

Which criteria did you use to assess the suitability of each quest description?

Number of respondents: 349

Responses
My criterion was, does the AI quest description fit the basic facts a player needs to know to finish the quest. The lowest rating were for descriptions that actively told the wrong things. The second lowest were simply not helpful in conveying the facts, and would likely leave the player lost. Second best was for descriptions that would get you most of the way there, and I rated any descriptions that were fully accurate, or allowed mild room for interpretation but would bring the player to the right place with the right intention.
Mostly just basic coherence: whether the AI passed for a human writer by not contradicting or repeating itself in unnatural ways.
Coherence, flow of the writing, context added in a nice way.
Wether they successfully help me understand what the player should do and how they might do it. Bonus rating if the texts reads authentic enough.
Creativity and fluency of the story line, suitable amount of details and background
Clarity and unambiguousness Syntax Motivation Tone
Is the next sentence not contradicting the previous one? Is the character repeating themselves? Is the description even following what the designer wrote?
Coherences, if a quest said something false : 1 Narration style, I like well written quests. Information, if there is enough details about the objectives
How much sense they made, whether they were short enough to make me read them and if I felt rapidly part of the story
Did I understand what should be done and were the descriptions coherent (not repeating same stuff or repeating same stuff but with alternating details).
Whether the description was actually consistent with the quest information. Whether too much information was given (such as introducing a name multiple times, or specifying that someone is male). Whether the purpose of why the quest was given was clear (who was sent by whom to do what? Why?).
Compared the quest description with the actual quest information. If the actual quest was off, I would rate it lower, another thing to rate it lower is lack of information and the last item, wrong information and sentences that negate each other.
If the description made sense. Not all of them did
- They had to make sense. - They had to be clear. - They had to feel worth reading.
Flow og quest story
Consistency, engagement in the story.
-Whether they got details from the prompt correct. -Whether included details were relevant to the quest.
Incorrect or conflicting information -- 1 Correct but boring -- 2 Reserved 3 and 4 for okay and good/inspiring
Logical flow and easy to understand
Novelty in presentation, whether they contained interesting ideas that grab my attention. Grammatical coherence. Self-contextual coherence (shouldn't contradict themselves) Coherence with the quest details (Shouldn't contradict facts of the quest)
Internal consistency (not contradicting itself or the stated quest objectives); not repeating phrases; no nonsensical phrases.
Ease vs tedious of reading, amount of unnecessarily repeated information, clarity of presenting task
I looked for how well the quest description accurately reflected the handwritten details provided, how clear the objective was made, and how well it was written.
Whether they made logical sense as both something that someone would say in general (statements reasonably followed from each other, didn't repeat things or have random non sequiturs) and whether they seemed to fit the conditions stated in the original setup.
The main criteria I was looking for was coherence.
Style, factuality
- logical coherence - does the quest text make sense given the available meta information - does it read roughly like "real" quest texts from video games
Whether it matched the quest details. Whether its internal logic was sound, i.e. the various parts of the description weren't contradictory. Whether a player would know what to do after reading the description.
If the background story made sense.
Matching with the original description Logical flaws The feel whether a sentence reads like it has come from a quest generator :)
1) Whether the information of the quest was given correctly 2) Whether there was any conflicting information or redundancy in the text 3) Whether the text provided too much or too little information 4) If the text seemed to flow naturally and was understandable and captivating enough to make the player want to do the quest
Whether all the facts matched up (including the quest goal in particular), whether it was coherent (both logically and in writing), and whether the tone seemed suitable.
1. Whether the text sounded like spoken English, not running sentences together, etc. 2. Whether the text contradicted itself in any way "e.g. the quest giver identifying themselves by two different titles) 3. Whether the text contradicted any of the text in the human-given quest description.
length clarity tone
How the right information got to the player.
Coherence, mostly.
Consistency in the characters' roles and in the logic used in quest descriptions; the "flow" of language.
I was mostly looking for whether the language of the quest descriptions matched each aspect of the quest properly. I was also looking for natural-sounding language.
Coherent language, motivation to complete quest beyond "go here and I'll pay you"
I ranked them high if they read naturally and felt like they belong in a videogame.

Responses
Whether the quest description aligned with the facts, whether the 'potential' flavour has been preserved and whether it was at acceptable level language-wise.
At first, I evaluated how natural it sounded and if the quest-giver's speech could tell you something about themselves, but afterwards I only checked if the text didn't contradict the facts, objectives and data given. It most certainly contradicted the facts.
I prefered the quests With less Repetition and a clear menaing
Whether it was repetitive and flowed logically like a conversation or assignment might.
- Did the grammar match up? - Did the sentences repeat themselves (if not exactly, then was the information just restated 2 sentences later?) - Did the description contradict itself, or at least confuse me as to the goal of the quest-giver("find this book so I can figure out the secrets" but also "the seal can't be broken!") - Did the quest description give a reasonable justification/backstory/'lore' for the quest, that would explain why the quest-giver is even offering me this quest?
