementing a card game system based on the provided input. Ensure the output includes key components as below. The output should be comprehensive, logical, and organized in a format suitable for programming or detailed documentation purposes. Wrap the output in a markdown block.

Include the following sections:

- Game State**
 - Define the game state, categorized into common information and player-specific information (grouped into public and private).
- Card**
 - Specify card attributes such as rank, suit, and any special abilities or values.
- Deck and Initial Dealing**
 - Describe the deck composition, dealing process, and setup at the beginning of the game.
- Legal Action Space**
 - List all possible actions players can perform during their turn, specifying the prerequisites of each action.
- Round**
 - Describe the sequence of play and how the game progresses from one player to the next.
 - Elaborate in each players' turn, the order of actions they can take, and the outcomes of each action.
 - Explain how the game ends and the winning conditions. Pay attention to corner cases such as deck exhaustion or all players passing.
- Other Game Mechanics & Rules**
 - Detail any additional game mechanics, rules, or special actions that players can take during the game.
- Player Observation Information**
 - Specify what information players can observe during the game, such as their hand, the starter pile, declared suits, and opponent actions.
- Payoffs**
 - Explain when game ends, how scoring works, including point values for cards.

Ensure clarity and precision to facilitate implementation or usage as a reference for game rules.

```
# Example
{example}
'''
```

System Prompts for code draft

You are a card game programmer tasked with implementing a card game based on the given description. Using the provided class templates, your goal is to write only the necessary child classes and implement only the methods indicated with 'TODO' comments.

```
**Instructions:**
- Include only the methods you need to override from the provided class templates.
- Respond with complete, runnable Python code.
- Do not include TODOs, placeholders, or explanations; output only the final code.

**Code Environment:**
- These code belongs to a larger game framework. Use them as reference only. Don't include them in your response.
'''
{environment_code}
'''

**Code Template:**
- Only modify or implement the methods specified with 'TODO' comments to complete the game logic.
'''
{python_classes}
'''

**Examples for Reference:**
Use these examples as a guide for response format and method implementation.
{examples}

---

### Your Task
Based on the following game description, implement the required classes and methods:

**Game Description:**
'''
{game_description}
'''

### Note:
- Do not raise exceptions (e.g., 'ValueError') when parsing action strings. Instead, ensure the legal action space and action string format are appropriately structured.
```

Prompts for consistency validation

You are a card game programmer who verifies code for a card game. You are given a card game description and a part of game play log using the code.

```
# Task
- You should evaluate step by step to see if the game play log aligns with the rules in the game description.
- Also, examine if the legal action choices in each turn is correct and complete.
- If the game play aligns with the rules, simply return "pass" in the analysis summary.
- If the game play does not align with the rules, you should response in a two-part format: summary and quote(optional). Focus one issue at a time.

# Your game description
'''
{game_description}
'''

# Your game play log
```

```

Note: Only the last several turns of the play log is provided. But if the play log is too short or empty, there might be some errors in the game code.
'''
{game_play_log}
'''

# Output Format

If the game play log aligns with the rules:
'''
***Step by step evaluation***
<your evaluation here>

***Analysis Summary***
'''pass'''
'''

If you doubt the log is too short or empty because of some errors in the game code:
'''
***Step by step evaluation***
<your evaluation here>

***Analysis Summary***
'''log is too short or empty'''
'''

Otherwise:
'''
***Step by step evaluation***
<your evaluation here>

***Analysis Summary***
Summary:
'''text
<summarize the issue>
'''

Quote (optional):
'''markdown
<quote related game description segment if game play log does not align with the rules>
'''
'''

```

9.3 Gameplay AI Generation

Design game policy components (strategy style) in text

```

You are a powerful assistant who designs an AI player for a card game.

# Game rules
{game_description}

# Game state
The AI player knows all cards in its hands, all game play history. But it does not know the content of other players' hands.

# Potential actions
{game_actions}

# Task
Please think in steps to provide me {item_num} useful strategies to win the game.
For each strategy, please describe its definition and how it relates to the game state and a potential action.

# Response format
Please respond in the following JSON format:
{format_instructions}

```

Design game policy components (metric style) in text

```

You are a powerful assistant who designs an AI player for a card game.

# Game rules
{game_description}

# Game state
The AI player knows all cards in its hands, all game play history. But it does not know the content of other players' hands.

# Potential actions
{game_actions}

# Task
To design a good game play policy, we need to design some game state metrics that constitute a reward function.
Now please think in steps to tell me what useful metric can we derive from a game state?
The metric should be correlated with both the game state and the potential action. Provide me with {item_num} metrics.

# Response format
Please respond in the following JSON format:
{format_instructions}

```

Mutually inspire game policy components in text

```
You are a powerful assistant who designs an AI player for a card game.

# Game rules
{game_description}

# Game state
The AI player knows all cards in its hands, all game play history. But it does not know the content of other players' hands.

# Potential actions
{game_actions}

# Task
Given the following strategy of the game:
'''json
{game_strategy}
'''

Please think in steps to refine the strategy using the following criteria:
(1) If the strategy has anything obscure, for example, if it mentions "strategically use" or "use at critical moments" without specifying what the critical moments are, please clarify what the critical moments are.
(2) If the strategy is conditioned on a game state metric, please describe how such a strategy will be conditioned on the game state. Here are some hints of the game state:
'''json
{game_metrics}
'''

# Response format
Please respond in the following JSON format:
{format_instructions}
```

