

Here is an attempt to explain why a skill-based infantry gameplay is needed to bring interest and recognition to a competitive Battlefield scene (and indirectly to the game itself, at any level), through the recognition of experienced or competitive players, as well as which guidelines to follow to create such a skill based gameplay on a new Battlefield opus. And, through this gameplay, how to eventually bring a little bit of competitive culture into the very casual community that is the battlefield community. That is to say, how to give the opportunity to players that are often not only uninterested, but hostile, to 5vs5 or 8vs8 formats to try them out and understand them.

I] Why a skill based gameplay is needed

- a) Why a skill based gameplay is required for the recognition of an esports scene, through the recognition of the competitive or experienced players
- b) The Scream effect
- c) The impact of tickrate as an example

II] Two possible Battlefield-like skill based gameplays

- a) Accuracy based BF3, Speed based BF4.
- b) Guidelines to improve the BF4 specific infantry meta (abandon the skill gap through spread control only)
- c) How to create a "feeling of pleasure" after a clean kill

III] How do you transmit a competitive culture to a casual audience ?

- a) Transmission through practice
- b) "Rush" with timelimit : a good gamemode for viewers and players
- c) The importance of a game's first weeks for the birth of an esports scene.

To conclude, video-game series are not a democracy.

A clumsy attempt at explaining how important it is for experienced players to try to be heard over other players. The answer to what gameplay could suit casual players the most is often not to find among casual players themselves. The mechanisms behind a "fun" gameplay are complex, and having fun on a game doesn't mean understanding exactly all the parameters behind this feeling. I know it can be read as the expression of a radical overconfidence in competitive or experienced players, and I try to explain why it's not.

I] Why a skill based gameplay is needed

a) Why a skill based gameplay is required for the recognition of an esports scene, through the recognition of the competitive or experienced players

Why were top infantry players held in (relatively) higher regard by the community on Battlefield 3 in comparison to Battlefield 4, where they are often watched with contempt or doubt about their abilities outside a 5vs5 context ? A major difference is how easily a viewer could grasp the degree of mastery behind what the Battlefield 3 players were doing, even if he had a limited experience of the game.

The gameplay was more likely to suggest to a spectator that he was in front of someone above the level of an average player ; someone who deserved some credit. In other terms, with a visibly skill based gameplay, someone who mastered this gameplay gave reasons to trust his claim of being a "top" player. Consequently, it gave reasons to give credit to the esports scene as a whole, as a really competitive space. In BF4, the problem of legitimacy behind the competitive scene is heavily linked to the absence of such a visibly skill based gameplay. When viewers watch "top infantry" players, they mostly see people who basically spray low recoil weapons like AEKs or Ace23s ; these viewers can legitimately wonder if anyone with a little bit of aim could be as good as most esports players : unlike many other games, there is no overtone of talent or respect associated to the term "competitive" player. It's only very recently, with the birth of a more skill based meta from Brazil, that the competitive gameplay began to look (for an outsider) like something that required higher abilities and consequently that could trigger some recognition for the player, and for the competitive scene as a whole.

Even on BF4, it's not a coincidence if the competitive players (especially in Brazilian teams) who built the biggest fanbase are the ones who are heavily relying on a skill based gameplay. That's the point I want to insist on : to have hype around an esports scene, you need to have hype around the players, you need your players to be mythified, to appear as legends or above human individuals. You need what *Scream*, *Get_Right* or *KennyS* are to CS:GO, ideals of a certain type of demanding gameplay. And that can only happen if your game is sufficiently skill based to allow players to develop these impressive gameplays.

b) The "Scream" effect

If a game possesses players who symbolise an absolute mastery of a high level gameplay, it will bring hype over the game itself. I'm convinced that someone like *Scream*, the CS:GO player famous for his headshot aim, did something the most rewarded CS:GO players in the world didn't do. He convinced a lot of people that the CS:GO head aiming could be mastered at an insane level. And that's something extremely important. Because he gave many newcomers a reason to trust the game, he was the living proof (or lie, it doesn't matter) that you could trust the effect of a hard training over your aim in CS:GO, and that you could get recognized for it. That a hard work on a skill based gameplay could pay off in Counter Strike. And this trust in the game, in the possibility to rise above everyone by

tryharding, to shine through talent, is what brings a numerous players to get interested into a competitive scene and into the game on which it takes place.¹

