

RUNIX CASE STUDY
HOW LUXARK SUPPORTED UI READABILITY
INSIDE A SYSTEMS-HEAVY PINBALL ROGUELIKE

IMPROVED BUYER-VALUE EDITION

No generic UI | No loss of system clarity | No unsupported performance claims

Developer / Publisher: Meteor Forge | Project: Runix: Pinball Roguelike

Luxark service: UI Art | Proof family: Real-Time Technical Production

UI ART role-specific production support	SYSTEMS balls, artifacts, missions, enemies	CLARITY player-facing readability
---	---	---

Source note: Based on public Runix / Meteor Forge project information and Luxark’s project note that Luxark handled UI Art. No numerical performance result is claimed.

1. The project and the production challenge

Runix combines fast 3D pinball action with roguelike progression, ball choices, artifacts, powers, missions, enemies, and leaderboard-driven replayability. That creates a UI problem with two jobs at once: help the player read the moment-to-moment action and understand longer-run progression decisions without slowing the game down.

Project element	Why it matters
Pinball action	Core information must stay readable while the pace remains fast.
Roguelike progression	Players need to understand build choices, growth, and run-based decisions.
Artifacts, balls, powers, missions	Layered systems need consistent visual hierarchy and communication.
Fantasy / magical identity	Menus and HUD art need to feel connected to the game rather than pasted on.
Public demo structure	A smaller playable slice still needs to communicate the full game loop clearly.

The core risk

A beautiful interface can still fail if it hides the game loop, weakens feedback, or forces players to decode too much during active play.

2. What Luxark supported

Support lane	Luxark focus
Gameplay readability	Help core information remain understandable during active play and support feedback around runs, missions, and progression.
Visual cohesion	Align menus, HUD elements, and system screens with the game's stylized fantasy pinball identity.
System communication	Support the presentation of artifacts, ball choices, powers, missions, and player growth.
Decision clarity	Organize progression-heavy UI so options and consequences are easier to navigate.
Presentation quality	Connect interface art to game feel rather than treating UI as decorative overlay.

Why this is technical production proof

The UI sat on top of interconnected gameplay systems. The value was not simply art polish; it was helping players understand the game while preserving pace and identity.

3. How studio control is protected

Luxark's current studio-facing model keeps product decisions with the developer while Luxark supports the specialist production layer.

Meteor Forge retains	Luxark supports
Game design and system rules	UI art aligned to the approved systems and direction
Creative and technical direction	Visual hierarchy, readability, and cohesion
Production priorities	Role-specific support against the current milestone
Scope-change approval	Clear change routing before additional work
Final implementation decisions	Assets and guidance designed to fit the existing workflow
Final approval	Revision support and transparent status

The studio keeps the game, the systems, the direction, and final approval.

Control note: The uploaded Runix source confirms Luxark's UI Art role and the project context. This responsibility map describes Luxark's current operating standard rather than a historical contract reconstruction.

4. How the case answers buyer fears

Buyer fear	Case-study answer
"A general recruiter will not understand our pipeline."	The proof is tied to a systems-heavy roguelike with action, progression, artifacts, missions, and layered player feedback.
"External art will feel detached from the game."	The UI focus included visual cohesion with Runix's magical pinball identity.
"We will lose control."	The studio retains design, priorities, scope approval, implementation decisions, and final approval.
"The fee or scope will change later."	Luxark's current standard is to confirm the model, fee/rate, trigger, scope, and change rules in writing before commitment.
"Are the results exaggerated?"	No numerical conversion, retention, or speed metric is claimed because the source does not provide one.

Trust standard

No generic proof. No hidden scope change. No unsupported KPI. No loss of developer control.

5. What this project demonstrates

- Luxark can support UI Art where interface clarity and game feel matter at the same time.
- The project sits inside a real production problem: layered systems must stay understandable during fast play.
- Role-specific proof is more credible than a broad claim that Luxark can “do game art.”
- The case supports outreach around UI clarity, system communication, HUD cohesion, progression readability, and launch-readiness polish.

Evidence boundary

These are capability and outcome-framing statements based on Luxark's documented UI Art role and the public structure of Runix. They are not audited player-behavior metrics.

6. Buyer value: lower cost and raise performance

The case is most persuasive when it shows not only what Luxark did, but how the engagement reduced the buyer's burden and improved the buyer's result.

Buyer cost reduced

Buyer burden	Luxark control
Broad portfolio review	A role-specific proof and focused shortlist reduce irrelevant UI / art review.
Production-lead time	The need is translated into systems, readability, hierarchy, and milestone requirements before profiles are sent.
Mismatch and rework risk	Contribution, engine relevance, availability, limitations, and implementation fit are surfaced before serious review.
Generic recruiter translation	The studio receives production language tied to action, progression, artifacts, missions, and player feedback.

Buyer performance raised

Performance objective	How the engagement supports it
Player-facing clarity	UI support is positioned around readable action and understandable progression, not decoration alone.
Visual cohesion	Menus, HUD, and systems communication stay connected to the magical pinball identity.
Sharper evaluation	The Art Lead receives exact contribution notes and suggested technical / production interview focus.
Faster qualified review	Luxark begins from a specialist lane and reconfirms the closest current matches rather than sending volume.