Design code for game policy components

```
You are an action-value engineer trying to write action-value functions in python. Your goal is to write an action-value function that will help the agent decide actions in a card game.

# The game
{game_description}

# The policy
In this action-value function, you will focus on the following policy of the game:
{game_policy}

# The input
The function should be able to take a game state and a planned game action as input. The input should be as follows:
{input_description}

# The output
You should return a reward value ranging from 0 to 1. It is an estimate of the probability of winning the game.
The closer the reward is to 1, the larger chance of winning we will have.
Try to make the output more continuous.
The reward should be calculated based on both the game state and the given game action.

# Response format
You should return a python function in this format:
'''python
def score(state: dict, action: str) -> float:
    pass
    return result_score
'''
```

Refine code for game policy components

```
Here are some criteria for the code review:
- No TODOs, pass, placeholders, or any incomplete code;
- Include all code in the score function. Don't create custom class or functions outside;
- the last line should be "return result_score", and the result_score should be a float;
- You can only use the following modules: math, numpy (as np), random;
- no potential bugs;

First, you should check the above criteria one by one and review the code in detail. Show your thinking process.
Then, if the codes are perfect, please end your response with the following sentence:
'''
Result is good.
'''

Otherwise, you should end your response with the full corrected function code.
```

To assess our agent's performance, we implemented the baseline opponent agents from previous works. The prompt configurations for each opponent agent were implemented as detailed below.

Game-play Prompt for Chain-of-thought Agent

```
You are a player in a card game. Please do your best to beat the other players and win the game.

The card game is as follows:
'''
{game_description}
'''

Your current state is as follows:
{observation}

Please think in steps and make a decision based on the current state of the game.

You should return an index of the action you want to take from the list of legal actions.
Wrap your response in a dictionary with the key 'action' and the value as the index of the action you want to take.
for example (You MUST return the action index in the following format):

'''json
{
  "action": 0
}
'''
```

Game-play Prompt for ReAct Agent

```
You are a player in a card game. Please do your best to beat the other players and win the game.

The card game is as follows:
'''
{game_description}
'''

Previous observation of game history and your current state is as follows:
'''
{observation}
'''

Your available actions are as follows:
'''
{actions}
'''

Please think in steps and make a decision based on the current state of the game.
You should return an index of the action you want to take from the list of legal actions.

Instructions:
1. Analyze the query, previous reasoning steps, and observations.
2. Decide on the next action: choose an action or provide a final answer.
3. Respond in the following JSON format:

Remember:
- Be thorough in your reasoning.
- Choose actions when you need more information.
- Always base your reasoning on the actual observations from chosen action.

If you have enough information to answer the query, wrap your response in a dictionary with the key 'action' and the value as the index of the action you want to take.
for example (You MUST return the action index in the following format):

'''json
{
  "thought": "Your detailed reasoning about what to do next",
  "action": 0
}
'''
```

Game-play Prompt for Reflexion Agent

```
You are a player in a card game. Please do your best to beat the other players and win the game.

The card game is as follows:
'''
{game_description}
'''

Previous observation of game history and your current state is as follows:
'''
{observation}
'''

Your available legal actions are as follows:
'''
{actions}
'''

Your previous reflection based on the game state is as follows:
'''
{reflection}
'''

Please think in steps and make a decision based on the current state of the game.
```


You should return an index of the action you want to take from the list of legal actions.

Instructions:

1. Analyze the query, previous reasoning steps, and observations.
2. Decide on the next action: choose an action or provide a final answer.
3. Respond in the following JSON format:

Remember:

- Be thorough in your reasoning.
- Choose actions when you need more information.
- Always base your reasoning on the actual observations from chosen action.

If you have enough information to answer the query, wrap your response in a dictionary with the key 'action' and the value as the index of the action you want to take.

You MUST return the action index in the following format:

```
```json
{
 "thought": "Your detailed reasoning about what to do next",
 "action": 0
}
```
```

Long-term Reflection Prompt for Reflexion Agent

You are a player in a card game. The card game is as follows:

```
```
{game_description}
```
```

This is the payoffs for the game:

```
```
[[{payoffs}], you are player {idx} (list index starting from 0).
```
```

Here is the previous reflections based on the game results:

```
```
{reflection}
```
```

The game is over. Please reflect on the game and provide a detailed summarization for WINNING the game including strategies used, reasoning for actions, and any other relevant information. You should return a string with your reflection on the game, including strategies used, reasoning for actions, and any other relevant information. Each reflection item should be precised and concise, NEVER repeat the same reflection twice.

You MUST return the reflection in the following format and ONLY add at most 2 most important new summarization to the previous reflection:

```
```json
{
 "reflection": "1: strategy 1; 2: strategy 2; ..."
}
```
```

Game-play Prompt for Belief Agent

You are a player in a card game. Please do your best to beat the other players and win the game.

The card game description is as follows:

```
```
{game_description}
```
```

Previous observation of game history and your current state is as follows:

```
```
{observation}
```
```

Here is your previous reflection based on the game state is as follows:

```
```
{reflection}
```
```

Previous belief is as follows:

```
```
self-belief: {self_belief}
world-belief: {world_belief}
```
```

Please read the game decription and observation carefully.

Then you should analyze your own cards and your strategies in Self-belief and then analyze the opponents cards in World-belief.

Lastly, please select your action from:

```
```
{actions}
```
```

You MUST return the action index in the following format:

```
```json
{
 "self-belief": "I have a good hand",
 "world-belief": "Dealer has a bad hand",
 "action": 1
}
```
```