Research & Analysis Prompts

Systematically evaluate any claim, idea, or strategy by stress-testing its logic, assumptions, counterarguments, edge cases, and real-world constraints.
Difficulty: Intermediate
Model: ChatGPT / Claude
Use Case: Critical Thinking & Validation
Updated: May 2026
Why This Prompt Exists
Most ideas fail not because they are obviously wrong—but because they are never properly challenged.

People tend to:

- accept assumptions without testing them
- ignore weak points in their own reasoning
- overestimate supporting evidence
- underestimate counterarguments
- confuse confidence with correctness

This creates strategies, arguments, and decisions that collapse under real-world pressure.

This framework forces structured skepticism—without emotional bias—so ideas are tested before they are implemented or believed.

The Prompt

```
Assume the role of a senior critical analyst, research evaluator, and strategic skeptic specializing in logic evaluation, epistemology, and decision risk analysis.
```

Your task is to rigorously stress-test the following claim, idea, or strategy.

Before generating conclusions, analyze:
- underlying assumptions
- logical structure
- supporting evidence strength
- missing counterarguments
- edge cases and exceptions
- real-world feasibility
- incentive misalignment
- unintended consequences

Then generate the following:

1. Clear Restatement of the Claim
2. Core Assumptions Identified
3. Strength of Supporting Logic
4. Weak Points in the Argument
5. Strongest Counterarguments
6. Edge Cases That Break the Claim
7. Real-World Constraints
8. Evidence Quality Assessment
9. Hidden Biases or Incentives
10. Scenarios Where the Claim Fails
11. Scenarios Where the Claim Holds True
12. Risk Assessment
13. Final Verdict (Support / Reject / Partially Support)
14. Reasoned Explanation of Verdict

```
INPUTS:

Claim / Idea:
[INSERT CLAIM]

Context:
[INSERT CONTEXT]

Stakeholders:
[WHO IS AFFECTED]

Intended Outcome:
[WHAT THIS CLAIM IS SUPPOSED TO ACHIEVE]

RULES:
- Do not assume the claim is correct
- Act as a skeptical evaluator, not an assistant
- Prioritize truth over agreement
- Explicitly highlight weaknesses
- Separate facts from interpretation
- Be intellectually honest, even if conclusions are negative
```

How To Use It

- Use this before committing to major strategic decisions or investments.
- Apply it to your own ideas first to identify blind spots early.
- Compare outputs against alternative perspectives or experts when possible.
- Re-run with updated assumptions if new evidence appears.
- Do not use it to confirm beliefs—use it to challenge them.

Example Input

Claim: AI automation will replace most entry-level software engineering jobs within 5 years

Context: Industry forecasting for hiring strategy

Stakeholders: developers, tech companies, bootcamps

Intended Outcome: workforce planning and education decisions

Why It Works
Most reasoning fails because it is confirmatory instead of adversarial.

This framework improves thinking by forcing:

- structured skepticism instead of intuition
- explicit assumption testing
- systematic counterargument generation
- risk and edge-case evaluation
- intellectual honesty over narrative comfort

Strong thinking is not about being right quickly.

It is about being wrong less often over time.

Build Better AI Systems

Subscribe for advanced research workflows, analytical frameworks, prompt engineering systems, and decision-making tools for builders and thinkers.

Carefully engineered prompts for people doing real work.

Share this:

- Share on Facebook (Opens in new window) Facebook
- Share on X (Opens in new window) X