Did the text provide clear instructions about the goal and the required means of achieving it?
1) whether or not the quest text made sense/aligned with what was described as the quest objective 2) whether the text was engaging and conversational (rather than just reciting a list of objectives) 3) whether the text sounded natural
Grammatical correctness. Interest and originality. No repetition. Clarity. Context Request
n/a
I tried to understand if the information given made sense, and if the quest gave me a clear reason and objective to do.
Yes
Plausibility
Main factor was whether the speech made sense and matched the description of the quest; numerous dialogues had mixed-up facts or did not seem to understand the objective of the quest.
(1) Natural use of language (2) Accuracy of presented tasks (i.e., rejecting descriptions that asked for things not accurate to the short form description).
I used the following criteria: - Did the text make sense from a logical point of view (no internal contradictions or sentences that make no sense)? - Did the text accurately describe the quest and would the text have helped me in the video game world? - Did it sound natural? - Was the text concise and to the point?
Details of the original prompt being correctly included in the dialogue (correct characters performing correct roles, the player being asked to go to the correct location), making sure the quest objective was actually present in the dialogue
If it made logical sense and was consistent. Many were not.
How funny the quest description was, if it made sense, if it was grammatically correct.
Internal consistency, readability, following the criteria given in the beginning.
Whether the descriptions actually made sense logically and how accurate they were in terms of location, quest giver, reward and task required.
Whether they make sense
If description is correct, doesn't repeat same fact, how "good" is writing (interesting, does it fit character),
Language used correlated with quest giver. Whether the information given would be enough to guide the player to the first quest objective. Succinctness
Plausibility; standard of English
Grammar, Logic, lack of contradictions,
Descriptions that align with the facts given and gives interesting things you could potentially do.
If the statement made sense and the prospect of work-reward was properly established, I considered it a good description. Another thing that improved my assessment was how excited the description made me to complete the quest it promoted.
Whether the quest description matched the overall intent of the quest facts. Whether it made sense stylistically, and grammatically.
How much sense the description made, how stiff it was, if it was accurate
Whether or not logic was maintained throughout, accuracy to original quest description, whether or not the quest sounded interesting, if the description made me laugh at all
- Accuracy of description to given prompts - Flavor text makes sense and are interesting
I checked if the facts given at the start matched the descriptions and if it was clear what is expected of the player. Then I looked at how natural the speech sounds - if it isn't stilted and if it carries personality across.
Whether it was easy to understand what was expected. Whether it when inline with the story.
I evaluated the quest description based on the internal logic described by the quest parameters. If the description broke the internal logic, I rated it poorly.
Credibility and how much they were "fun and enjoyable" to read.
How well each was worded and how much important information they gave.
Does it have obvious language errors? If yes, then 1 (note: I'm not native speaker) Does it make general sense? 2 Does it make general sense and is mostly true to the values given at the quest brief? 3 Everything seemed fine 4
If it would seem like someone would say this. If it sounded organic or natural. If it was presented well.
Content Grammar Structure of the sentences Immersion
Did it make sense given the description? Was it grammatically correct? Was the correct information given? Did it read with a good flow?
How repetitive the dialogue was, it's length, and how clear it was.
Whether the quest description gave the full information, then how decent the English was. Only in the maybe two or three cases that was decent did I consider how well it was written. I ranked, but let me be clear: maybe one or two of these quest descriptions would be acceptable in a first-timer's indie game, the rest was useless.

Responses
In short: consistency, repetition, and narrative voice. If the quest description seemed to directly contradict any of the quest facts, or if it felt inconsistent within itself (i.e. if the "mood" shifted throughout the description), I rated it either a 1 or a 2. If the quest description was overly repetitive, I docked a point. If the quest description seemed like it had "feeling," I tended to give it a higher score. As an example, several descriptions of the "Through a Nightmare, Darkly" quest really conveyed the concern of the quest giver quite well.
The one you asked to use : hypothetical thrill in accepting the quest in the case it was given in a game
- Did it make sense at all, even if fals? - Would I understand the first objective of the quest or know what to do next? - Does the quest, quest giver, or other details match what was given in the hand-written description?
Sensible questions and consistency.
How understandable How interesting How detailed
If it made sense following the information laid out, and to some extent the lore of the universe the information was drawn from.
Good grammar, whether it relayed the necessary information or not, and whether it sounded in character or not.
Whether the description contained the necessary information, general coherent request given to the player, appropriate tone
If they made sense or not
I assumed some additional context could be missing, as long as the description made some sense I rated it higher.
Correctness (with respect to the meta description given before) General wording, fitting to the world
If the quest made sense. Were there strange references to "you" when it should have referred to one of the characters?
Narrative coherence, style, clarity, flow
Coherence and wit
How it read was as if the NPC was talking to you and giving you the quest. So I judged it based on how intriguing it was.
