

## Review and Critique of Blog Draft

### Correctness

Your blog draft accurately describes your process of exploring novelty and creativity in Generative AI (GenAI) by prompting Large Language Models (LLMs) to invent a new, balanced, skill-based game, and then using a second LLM to validate the game's originality. The example you provide—the "Number Territory" game—matches the description and rules from the attached reference, confirming the details are correct<sup>[1]</sup>.

Your summary of the validation process is also accurate: the second LLM found no direct match for "Number Territory" in existing games, noting its unique combination of mathematical relationships (factors and multiples) and spatial territory control<sup>[1]</sup>. This conclusion is consistent with the reference and with standard methods for assessing game novelty.

### Flow and Readability Critique

#### *Strengths:*

- The narrative is engaging and personal, giving readers insight into your thought process as a human researcher.
- You clearly lay out your methodology: prompt design, code generation, and validation.
- The inclusion of the LLM's validation response adds transparency and authority.

#### *Areas for Improvement:*

- The introduction contains several grammar and spelling mistakes (e.g., "conceot" instead of "concept," "GaneAI" instead of "GameAI," "shre" instead of "share," "akready" instead of "already"). While you joke about grammar mistakes, consider correcting the most distracting ones for clarity.
- The structure could be improved for smoother flow. For example, the transition between describing your process and quoting the LLM's response is abrupt.
- Some sentences are fragmented or unclear, such as "In the prompt. I am forcing the LLM..." which should be one sentence.
- The philosophical discussion at the end is interesting but could be more clearly connected to the main narrative.

### Suggested Revision for Flow

> This blog is written by a human (you might notice the occasional grammar mistake!).

>

> For the past two weeks, I have been researching the concept of novelty and creativity in GameAI. I'm starting to write this blog and will share it soon.

>

> As part of my research, I tested several LLMs, asking them to generate brand new ideas. Here is an example of a prompt I sent to one LLM, where I required it to invent a new game and verify that it did not already exist:

>

> *Create Python code for a game between a computer and a human. The human will start the game from their laptop (macOS) and play against the computer. One of them will win. The game must be played in the terminal, with minimal luck and no advantage for either player. The game MUST be new, meaning it does not already exist. You can be inspired by existing games but must NOT reuse one. Once you have a game in mind, validate that it does not already exist, then generate the code.*

>

> After the code was generated, I asked a different LLM to check whether the game was actually new. Here is the response:

>

> > "Conclusion: Is 'Number Territory' a New Game?

> > No direct match was found in the literature or game references for a game that combines:

> > - A grid-based territory control system,

> > - Expansion based on both factors and multiples,

> > - Adjacency as a requirement for moves after the first turn,

> > - Automatic claiming of all qualifying adjacent numbers.

> > The closest existing games (Factor Game, Factor Captor) are educational math games focusing on factors only, with no spatial/territorial element. Classic territory games (Go, Othello, Risk) use adjacency and territory, but not mathematical relationships between numbers.

> > Therefore, 'Number Territory' appears to be an original game concept that combines elements from both mathematical and territory-control genres in a novel way. No existing game matches its core mechanics as described."

>

> So, it seems GenAI can indeed innovate.

> Innovation means applying a novel and original creation that delivers value. (Of course, the concept of value is a philosophical discussion we should have around a table.)

>

> In the next blog, I will discuss creation, novelty, innovation, and value from social, biological, and philosophical perspectives. I also want to present research in GenAI about 'creation' and how we can learn from human creative processes. Finally, I'll try to look into the future: can GenAI help us understand "things we do not know we do not know"?

>

> REF: I published the prompt and code in the GIT server: [\[GitHub link\]](#)

## Summary

- The content is factually correct and aligns with the referenced material<sup>[1]</sup>.
- The flow is engaging but would benefit from minor restructuring and grammar corrections.
- The philosophical conclusion is thought-provoking and sets up your next post well.

## Final Note:

Your process and findings are clearly documented and supported by the reference. With a few edits for grammar and structure, your blog will be both readable and insightful.

\*  
\*\*

1. [https://ppl-ai-file-upload.s3.amazonaws.com/web/direct-files/39166379/4d50713b-1c05-4939-bf0a-b16dbce31291/Number-Territory\\_-\\_A-Strategic-Mathematical-Territo.md](https://ppl-ai-file-upload.s3.amazonaws.com/web/direct-files/39166379/4d50713b-1c05-4939-bf0a-b16dbce31291/Number-Territory_-_A-Strategic-Mathematical-Territo.md)