It's not a paradox if the Fnatic BF4 players, who won almost everything on BF4, are comparatively less hyped than other less successful Battlefield teams playing with a less controlled gamestyle. Because the Fnatic players have often been "too professional" to find themselves in situations where they were forced to rely essentially on skill to win. They have too much control over the game for that, and they are less likely to have to shine individually with insane feats from one player. Their skill is less visible, because it is incorporated into a very developed teamplay. And for a stream viewer unfamiliar with the gamemode, teamplay and map control are not perceptible ; he can't see all the work behind the players positionings and movements. This is not what creates the show for him at first. On the contrary, the high APM gameplay of many of the Brazilian players during the last Esl One was a clear indication for any viewer, even with no experience of the game, that the player on the screen mastered something complex, a meta, a specific gameplay. It was clear for a twitch or youtube viewer that this player had reached a level that not everybody can reach just by spending some time on the game.

This is why a skill based infantry gameplay is essential for the recognition of the players, of the competitive scene, and of the game itself. Regardless of the real merit of the competitive or experienced players, if the gameplay doesn't reveal or suggest the high degree of mastery they achieved over the game, they won't get any credit, and the game won't be seen as a place where talent can deploy.

It is important to understand how micro is linked to macro in the success of a video game. The fact that I need to do a small mouse adjustment before I kill an enemy ingame may indirectly be part of the process that will lead this game to be in an international tournament sponsored with thousand of euros. Things that can appear as small and insignificant details can be major components of a gameplay that will bring fame and money to a game at a macro level. In my perspective as a player, I would even say that these details are more defining for a game's future that all the money and efforts invested into advertising it. For the rest of this document, I will try to point out different mechanisms that, from my observations, can help to the development of such a gameplay on a Battlefield serie.

c) An example : the impact of tickrate

Tickrate has dramatic consequences on the skill ceiling of the infantry gameplay, competitive or not. It affects dimensions of the game as different as the way players peak, the way they move together on the map, the way they handle spraying in 1vs1, if they rely on jumpshots or not, etc.

The most common difference it makes can be summed up that way : A higher tickrate decreases the Time To Kill needed by a good aimer over a bad aimer. Sometimes he may also need less bullets before he makes a kill (or at least before he gets the killfeed information that he can stop shooting because the kill is done). This extra time and bullets

¹ I'm referring to Scream's image of course, to what he symbolized for many newcomers on CS:GO, not about his actual level. Any player that gets mythified as "the best sprayer", "the best aimer", etc. get his image separated from his actual variable performances as he becomes a living advertisement for the game.

allow the player to focus on more targets more quickly, before he dies or has to reload. The individual impact of an experienced player will be higher in a higher tickrate.

The ingame effects are very tangible. For example, 1vs2 situations are facilitated in high tickrate : the time to kill is short enough to finish an enemy before the second one had the time to stop sprinting, aim and shoot. Typically, on a lower tickrate, the time to kill the first enemy in a 1vs2 will be superior to the time that needs the second enemy to stop sprinting and shoot. In that case, when you switched on the second player, he is already shooting, and you are beginning this second 1vs1 with a disadvantage. Thanks to the high tickrate servers during last Esl One finals, many successful 1vs2 could be observed (even despite some connections problems reported during the Lan !), and you can check the INTZ fragmovies to realise that the tickrate favored that skill based playstyle.

<https://youtu.be/nIDJxLZNLTo?t=19s>

More generally, anything linked to the impact of an individual player against a mass of enemies is made easier in high tickrate. And, on the contrary, the impact of a mass of players will be bigger when the tickrate is lower. Since you need more bullets for every of them, they will be less easy to wipe with a fast burst in every of them. Players massed together won't feel like many vulnerable targets, but like one big sponge that you don't have enough firepower to kill.