Consistency
I checked if the quest descriptions matched the stated quest facts.
How easy it was to follow along. How believable it would be to be said by someone etc
Amount of information, the character of the question and the style in witch it is delivered and the general tone of the quest text
How informative the dialogue was in terms of objectives. how natural the sentences were, too many of the lines were very robotic. Brevity was a definite bonus, and a high consideration.
If it was close to the informations without making any weird assumptions, I deemed it good.
Their internal coherence, and whether or not they accurately reflected the quest ingredients.
Common sense, logic and the flow of the text.
All inormation is provided, the description is more or less logical, it is not simply listing of facts but something with a bit of flavour
Coherence, phrasing, readability of the objective
- Is it well written? - Does it feel immersive? - Does it make sense and is it easy to understand?
- Does the description match the list of facts about the quest? - Does the description make sense? - Is the description interesting?
If they get the basic facts of the quest right, if it would be clear to me as a player what I need to do. To a lesser extent if the text sounded natural (i.e. a character probably wouldn't start a conversation with 'I'm a nervous winged elf')
Ease of understanding the task, Information given was correct and sentences flowed easily.
How natural the text seemed compared to how I would have written a similar quest dialogue.
Does it make sense, i.e. do I know who the person is & what they're asking me to do. If by the end of them talking I don't know what they want of me, it made it poor quest dialogue.
If it was coherent with itself. If it correctly conveyed the quest objective. If it was well redacted and sounded natural. If it sounded interesting
Fluency of key terms and concepts Prevalence or necessary and unnecessary descriptions (I.e quest related or just waffle) Characters being referred to in the correct context, as in "I am maldor, a nervous man" vs "I am maldor. Maldor means nervous"
If it made sense (both internal logic, non-contradiction within itself, and if it conveyed the quest as I understood it from my gameplay)
Coherence of the description Presence or absence of contradictory sentences or informations Repetition of information Whether the description actually says what the player should do, as well as how and where if applicable
Natural speech and the 'voice' of the questgiver matching the tone of the scenario.
Coherence and mood of the text
How accurate the description was to the actual quest objective. Clarity of language and message being delivered. Correctness of information.
Did it make sense, particularly is the information given in order. E.g. "You can have this elytra. This is called an elytra". Or was there meaning behind the words. E.g. "you can have this staff. A staff has many uses."
Was it clear what I needed to do? Did the description make sense?
- Whether or not it covers the objectives properly - Whether or not it sounds like something said by a human - Whether or not it has any redundant/repeated sentences
Whether or not there were grammatical/contextual/logical errors present in the text
Whether it makes sense - for example, it wouldn't make sense if someone said "my father needs to be buried" in one part and then later said "you must bury me at X location" as they provided inconsistent information.

Responses
1. Does it make any sense at all 2. Does it tell me what I have to do 3. Does it match the human-written quest description
The way the NPC greets the player, The way he describes , where to go , what to do If he put some emotions in the text
Whether they actually made sense, and whether the quest sounded interesting
Consistency, accuracy, entertainment
General flow and description - how well they explained the quests.
Cohesiveness Correct use of the description That the last sentences finish with everything wraped up correctly
How correct they were and how easy to understand they were.
Clear goals (do I know what I have to do?) Consistency (is the request contradictory?) Correct goals (was I asked to do the right task?) Background (was this an individual, or a race? Does the lore make sense?)
Did the description accurately describe the task, including names of principals, locations, and items. Did the description provide a rationale for the task. How well did the description convey the importance and/or urgency of the task.
Does it cover the quest prompts? Are the locations / people / factions placed correctly in the context?
The coherence
Does it at make sense? 4 - it's okay 3 - something is odd about it 1 - there is something completly wrong
If it's thematically fitting, and sets a good mood / feels appropriate
1) Length of the text - I don't want to spend too long reading something, but at the same time I need some background information that isn't too brief. 2) The flow of the text - quest descriptions work better when the text flows and tells a brief, but easy to understand story. 3) How the quest was described - a boring description wouldn't interest me, I need to have something which excites me.
Proper grammar Correctly relaying the information in the "ingredients" to the description Length, doesn't need to be super long but it should encapsulate all the info from the "ingredients"
Did the quest description provide me a clear and logically consistent reason for doing the tasks assigned to me, and was at least the first step of the quest provided to me so I would know where to begin.
Consistency and integrity.
Complete sentences, and whether or not the description made sense given the objectives.
consistency with information absence of major syntax errors clarity of the quest immersiveness
How much it contradicts the quest info i was given at the start of the page and if i would get confused about what i had to do in the quest.
Primarily I was looking to see if the description was correctly using information.
does it make sense? Is it interesting to read? Do I want to do this quest?
Logic. Most have a line which is not logical
Whether information had been repeated within the given description; if details of the quest did not correspond to the quest information provided beforehand; if it was clear, concise and read in such a way that would be suitable for a fantasy-based RPG.
