I don’t quite agree with the idea pointed by the article, because it doubts the basic core of a game which is, in my opinion, the mechanics of gameplay. Here’s a simple logic: a thing is made for what it does, only except for a handful of special functionalities in certain situations, like pizza to eat, clocks to tell time and games to play. When creating a game in no way it can be played, it loses the meaning of “game” at the first place. What I would appreciate is, the article distracts people from fetishizing gameplay and offers us more broadened ways of introducing novel elements, but again, all these attachments lay on the basic principle of the game—no matter what you add, you would actaully play it in the end.

When trying Braid, I recalled a game called “Sumo man” in which I first learned about the mechanics of time wrapping. It phenomenally eliminates the frustration of failure in an action-based game and the result is, players would be kept interested so that they would be very likely to try again and again for any possible solutions in a puzzle. However, I didn’t play much of it, because of the weird art style: I cannot immerse myself into the little dwarf character. So I guess the visual design may be the biggest drawback in this current version.