This will have consequences in a competitive context, where impressive actions, stream-friendly acts of skill, will become extremely unlikely. What will take place will be a very dull gameplay of 1vs1 trades between most of the players. That's to say the caster's nightmare gameplay. A gameplay where every player on which the camera switches makes one kill and dies, without any streak or interesting action, and the caster has to switch camera constantly without being able to find any POV to focus on. It could be added that, in public or competitive servers, behaviors like massive rushes or team staking will be very hard to counter by a few players and, maybe, give a feeling of helplessness against the game itself.

II] Two possible Battlefield skill based gameplays

a) Accuracy based BF3, Speed based BF4.

In my opinion, two different skill based aiming gameplays have been proved viable in the last battlefield series, at a competitive and public level. In other terms, I consider the very recent bf4 infantry meta roughly viable, especially with a high tickrate. As well as its almost complete opposite, the bf3 infantry gameplay. These two gameplays could be viable for a new battlefield, with some improvements for the bf4 one.

On BF4, the current AEK "competitive" gameplay is the ideal example of the way in which this game's infantry gameplay distinguishes itself (in good and bad) from the other Battlefields. I know there are many other ways to play bf4 than this, but this is the only case

where a new infantry meta appeared and triggered the interest of a lot of players on this game. In my opinion, this specific meta, used by many Brazilian players, has a big responsibility in the relative success that bf4 had in this country².

Many people that watched the last season of EsL One in obliteration felt that the Brazilian team managed to master a very interesting meta with the aek (meta that was already in use for a long time, but it became more obvious this time). It was based on a combination of jumpshots, on an aiming favoring speed and reactivity more than accuracy, and on a very call of duty like "hipfire and zoom" way to take many duels. In other terms, it was a skill based gameplay, but for completely reversed reasons than the traditional battlefield 3 accuracy based gameplay. The fastest way to explain the difference between the bf4 aek competitive meta and the bf3 competitive meta is : On bf4, Speed > Accuracy. On Bf3, Accuracy > Speed. Bf4 aek aiming is focused on shooting as fast as possible in the general direction of the enemy, opposed to the bf3 aiming where the adjustment was slower to be exactly on the target when the first bullets were fired. In other terms, the aek meta allows you to simply shake your aim in the general direction of the enemy and to kill him, but sets the skill gap elsewhere. The skill gap between players will exist through their ability to master the fast paced moves and through their reaction speed during fights.

These frags from the brazilians in the last ESL ONE are typical examples.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kEzqGihLSHE>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nIDJxLZNLTo>

b) Guidelines to improve the BF4 specific infantry meta (abandon the skill gap through spread control only)

Consequently, even if this specific bf4 infantry gameplay has sparked the interest of many players, it's still obscured by huge flaws and random factors that can be improved without betraying the speed based meta on which it's based³. Some of the following ideas have already been discussed a lot :

- Reduce the spread increase rate on weapons but add more recoil. Adding a big spread increase was a good idea in theory. It was supposed to create a skill gap based, not on how you handle the recoil, but on how well you time your bursts to keep a low spread. Sadly in practice, it rarely works like that. At middle or close range, full spraying is the most effective way to ensure a kill. In these situations, the time it takes to wait between bursts is often too long to contest a guy who just spray approximately in your direction. In consequence, you have a huge random factor in close, middle and more rarely in long range 1vs1s. Because there is no skill based element that can decide a winner between two players who are just full spraying on one another with a high spread. Very experienced or not, both players can

² There are of course other factors, like Zigueira who is both a famous Brazilian youtuber and a bf4 competitive player. But the Brazilian people I talked with are usually passionate about the recent fast gameplay meta. And I can't verify it but I feel a renewed interest on many infantry servers since this gameplay became popular with the last patches.