Was it overly repetitive, demanding, seemed well-written
If they adhered to the info given and were mostly coherent. I was honestly impressed with how good some of them were.
How Apeeling the language was, Grammer
how coherent the narrative was.
If it made sense, was understandable, and if the character's plight was interesting enough.
Making sure the description matched the hand written details. IE of it said "objective kill" but the description said "bring him to me" or if it said the quest giver was a warrior but the description called him a priest.
Quest giver, readability, continuity of pronouns and perspective.
Did it seem like it was written by a real person? Did it flow naturally? Was the vocabulary and syntax appropriate for a fantasy/RPG setting? Did the quest text deliver dull instructions (bad) or include some flavour/personality (good)?
The congruence of the given facts of the question and the generated text. Correct grammar and sentence structure.
The amount of the information given to player by the quest givers. I prefer to have limited information about what I am supposed to do which leaves me with enough space to experiment on and explore the game by myself.
That the quest made sense and didn't have contradictory requests.
Is the given task clearly stated in a way that feels natural. Does the text match the rest of the world presented.
Detailed answers that did not repeat information
Correct grammar and sounded more real
Clarity and brevity
as long as it make sense
- is the info relevant - does it make sense
Was it logical
Description of the task. Details of what to do and where. A bit of lore and fluff help too.

Responses
Accuracy to the quest outline, flow of the description, and syntax.
Self-consistency of the text, validity of the information provided, how natural it sounded
Informative yet concise with clear directions, not necessarily revealing everything but at the very least makes the next steps very clear.
compliance with the man-made description internal coherence
How clear it was what had to be done. Whether or not there where any contradictions, errors, repeatings or other things that might hinder my understanding. How the urgency of the quest was resonsting with the quest giver.
I considered how much each description suited it's quest and how excited would I be to complete the quest after each description.
Whether the description made sense or not. Also the criteria (where to go to, who to talk to, etc.) was important.
Amount of internal contradiction. Humour.
None
The complexity of a language while still being easily understandable what needs to be done and where.
Clarity of objective. Accuracy to original.
How well they fit the quest details, and how much sense they made.
I rated them based on comprehensibility, clarity of the task, and how natural the writing sounded.
Whether the relevant facts necessary to understanding the quests was presented in a coherent manner
How well they matched the descriptions, how easy they were to read and comprehend and lastly how natural they sounded.
Internal coherence, making sure that later sentences matched what had been stated in earlier ones. Making sure that the quest description matched what the quest was supposedly about, as initially stated. And also general tone matching what the tone of such a quest ought to read like.
Consistency, coherence an accuracy with the information given.
First of all I measured descriptions by its suitability to actually convey the meaning of quest, then I looked into how well it written.
contradiction of quest details within descriptions → lower score no repetition without extra detail → higher score extra details which doesn't ruin the flow → higher score
Accuracy of communication of the intent / outcomes of the quest, flow of language, understandability.
I rated the descriptions by whether they made sense to me. Stuff like whose perspective the description is written in, whether the same name was used for multiple characters, etc.
The accuracy of the quest giver's information in relation to the quest facts. There was some leeway given to quest givers that were supposed to be ghosts or undead-like, as usually in games they are confused or mad. As long as the quest description was accurate to the facts, gave clear instruction, and did not focus too long on unnecessary details, I generally agreed with the quest descriptions.
Logic, absence of repeating phrases
Length and readability of text. Attitude of the NPC.
Whether the descriptions sounded natural and believable, the quality of writing, consistency
Details, but without unnecessary tangents or irrelevant info. Also tone
Enjoyment in reading, how much sense it bad, and how it made me feel about the meantime's quest
Whether or not the information made sense and matched the outline given.
If it sounded realistic/immersive.
How well the quest description matches the information given in the beginning. Checking if there were any internal conflicts in the quest description.
If they were comprehensible and if they gave information in a succinct and interesting manner
How easy it was to determine what the quest objectives were.
I checked if the quest descriptions managed to convey the required tasks clearly or anything relevant to the quests at all, and I also tried to get a sense of how "natural" the descriptions were(i.e if it felt like a person would have written something like it). Then I also checked for grammar and if the descriptions got all the quest details correct.
How well the AI stick by the quest's facts as well as the identities of the characters.
Clarity, for the most part, followed by readability.
This entire exercise is putting the cart before the horse. If a quest description isn't valuable enough to write, it shouldn't be read.
Following the objectives presented by the quest log Keeping the character mentioned in the description coherent
Whether they were understandable, explained the situation properly, were using proper language, made the quest sound interesting.
getting to the point, and logic of the statement
Simplicity and absence of repetitive words.
The most important criteria was whether or not the objectives and facts in the quest description matched those in the human-written quest. Another important criteria was how much the quest-giver sounded like a unique character, and not just a generic quest starting point.
