
RESEARCH SYNTHESIS ON A REAL DECISION

60–90 MIN

Objective. *Run a multi-source synthesis prompt on a real decision you're working through, verify two of AI's claims, and decide.*

CONCEPTS TO KEEP IN MIND

- **AI synthesis is fastest where the sources disagree.** That's where the lift is — surfacing contradictions, not summarizing consensus.
- **Verify the claims that would change your decision.** You can't verify everything; pick the load-bearing ones.
- **Hallucinations are confident.** If a claim feels surprising and well-supported, that's exactly when to verify.
- **The decision is yours.** AI synthesizes inputs; humans weigh tradeoffs. Don't outsource the call.

SCENARIO

You're deciding something this month — a vendor, a new tool, a hire, a strategy change, a personal financial move. You've been gathering inputs but haven't synthesized them. Today you do, with AI helping.

SOURCE MATERIAL

Pick **one** real decision in front of you. Then gather **3–5 inputs**:

- Articles, reports, vendor docs, transcripts of conversations with people who've decided this before
- Internal docs (sanitize first if confidential)
- Reddit / forum threads on the same decision
- Your own notes / pros-cons list

PROMPTS TO TRY

Multi-source synthesis:

[Context] I'm deciding [the decision], with criteria [your criteria – e.g., total cost, time to value, risk, fit with existing tools]. Below are [N] inputs I've gathered.

[Specific Details]

Source 1: [title or one-line summary]

[paste content or paraphrase]

Source 2: [title]

[content]

[... etc]

[Intent] Synthesize across these sources. I want to see **agreements** and **disagreements** clearly, not blended.

[Desired Format]

- Where the sources agree: 3–5 bullets
- Where they disagree: 2–4 disagreements, framed as "Source X says A, Source Y says B"
- Claims that would change my decision if true: 2–3, each marked [verifiable] with one specific way to verify
- The two open questions the inputs don't answer
- Tentative recommendation with one line of reasoning (you can be wrong)

[Constraints] Do not blend disagreements into "both/and." Surface them. If a source's claim contradicts another, name it.

Verification follow-up (use after picking which claim to verify):

I'm verifying this claim from Source X:

"[paste the exact claim]"

Help me design a 5-minute verification: what to search for, where to look, what evidence would confirm or refute it.

Explain-like-I'm-reviewing (when you want a reality check):

I'm leaning toward [tentative decision]. Argue the strongest case **against** it. Use the sources I gave you. Don't be polite – I need the actual counterargument, not a hedge.

DELIVERABLE

A short note (one page) with:

1. The decision and your criteria
2. The synthesis output (agreements / disagreements / verifiable claims)
3. The two claims you actually verified, and what you found
4. Your final decision
5. One sentence: did AI's synthesis match your own reading, or did it shift you?

SIGNS OF SUCCESS

- AI surfaced at least one disagreement you hadn't fully registered.
- You verified at least two claims yourself. At least one of them was *off* in some way (overstated, missing context, slightly wrong number).
- The decision is yours, not AI's — but the synthesis made it faster to make.
- You'd run this pipeline again on the *next* real decision instead of stewing on it for two weeks.
- You don't trust AI synthesis blindly going forward. (Hopefully: yes, that's the goal.)

Deliverable. *Your final decision plus a short note on how AI shaped it (or didn't).*