³ I personally don't care which gameplay model is chosen. As long as the infantry gameplay is skill based, it will bring recognition to the game through the players, that's what matter. However, if the developers decide to transpose a BF4-like infantry gameplay to the new Battlefield serie, some mistakes would be easy not to reproduce.

handle the recoil, since there is almost none, and hold their left click. On the contrary, as a consequence of the lower spread on bf3's weapons, the game had a huge skill factor in 1vs1, because it was a question of perfectly countering a not-so-easy recoil. Since, if you did so, you could be sure that your first bullets were going straight into the enemy's head, every bullet counted. And since every bullet counted, a perfect recoil control and a perfect target following were skill based elements that made a difference in a duel.

-OR Increase both : a high spread increase with a high spread decrease between bursts combined with an important recoil. In a bf4 famas-like gameplay.

It would have two effects : 1) Force every player to burst as soon as his target is above short range. The "spray and pray" gameplay would become less effective than the burst gameplay AND the burst gameplay would be more intense and less random since the spread decrease would be high enough to allow zero spread to a good player without diminishing his Rounds Per Minute too much. 2) Give most weapons (not only the super high RPM weapons) a skill gap in recoil and click timing. Doing micro bursts without any recoil, like on many bf4 weapons, creates an insignificant skill gap and, from what I heard a lot of times, doesn't give the feeling of having a weapon in your hands. On the contrary, to lower the mouse/pad and tap fire at the same times is both demanding and enjoyable when mastered. That said, I have to admit that the recoil + burst gameplay has not been tested that much in a recent battlefield, it should be implemented cautiously if it's the chosen solution.

- Abandon the "call of duty" hipfire to zoom. In bf4, if you start spraying in hipfire and then ADS during your spray, you spread value will be set to an ADS value as soon as you are zoomed in. This allows to start firing in hipfire and click on the zoom button at the same time, hoping that some bullets will hit the enemy before you are zoomed in. Most of the competitive exposed 1vs1s are achieved this way : both players press "crouch", "zoom" and "fire" as soon as they see each other. This does not create a skill gap, and it create a random factor in the middle range 1vs1s. It's still more skill based than a hipfire only gameplay though.

- Set a high hipfire penalty. A very high hipfire penalty means you are forced to ADS in difficult situations (even during jumpshots, which makes the adjustments harder to do on a close enemy after a jump), and increases the skill gap a lot. If bf5 wants to be a good game, the hipfire must be either very ineffective compared to a guy in ADS position or extremely hard to master through very timed bursts or clickings.

-Keep the fast paced soldier's movements. They are the main reason behind the pleasure that most people I know take at playing infantry in bf4. They allow impressive duels between players, with many dodging movements, fake peaks, etc. Such movements are also very likely to create impressive actions on streams.

-I would really advise to keep the all the possibilities of jump shots and sliding (excluding the Zouzou jump). The jump + crouch + slide combination is a perfectly interesting way to take some peaks on bf4 right now and it gives a feeling of fluidity for anyone experienced with the

movements ingame (kinda like the cs:go bunnyhopping moves that every experienced player uses in some situations). If the hitboxes are not bugged during jumps, jumpshots can be both skilled, hard to master and agreeable to realise.

c) To conclude : how to create a "feeling of pleasure" after a clean kill

As a general principle, it has to be rewarding to kill people for the infantry gameplay to be enjoyable, in public or competitive. The first thing most of the BF3 players I know said about BF4 was how they lost the "feeling of pleasure" you have when you make a nice clean kill. As weird as it sounds, "putting bullets into a body" was pleasurable in bf3, because it was not an easy task and because it didn't feel random thanks to the clear spread control patterns. The feeling of pleasure you have when you make a frag is linked (among other things) to the difficulty to realise it, especially if that difficulty is felt like something you can control, something not random (having a hard time killing people in low tickrate because you can't hit doesn't work). So a new battlefield has to keep this rewarding feeling of a nice kill, either with hard to control weapons or with fast paced movements (and possibly but not necessarily jumps) that allow gratifying feats of skill.

III] How do you transmit a competitive culture to a casual audience ?