1. We're groups involved represented in the description in the same way as the input? 2. Were the characters involved represented in the description in the same way as the input? 3. Did what they were saying make sense, i.e. ask for the right things, done in the right way, characters remain separate, objectives don't change? 4. Etc.
Mostly, I asked myself if the descriptions made any sense, given the quest information provided. Some actually did not! Then, I noticed if the description gave some indication of the stakes or importance of the task/quest. Those that were most engaging, whether emotionally or in terms of drama/action made me happier.

Responses
Grammar, flow, repetition, personality.
Clarity of who is who and what to do Good length, not overly long or too short Quest giver has a bit of personality
Relevancy to initial context and flow of dialogue.
Reading comprehension, sentence structure, and whether or not information was repeated without reason (I.E "a camp of the eiro are there! Next to your objective is a camp of eirol)
Clarity, logic, semantics
I focused on how well put together they seemed, whether they made sense and felt like something a character would actually say.
Coherence was the main criteria. Joining the Nightengales in Skyrim isn't actually a matter of the Thieves' Guild despite member overlap. They are two separate organizations.
If they made sense, didn't repeat or contradict themselves, provided accurate information and if they flowed well.
Whether it would be interesting to do the quest, whether it was "whole" and understandable
(1) The quest description describes the quest: The task should be correct and clear. (2) The given background should be woven into the quest description. I want to know not only what to do, but also why and how it's a relevant, interesting part of the game world. It's fine if some shady character I don't know hires me to do a shady job without giving much information. It fits the character. But in most cases quests aren't simple, characterless delivery jobs. (3) A character should speak and act in a way that fits his character. (4) The dialogue should be written in fine, appealing language.
Coherent sentence structure, accurate information. Emotional overtones of descriptions.
Coherence - did the ideas of the narrative lead logically to the quest goal? Were any sentences/ideas irrelevant? Were the background descriptions and the quest goal clearly linked? And were the antecedents clear and understandable?
Mostly whether it actually made sense. If it was rambling or contradicting nonsense, it got a 1. If it at least made some sense, but still lacked enough quest info it got a 2. If it had a decent amount of quest info, but still lacked a couple pieces of info or had some random nonsense included it got a 3. And finally they got a 4 if it was lacking any major errors and actually informed me of the quest.
It had to make sense and not contradict itself.
I generally wanted to accept quests from and help "good"/ kind people
Coherence with quest objectives and details.
The criterion I used to assess the descriptions were completeness of information, consistency with lore and background, and the suitability of the tone of speech relative to the scenario.
the well built the text was and , the interesting and apealing to me was.
How concisely and effectively the descriptions conveyed the information needed to perform the actions that were part of the quests
Coherence.
I wanted to see if it made logical sense or contained conflicting/misleading information.
How much it sounded like a human could feasibly have said this, and how well it aligned with the information provided.
I went with things that made sense and ones that didn't over-explain things that most likely would be basic information.
It was a combination of accuracy to the prompt and readability. Admittedly it wasn't super objective, but generally I wanted to make sure it was reasonably close to what was sought but also understandable.
How well the quest objectives line up with the text, grammar and wording, and whether the text makes logical sense.
-Whether the quest information made sense (some quest descriptions had inconsistencies) -Whether the phrasing seemed like natural speech (made sense why each sentence followed from the previous) -Natural emotional progression (some quests jumped between sentences that seemed emotional to me and those that seemed matter-of-fact, which sounds unnatural) -I saw it as a bonus if the quest description implied additional "flavor" information about the character or setting
Process of elimination, discarding: Texts that are too wordy. Texts that are missing key information. Text that do not have natural conversation cues. Texts that read 'off' as if poorly translated from a Chinese comic.
If its repetetive or doesnt add any value to the quest/lore
The ability for me to understand the quest objective and if the flavor text matched the original hand-written description.
The length and conciseness of each quest description.
Context, language and experiences from well made quests in various of games.
Their relation to stated facts.
Internal logic of the quest (logic sequence of actions can be deduced from the quest giver's information), information on problems or enemies to be expected, rewards obtained
How natural it sounded in terms of making sense within context and how much it sounded like normal quest descriptions
Most important was whether the AI could properly interpret the data and keep it consistent. Sometimes it failed, mixing details around our even invent from scratch. Another criteria was repetition.
how the npc addresses the player character. how the npc introduces themselves. how the quest text fits the given task (lenght, detail, context).
The consistency to objectives that the description was asked to follow and natural sentence structure.
Consistency with the given quest details, natural grammar, and good sentence logic or syntax
Clarity, conciseness, lack of needless repetitions, emotional involvement of the speaker, fluidity
The most important criteria is whether the objective of the quest is clear. If I can get a clear idea of where to go and what to do, then the flavor of the description is secondary. Second I evaluated whether the flavor text flowed logically. Locations and character names stayed consistent. Last whether the description makes sense in context of the quest and objective.