Linked activity chain

Systems need -> role qualification -> UI / technical fit verification -> focused review -> studio-controlled implementation and approval

The advantage comes from the linked path - qualification, fit, control, communication, review, and outcome capture - rather than from a case-study PDF by itself.

7. Evidence standard and the next proof layer

This document separates project evidence from Luxark operating standards so the buyer can see what happened, what is attributed, and what must still be confirmed for a new engagement.

Evidence level	What is supported
Verified project facts	• Luxark handled UI Art for Runix. • Runix is a systems-heavy pinball roguelike with action, progression, artifacts, powers, missions, enemies, and replayability. • The case supports a role-specific conversation about UI readability and system communication.
Source-attributed outcome	No numerical outcome is attributed because the available source does not provide one.
Luxark current operating standard	Studio control, focused submissions, known-limitations disclosure, current availability checks, and written commercial terms are Luxark operating standards - not reconstructed historical contract terms.
Not claimed	No conversion uplift, retention increase, time saved, revenue effect, or Technical Art result is claimed without supporting evidence.

What a live submission still needs to prove

- Candidate Fit Brief: exact contribution, engine / tools, production stage, availability, compensation alignment, and known limitations.
- Production-Readiness Scorecard: autonomy, feedback behavior, communication, file organization, and blocker escalation.
- Role-specific portfolio evidence: UI systems, hierarchy, HUD, icons, implementation, or adjacent technical work as required.

The complete trust sequence

Email makes the promise. The case study shows the behavior. The Candidate Fit Brief proves the person. The proposal locks the fee, scope, ownership, approval, and continuity terms.

Case-study use guardrail

Use this case primarily for UI Art, UI systems, gameplay readability, and systems-heavy visual communication. Use it for Technical Art, VFX, animation, or engine implementation only when paired with role-specific candidate evidence.

8. Best-fit Luxark niches

Best use	How this proof should be positioned
UI Artist / UI Systems	Readability, hierarchy, progression communication, and visual cohesion.
Technical Artist	Use as adjacent proof when the need connects art to engine, implementation, or system clarity; pair with a technical fit brief.
Real-Time VFX	Use when the buyer's problem is feedback readability or gameplay communication; pair with VFX-specific evidence.
Technical Animation	Use for systems-heavy teams only as adjacent proof; pair with rigging/runtime evidence.
Systems-heavy indie / AA	Strongest fit for roguelike, strategy, ARPG, action, and progression-heavy teams.

9. Three stakeholders. Three types of trust

The same case study may be forwarded from an artist lead to Talent Acquisition and then to an executive. Each person needs a different risk answered, while the underlying project facts stay consistent.

Connection level	Quiet fear	What this case and Luxark process answer
Senior Artist / Lead	Will this specialist create more work, weaken my authority, or take my job?	The documented Luxark contribution was UI Art. The case does not claim ownership of Runix system design, gameplay direction, or studio leadership. In Luxark's current supplemental model, internal leads retain system direction, priorities, reviews, and final approval while the specialist handles a bounded clarity or production gap.
Recruiter / Talent Acquisition	Will Luxark duplicate, bypass, flood, misrepresent, or create ownership and fee problems?	Role-specific evaluation is more useful than title matching. Luxark limits submissions, documents contribution and limitations, respects the studio's routing process, and confirms ownership and fee triggers in writing before movement.
Executive / Founder	Will this cost too much, reduce control, create administration, or fail to protect the milestone?	The business case is milestone clarity: reinforce player-facing readability without transferring product control. Commercial terms, scope changes, and approval points are documented before commitment.

The quiet artist-level question: "Will this person take my job?"

Luxark should never promise that a role is non-replacement without confirming the studio's actual intent. Before outreach or presentation, the need should be classified as supplemental capacity, a newly created specialist function, or a replacement search.

When the engagement is supplemental

The internal lead retains Gameplay and systems direction; UI/UX priorities; technical constraints; review standards; scope approval; final implementation approval. The external specialist receives a defined scope: Defined UI Art, readability, visual communication, implementation support, or polish tasks approved by the studio. Any change to scope, authority, reporting lines, or engagement purpose requires studio approval.

The purpose is to remove production pressure, preserve the internal lead's visibility and credit, and prevent a temporary support role from quietly expanding without approval.

Three trust gates

Technical trust earns the lead's support. Process trust earns the recruiter's cooperation. Commercial trust earns executive approval.

10. Engagement paths and next step

Path	How it works
Direct specialist placement	The studio hires and directs the specialist; Luxark sources and vets.
Embedded specialist	One UI or technical specialist joins the existing workflow temporarily.
Scoped polish sprint	A defined readability, UI, icon, HUD, or launch-presentation need is completed against an approved scope.
Hybrid path	Start with a small scoped engagement, then expand or convert only through written approval.

Need players to understand the game faster? Start with the systems, the milestone, and the exact clarity problem.