This brings me to my last point. How to bring spectators on Battlefield competitive streams, given that the battlefield community is often not only uninterested, but hostile, to 5vs5 or 8vs8. This is something that most of the guys I talked with had already worked on, and I saw many people agree around the same theory, so the problem is already well identified. But it's absolutely critical that their ideas get realised, or bf esports won't change in depth. I will try to add my own analysis after summarizing the problem.

a) Transmission through practice

What matters is that LoL or CS:GO viewers are shaped by the game itself to value competitive streams. The main fact behind the ease with which LoL or CS:GO player will watch competitive streams, is that they already have assimilated a huge background of knowledge about the competitive mode. If I can use that word, they have been socialized by the game itself. The first thing they saw in the menu was 5vs5 Matchmaking. The first experience they had was probably matchmaking. So they have been used to see 5vs5 matchmaking as the basic experience of the game. When they see a top player streaming, they recognize situations they have been in, and they are interested because they want to understand how he deals with these ingame situations. In other terms, the basic codes, the basic knowledge of the game is something commonly shared from casual players to the most elite players in the world. There is not like in Battlefield, one guy who only thinks about jets or tanks and one guy whose life is to be the best aek player in the world. These guys play on different servers, different maps, different gamemodes ; one of them has an extended knowledge of all the secrets tricks in infantry, the other in vehicles, etc. The degree

of common knowledge they share is almost non-existent. And if they watch the other guy's stream, they will see almost nothing that they can link to their own Battlefield experience.

To overcome this state of things, many important persons in the Battlefield community worked on how to establish a Matchmaking system directly on battlelog. In some ways, it would mimic how CS:GO and LoL highlighted matchmaking in their menus. And it may help to reconcile some players with competitive formats by giving them a fast and easy occasion to try them out and get interested, but without forcing anyone to do so. Which is an excellent idea. Some guys worked on a very elaborate ranking system that looks really addictive, but that's not my work and that's not for me to explain what they did.

Something that is never mentioned though, is that 5vs5 is dependent from 8vs8 (or even 12vs12) in that process of transmitting a competitive culture. 5vs5 is radically different from most of battlefield players' daily experience. 8vs8 is different, but not radically : vehicles are still there, map size is still big, banned weapons are less numerous, etc. That's why, in the case of an official and visible matchmaking, I doubt many bf4 veterans will suddenly find any interest into 5vs5. But through 8vs8, they may get accustomed to a competitive culture, esl rules. And a small part of these guys may think "hey I'm actually good in infantry, I should give a try to 5vs5". So, in my humble opinion, in their own interest, 5vs5 players should encourage a 12vs18, 8vs8 and 5vs5 matchmaking, because the traditional battlefield audience will focus 8vs8 and 12vs12, and that's through them that a part of these traditional Battlefield players will filter through 5vs5. The term "filter" doesn't imply any hierarchy of level between modes by the way, just a hierarchy of distances from the daily Battlefield conquest large experience.

And this is important, because 5vs5 desperately needs fresh blood. Almost every single successful BF4 5vs5 team... was composed of people who began competition on BF3. The number of "newcomers", of people who got interested by competition through bf4, is extremely small in 5vs5. And the number of people who came from an other competitive scene (shootmania, CoD, CS:GO, etc.) is almost non-existent. I have met 6 guys in that situation in my whole bf4 competitive experience. Even the bf3 players' state of mind indicate how unattractive bf4 was in terms of competition. All the guys I knew from bf3 have played bf4, at first, in memory of the great times they had on bf3. It's what allowed them not to be disgusted by the game in the first months, before it got patched. And it's probably why they could stay when many teams with a different competitive background left.

b) "Rush" : a good gamemode for viewers and players

The potential best gamemodes for 5vs5 have already been discussed everywhere, I merely want to add my opinion on the subject.

Given what has been said in the previous part, a good gamemode in terms of viewership is : easily readable for a newcomer, punctuated by many situations of suspense or drama, and allows the existence of spectacular feats of skill at a frequent rate.

That's what obliteration was⁴. It had the huge advantage of appealing to real life elements (the concept of planting or defusing bombs) that could be intuitively understood for a total outsider that never played the game (unlike the abstract concept of capturing arbitrary "zones" in domination or conquest). The only abstract concept left for such a viewer was actually the possibility of respawns.