Whether they conveyed the task of the quest well, whether the story flowed correctly and whether the added context made sense. It seems that the tasks are usually explained somewhat decently (mainly in the last one or two sentences), but the context and story of the quest usually makes no sense. When the quest is simpler, with a shorter description, there seems to be a higher chance for the generated quest text to work.
In order of importance: 1. The description must be factually correct 2. It must not be missing information 3. It must not be misleading 4. It must not confuse the player or include irrelevant information

Responses
How easy it was to read. How invested it got me. How fitting it seemed for the situation.
If the variables that were given are consistent with how the quest description is constructed.
how correct the information was, how much extra superfluous information was invented
How easy to understand and follow they were
Length of description and the content.
Does it fit the premise of the quest? Does the description make grammatical sense? Does the description contradict itself?
I tried to find a quest description that sounded naturally phrased. See below. Without blatant contradictions or weirdly unspecific informations as if Questgiver wasn't sure what he wanted player to do. Respect for the situation of enunciation. I assumed description weren't meant to be funny or jokes. As some could have been from a surrealistic b-movieish rpg parody. see below.
If they made any sense, and if they sounded like things people would actually say. For some of them, if the "quest" text made it clear that the asker knew what the item actually was.
- If the text made sense - If it matched the facts given above - If they managed to get my feelings involved
For the last description I saw (nloth? debt quest?) the information seemed to be factually incorrect in a lot of places, and highly confusing. That's a big negative (and one I didn't expect to see). In general, I just decided if I liked it or not. I like concise descriptions, and I like to have a reason to care about the quest. I hate seeing stupid information that isn't relevant to the quest, is unnatural, or doesn't contribute effectively to the lore. As an example, a lot of these characters are saying things that simply don't make sense for a quest giver to say. To be honest, very few of the quests lived up to 'natural' quests in games that I have played. If these numbers went from 1-10 instead of 1-4, I think they'd get the same ratings, for the most part (parrot quest would be higher I think). The reason I mention this is because I would likely have used different criteria if I thought the quest descriptions were any good. But they really weren't.
Fluidity / believability of dialog, consistency of information, ability to communicate quest objectives and context
I rated them based on whether or not the description was accurate. If two descriptions were accurate at the same time, I would rate the one with a little "added flare" better. What I call added flare is a lore touch, a bit of dialogue which immersed me more in the universe.
Internal consistency with the authored task, and within the description itself, and adherence to the internal logic of the statement.
How concise the quest giver was about the main task, any extra "flavour" the dialog had, that made it sound more interesting, gave some extra insight.
Sentence structure and word usage as well as how believable or in universe it sounded.
If the quest statement was copacetic with provided facts and details, whether the quest giver's tone/attitude seemed reasonable
Grammar Logical errors (such as not doing self introductions if the player knows the quest-giver) Correctness of description
It sounds something an interesting character would say. I can relate to it on some level.
1. Fact-Checking - I assess if the information was correct compared to the written question. ie. If Yago was an evil male mage, that name cannot also be the name of the daughter used in the AI-generated quest snippet. 2. In an RP context would any of these snippets fit into a game I was playing and not pull me out of the experience due to written flow. ie. NPC's don't need to identify their gender as part of their introduction. As that is not part of the natural flow of conversation "Hi, my name is Sue I am a female accountant of lower station. Please accept my request for TPS reports"
Grammar, consistency
1. Logical consistency: Many quest descriptions didn't follow an internal logic. 2. Fluff: Briefer descriptions were boring. Give me a reason to care. 3. Choice of wording: Use some fantasy-esque lingo not something that sounds too modern.
How "flavorful" was the text - did it have personality, did it portray the "voice" of the quest giver, etc. As well as how clear were the steps suggested for the tasks.
Accurate objectives Accurate pronouns Details not contradicting the facts given Good grammar
Consistency of the quest descriptions with themselves and the previously listed details.
1. Quest description was in line with the objectives of task at hand. 2.Language style used was in line with the characters giving them. 3. Generally made sense
Logic to the story, grammatical correctness and how engaging the description is.
I read the quest parameters and checked in the generated descriptions had presented the information correctly - in most cases, they had not. I also considered whether the wording and phrasing seemed natural, or if it was forced. Sometimes too much or too little detail is presented, and quest-givers can pad their speech with too much extra detail, so I also took that into consideration. Words or phrases that were repeated too much also meant that points were docked.
Primarily, I assessed whether the description contained logical inconsistencies (ie, the same character being referred to as both the questgiver's husband and daughter). I also marked quests down for poor grammar or unnecessary detail.
1. Needs to reveal enough details to be interesting, but stay vague enough that the player gets curious about what the quest is about. Descriptions which reveal the entire backstory at once were a no-go. 2. Clear instructions. There were some quests (e.g. the food sacks) which sounded really boring and complicated. Instructions had to be clear and succinct so a player skimming through them knows what to do. 3. Suitability of emotion, phrasing etc. For instance, the quest with Commander Brage had one description where the quest giver was talking about his job, then his dead family - this felt a bit weird to me.
