

Research & Analysis Prompts

Combine multiple perspectives, reports, and informational inputs into a structured synthesis that highlights consensus, contradictions, patterns, and actionable insight across sources.

Difficulty: Intermediate

Model: ChatGPT / Claude

Use Case: Research & Strategic Analysis

Updated: May 2026

Why This Prompt Exists

Most research fails for a simple reason: it summarizes instead of synthesizing.

People read multiple sources, then repeat what each one says individually—without ever resolving the tension between them.

Real insight comes from:

- comparing competing perspectives
- identifying agreement across sources
- highlighting contradictions and gaps
- extracting underlying assumptions
- separating signal from narrative noise

Without synthesis, research becomes repetition.

With synthesis, research becomes decision-making intelligence.

This framework forces structured integration of multiple inputs into one coherent analytical output.

The Prompt

Assume the role of a senior research analyst, strategy consultant, and investigative synthesizer specializing in cross-source analysis, epistemic evaluation, and insight generation.

Your task is to synthesize multiple informational sources into a structured, decision-ready analysis.

Before generating conclusions, analyze:

- credibility differences between sources
- areas of agreement
- areas of disagreement
- implicit assumptions
- missing information
- bias indicators
- signal vs noise
- emerging patterns

Then generate the following:

1. Executive Summary of Findings
2. Key Themes Across Sources
3. Points of Agreement
4. Points of Disagreement
5. Contradictions and Tensions
6. Underlying Assumptions
7. Missing or Underreported Information
8. Credibility Assessment of Sources
9. Emerging Patterns or Signals
10. Practical Implications

11. Strategic Insights
12. Risks and Uncertainties
13. Final Synthesized Conclusion

INPUTS:

Topic:

[INSERT TOPIC]

Sources:

[PASTE MULTIPLE SOURCES OR SUMMARIES]

Context / Objective:

[WHAT DECISION THIS RESEARCH SUPPORTS]

Audience:

[WHO THIS ANALYSIS IS FOR]

RULES:

- Do not simply summarize sources individually
- Focus on cross-source integration
- Highlight contradictions explicitly
- Distinguish fact, interpretation, and speculation
- Prioritize actionable insight over description
- Be explicit about uncertainty where it exists
- Maintain analytical neutrality

How To Use It

- Always include multiple sources—single-source input defeats the purpose of synthesis.

- Use this prompt when decisions depend on conflicting or incomplete information.
- Separate factual agreement from interpretive alignment.
- Re-run the analysis when new sources are added to track shifting consensus.
- Combine with trend analysis prompts for deeper strategic forecasting.

Example Input

Topic: Future of AI regulation in healthcare

Sources: Industry reports, government whitepapers, medical journal summaries, tech company statements

Context / Objective: Understand regulatory risk for an AI healthcare startup

Audience: founders and investors

Why It Works

Most analysis fails because it treats information sources as additive rather than relational.

This framework improves reasoning by forcing:

- cross-source comparison instead of isolated summary
- explicit contradiction mapping
- bias and credibility evaluation
- structured insight extraction
- decision-oriented synthesis

Real intelligence is not in reading more.

It is in connecting what others treat as separate.

Build Better AI Systems

Subscribe for advanced research workflows, analytical frameworks, prompt engineering systems, and practical intelligence tools for builders and decision-makers.

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](#)