No-respawns gameplays like Counter Strike have an innate advantage in terms of drama likeliness and of readability : that any death is definitive in a round makes the action both clearer and each kill more dramatic. It's closer to a real life gunfight experience and will be more likely than any respawn mode to create a feeling of immersion during 1vs1 situations, 1vs2 situation etc. Which doesn't mean that respawn-modes can't compensate this disadvantage through what respawns can bring to a gameplay. In turn, they have an innate advantage to create frantic teamfights. If the gamemode is good enough to reduce the snowball effect of a failed teamfight, the respawns will allow players to make continuous pushes that can keep a high level of interest from the viewers, as well as a high probability of seeing an impressive feat from a player.

A gamemode that would combine this dramatic "real life gunfight" experience with the possibility of respawns and frantic teamfights would be a Rush mode with no ticket limit but a time limit. Many people have been asking for a competitive rush mode since bf3 and it does answer most of the criteria I previously discussed. It's the easiest battlefield mode to understand for a complete outsider, since it's basically guys defending a mcom (or a building, secret documents, anything that can be of obvious understanding to a viewer) and guys attacking it. It's drama wise, since the bomb system allows one kill to make all the difference. It can have a low random factor if the maps are not too bad and if the matches duration is long enough. And finally it's varied : since the rush path is in several steps, the map size and its diversity are put to good use. It artificially focuses the action on a path which prevents to dilute the action on too large scale fights. Just take the rush mode on Damavand on Battlefield 3, that gives an idea of how an incredibly varied rush path could still focus the action in the important points. It even allowed a tactical use of vehicles in an essentially infantry based fight.

c) The importance of a game's first weeks for the birth of an esports scene.

The first weeks of a potentially competitive game are the most important, unless the game serie has such a huge pre-existing competitive base that it can afford to be a failure at launch (CS:GO could, not Battlefield). The decision of teams or players to invest time on a game depends of their first impressions. There is a short window of interest for the game after the release, but if it doesn't feel good, if players can't feel any possibility for a skill-gap in the gameplay that would advantage them, they won't launch themselves into a potentially extremely frustrating experience.

⁴ Even if, as a player, I'm convinced that the random factor was too high with the current set of rules.

Just check the number of teams during the first go4's on bf4, you had more than 140 :
<http://www.esl.eu/eu/bf4/go4bf4/cup1/rankings/>

2 months later you had 26 teams.

<http://www.esl.eu/eu/bf4/go4bf4/cup8/database/members/>

Two years later you have between 15 and 20 teams at most.

If bf5 wants to have a bigger place in esports than bf4 did, it needs to be playable and fun from the start. I'm not saying perfect, I'm just saying playable with a palpable skill based gameplay.

It's a very important topic, because I can tell you what it's like to have huge hopes for a game, and to see everything fall in ruins. When bf4 was released, a huge number of bf3 players were literally depressed and had no idea what to do anymore. They had trained a lot at the end of bf3, made plans, and what they had was a broken game for at least 6 months. BF4 esports story has been the (failed) reconstruction of the competitive community that had been completely destroyed at first.

Conclusion : FPS series are not a democracy and it's not a drama

We have very interesting people in the battlefield 4 community. But we also have one of the most casual playerbase of any fps game I know. By casual, I'm not talking about their ingame behavior, about their level. I'm talking about their general horizon over how a FPS works. But isn't trying to decide what would be a good infantry gameplay for the next battlefields an arrogant behavior from infantry competitive or experienced players ? Isn't the majority of players able to decide what they need way more than any big-headed so called "top" player ? Aren't we proclaiming ourselves more enlightened than casual players by talking like this ?