Whether there were glaring contradictions (for example, referring to "dawnward" or other entities as individuals).
Congruency with the facts presented, grammatical consistency and a logical flow of ideas.
Grammar, logic sentences and capacity of immersion
Understandability and sticking to the prompt.
The amount of details in description
- Correct grammar - Realistic wording - Correct information about the quest
Readability of the language, accuracy of story, accuracy of details, and if the quest objective and reward are clearly communicated.
I imagined myself as said character, in said situation and checked how well the description would fit, if it was too long/short, or likewise.
Whether the dialogue omits or confuses critical information and if it flows well while remaining in-character.
First, basic Syntax and Semantic analysis. Some of the quests just didn't make sense given how the words were arranged. Second, redundancy and unnecessary details were often added in the larger descriptions. In one, the character introduces themselves twice.

Responses
Coherency and flavour, consistency
grammatical sense, details, flair, matching the quest facts
I looked for coherency, context, grammar, and consistency.
Common sense, basic coherence and how well did it match the "recipe".
Legibility, realism, flow, whether or not it made sense in context
How natural the text/language sounds and how clear the quest is.
Whether the description we were given matched the quest text.
Logic of the description. If it was fun. How much the description told me about the task.
Accuracy first and foremost; any description that didn't match the original facts/information just doesn't seem like something I would like to be handed in a game - confusion and contradiction aren't good things to have here. My second criteria was in the composition of the descriptions, how they were put together grammatically, the wording and the level of detail in each one. This is not -as- important, but I nonetheless felt it was a worthwhile parameter considering the value of immersion in RPGs.
1. They gave accurate information with regards to what the quest required. 2. They told some sort of coherent story or presented a consistent character.
Proper English and good sentence structure. Also using prior game knowledge of quests to compare the dialog options.
The writing quality of each description, and how much information it provided for the player.
If it made sense firstly and then how much I would actually want to do that description of the quest verses the other descriptions in each group.
Internal consistency, interesting details, in-character.
If they seemed reasonable
Permanence and consistency for quest actors/targets (when something is referred to multiple times, then the locations/description should match between references). If grammar was correct (especially the use of prepositions) If there was narrative/lore revealed during the description, and if it was told incrementally so that the reason and objective are clearly communicated.
How close it matches the intended quest objective, How "natural" the quest giver's speech sounds, Any interesting additions beyond the basic scope of the quest (personality, speech patterns, descriptions, etc.)
I first judged whether or not it made sense, then I considered how much it felt like dialogue with a person.
Whether the descriptions matched the actual situation described.
I based my decisions on whether the quest made sense based on the prompt above the quests and whether the quest was not contradicting itself.
I rated quest descriptions on the basis of how immersive, or immersion breaking, they were. In addition, I assessed how exciting the quest was, and how likely i would be interested in the characters and the story in question for each quest presented here, based on the descriptions.
context.
Logic of what is being said, structure of the text
Plausibility as a real quest
If and by how much it contradicted the quest objective, task and other facts given at the top of the page.
Matching facts, preserving characterization
Clarity of where to go and what to do
Cohesion. The text should be consistent and easy to understand.
Logic and coherence
If the quest description included the pertinent names, location, and facts.
-Getting the facts right (objective, destination. who is suppose to be talking to you -The sentences have some kind of continuity, not just random facts thrown away to the player. -Personal human "feeling" I added one point towards "strongly agree" per characteristic.
If it was logical compared to the facts given at the begining
I held three things in mind when assessing the quest descriptions. Is it clear? Is it consistent? and lastly, Is this something I wouldn't start laughing at?
Did the facts match the quest description
Whether the quest clearly stated what I needed to do and who I was going to do the objective for
Whether or not the AI followed the logic of the quest (syncing NPCs with locations, given motivations). Also how funny they were
If it matched the quest details and what the player is supposed to do. How nicely worded the description was (i.e. did it sounds like an actual person wrote it). How clear the description was. The overall tone of the description (e.g. did the speaker go from scared to excited, etc.)
If the text has an inert logic I could follow relatively easily. I also tried to Math it to the actual task and asked myself if I would gut involved if someone talked to me like this
Whether it made sense logically, whether there was a good ratio of background/lore to actual description of the task, and things like lots of repetition, grammar, etc.
Whether they made sense logically. I also rated them high if they didn't make much sense but made me.laugh.
How well they matched quest goals and setting. Some descriptions had good detail, 'fantasy' and mostly correct facts, getting one or two details wrong.
clarity, longevity (not too short, not too long), interesting details
presence and understandability of key information

Responses
Primarily, whether or not the description matched the information previously given about the quest. Descriptions that repeated information redundantly were rated lower than those that did not. Irrelevant information would result in a lower rating, unless it clearly add to the character or world.
Logic of the sentences, fact-checking of the information provided by the non-AI description, and awareness of meta information by NPCs in AI descriptions.