Yes I think that the most experienced players, especially if they have practiced many FPSs and have a nice horizon of comparison, should think they are more competent to know what will fit the other players. I know it can be read as the expression of a radical overconfidence in competitive or experienced players, and I will try to explain why it's not

Let's say that, for their new game, the developers decide to follow the community directions on every point, or at least the people who have the most visibility in the community. Are most of the guys who spend 30 hours a month on a fps game able to identify the mechanisms behind an enjoyable fps gameplay ? Not only may they be oblivious to these mechanisms but they may be wrong about them, which is way worst. Being unexperienced on the subject, they may attribute false causes to their annoyance during a game. For example, they may blame the hitreg in situations where it's the weapon spread increase that is too high. Or they may blame a specific weapon as being overpowered when the real cause is that this weapon is statistically used by very good players, which makes it more likely to be used by someone with a good aim that makes it feel powerful, even if the weapon's stats are sometimes lower than many others. And this lack of experience may lead

these players to be extremely vehement to advocate changes that will actually degrade their own game experience.

This may sound like an elitist vision of things. It only does because FPS games have no fixed criteria of expertise, unlike many other more legitimate disciplines. FPS games are extremely complex to make and balance. It is a mistake to think that a few hundred hours spent playing a game allows anyone to have a clear vision of how it works. That reassuring belief is part of the magic surrounding FPS games but it's false. Most of disciplines have a clear (or less blurry) definition of what is an expert, and can oppose it to an amateur with a less accurate vision of things. No one will criticize a company selling fishes for listening to an expert in the fish market rather than to a guy who did fishing a few times with his family. Video games have a low level of legitimacy compared to traditional sports, especially on a game like Battlefield 4, and the difference between an amateurs and a "top player" is very blurry, but the principle stays the same : someone with low experience is less likely to find the real problems that someone with a lifelong experience.

An imperfect but revealing analogy is how ban decisions are made on Battlefield battlelog report system. Ban decisions for hacks are not a direct consequence of the numerous reports of other players. And it's very fortunate, because the majority of players may sometimes have no idea what they talk about. If a huge number of reports were sufficient to blindly ban anyone, it would be a total disaster of unjustified bans. The majority of players doesn't play in an intensive way, doesn't follow the very professionalised esports scenes like the cs:go one, doesn't have an extended knowledge of what top players of these scenes can do with specific sensitivities, mice, habits. But they are often put in situations where they have to judge people who play several hours a day intensively, who rationalize many aspects of their game to be more effective, and who have years of experience in First Person Shooters. This is a dangerous situation. In my experience, the less experienced people have a tendency to be the ones who hackusate the most, being the less informed about what a well trained player can do. And with the most categorical opinions, which are not based on a vast observation of what's commonly possible in FPS at high level. I have always observed as the norm for any beginner or inexperienced player to ignore at first the level difference between him and more experienced players, which paradoxically makes him the most akin to think he can decide if someone hacks or not. Therefore, if the ban decisions were to be taken by a direct report system, the results would be disastrous. The less clear-sighted a player, the most numerous his accusations.

It is well accepted in legitimate sports that you won't be able to understand everything an excellent tennis player does just because you played all the summer with your friends. Should you be able to decide what an excellent FPS player can do, just because you played all the summer with your friends ? The battlelog report system is a tacit disagreement to this fact. It tacitly and fortunately recognizes that a high number of players opinions without any proof of competence doesn't guarantee any degree of certainty.

The phenomenon is the same in the case of players' advices about what would be the good improvements for a game like Battlefield. A very experienced player may actually have a more doubts about what is good or bad for the game than a guy with a reduced experience. Because his vision of what makes a gameplay good is complex, while the other guy's vision is simplistic because he has a reduced number of facts to synthesize, and also a

reduced horizon of comparison with other FPS games. In consequence, it's very possible that the less competent player will be the one with the most visibility and confidence in his feedbacks. That's why, if developers' gameplay choices are influenced by the number of players making a remark rather than by the experience of these players, the consequences can be disastrous. Was it the reason behind some of the gameplay choices at the release of Battlefield 4 ? In any case, players with a big experience and training in video games must be the priority counsel in the evolution of a game serie.

Some parts of this document were written to be read out loud, please pardon the language.

Thanks for reading,

Rela

PDF Version of this document:

https://mega.nz/#!rZZg0LhQ!AgRrGn-nTOG4xFKIEy2oMA_yRp27W4arxs0cifAeLFo

Contact : @MaybeRela

Damien.Rudaz@gmail.com