Whether the description was consistent with the initial quest and the narrative created by the ai in the same description.
If it sounded intriguing and interesting
Mostly soundness and grammatical structure
Grammar, how well the description matched the listed facts of the quest, internal consistency.
Who the narative flowed, as well as how the information was given
Mostly how well spoken the questgiver was as well as any logical errors
Inclusion of relevant facts to the quest, consistent tone
1. The possibility of each quest description tying into a larger quest arc/main quest or expanding the PC's understanding of the lore. This helped to distinguish descriptions for the protection scroll quest or the body wrappings quest. 2. If the quest description expanded on the state of certain groups or individual characters living in the RPG world. So the quest descriptions detailing the state of the refugees and how the inn turned them away, or how the refugees might "disappear" later on (would they be captured and later sold to slavers?) ranked higher. I ranked Body Work quest description 9 as "agree" because it raised a lot of questions about the Zeraphi-- who are they? Why does Umahd keep on finding himself without the wrappings? Is there a wrapping-stealer with a vendetta against those who need his help in battle? But I didn't rank it as "strongly agree" because of internal consistency (see criteria 4)-- why should the Ezrohir marauder be rewarded with the power when presumably, they stole it? 3. I ranked higher quest descriptions that can help distinguish in the role-player's mind what KIND of hero, or anti-hero, they're playing as. For example, good quest descriptions indicated that the player character can help the disadvantaged (if the PC is playing as a Chaotic/Lawful Good character), or someone that can call in a favor later on (if role-playing as a scheming character) or simply an evil character (saying NO to refugees). 4. Internal consistency. Quest description 9 for the potato snatcher is a bit confusing because the character I'm role-playing as doesn't know if S'jirra wants me to find money AND the person who did it. Quest description 5 also didn't make sense because the character should be angry that the husband left, and maybe possibly stolen the recipe as well if he took everything else. 5. Humor: For the Potato Snatcher quest, description 8 was so overly dramatic-- only source of sustenance? That's just asking for scurvy. More examples: according to the above criteria, Potato Snatcher quest description 7 ranks as "strongly agree" because it helps to establish that there is someone that is stealing potatoes (could be part of a larger arc, criteria 1, or is there a food competition going on in the town, criteria 2) and because if I deny the quest I can establish myself as a character who doesn't care about someone and their family who loves potatoes (criteria 3). It is also internally consistent, criteria 4. Another example: let's rate quest descriptions for "Refuge for the Elves". - For description 7, the "it's so good to see you again!" indicates a bond with the PC, which meets criteria 2 and the possibility of meeting a character again from a prior arc, criteria 1. However, the internal consistency is lacking (criteria 4): it's a bit confusing that the quest giver cannot find a way out of the city with coin if "I'll pay them well". - For description 5, the "I'm not sure if you're aware of it," makes me think that this is an NPC that I can ask more about the refugees/ there is a dialogue chain I can pursue linked to the quest that will explain the plight of the refugees (criteria 2), and there's a hint of mystery in "I don't know what they want"-- what could they want other than food and shelter? Is there something else the refugees are looking for? Will I get to talk to some of the refugees and have them tell me what else they need? (Criteria 1) It is internally consistent (criteria 4). - Quest description 8 was "agree" because it seems just like a side quest, but helps to establish the character (criteria 3) and also had a very dramatic "starve to death!" that was kind of funny (criteria 5). Also, the "I can't stand by why my people suffer like this!" makes the quest-giver tolerable for asking you for a favor. Maybe you can recruit this NPC to help you in this quest (criteria 2). Finally, for Firebead's Scroll: most of the quest descriptions were intriguing, but were not internally consistent. Quest descriptions 8 and 5 meet the most criteria out of all of the other descriptions, but still lacked internal consistency. Description 8: how does the NPC know the scroll is corrupted, but doesn't know where it is? Suspicious. Description 5: do I bring back the scroll to the quest giver? I think these are questions that SHOULD be answered through further dialogue chains in order to complete the quest successfully. For example, it's ok if for description 8 the NPC is shifty and doesn't completely answer how they know the scroll is corrupted, as long as there's an in-game reason that I can investigate later on (eg. it was a set-up all along!)
Did the language sound natural? Was the information correct as related in the initial quest write up?
Descriptions should fit the urgency of the quest, e.g. when someone is panicking or anxious, the text should also mirror it. Vice versa, non urgent quest should form a narrative to make it appealing.
- if it fit the description given at the beginning - if it ended with a request (some ended with generic dialogue) - if the request made sense given the description (leaving some leeway for interpretation here) - if the dialogue stayed on track, so that the request was correlated to the problem.
First, whether or not the reader could surmise the quest objectives from the summary, and if key information like locations, items and a reward was communicated. Second, if the summary was factually correct e.g. It was referring to character's by the proper pronouns or title, and not making things up about connections between characters.