



ASCENDEA

AI / BUSINESS GROWTH / PROMPT PACK

Humanise Your AI-Assisted Copy — A Practical Prompt Workbook for UK Small Businesses

A beginner-friendly, UK-focused workbook of 43 structured prompts for briefing, drafting, editing, checking and improving AI-assisted business content while retaining human judgement and verification.



Author: Rob Arnold

ascendea.ai

Your route through this resource

Use and draft notice	4
The hybrid writing principle.....	4
Before you paste anything into an AI tool	5
Your one-page content brief	6
1. Notice the patterns that make copy feel generic	6
2. Give the tool the right job and context	8
3. Capture and maintain your business voice.....	10
4. Edit the draft so it earns attention.....	11
5. Build a repeatable writing workflow	13
6. Prompts for common small-business content formats.....	15
7. Check quality before a real reader sees it	17
8. Develop a point of view without faking authority.....	18
9. Help a team write consistently	20
10. Measure learning, not vanity	21
A practical starting sequence.....	23
Pre-publication checklist.....	24
Your next piece: decision and action page	25

References and verification notes 25

Chapter links and PDF bookmarks support navigation. Writing areas are for handwritten or separate notes, not interactive PDF forms.

Author: Rob Arnold · Ascendea · Edition v1.0 · October 2026

<https://ascendea.ai/>

Educational guidance; not a guarantee of business results or legal, tax or personalised financial advice. This is a non-exclusive licensed-content adaptation. For your own learning and permitted end use only; no resale, redistribution, editable-source or private-label rights are granted.

A practical prompt workbook for UK small businesses

Author: Rob Arnold · Ascendea · <https://ascendea.ai/>

Edition v1.0 · October 2026

AI can help you turn a rough brief into a working draft. It cannot know your customers, check your facts, take responsibility for a claim or replace your judgement. This workbook helps you use it as an assistant in a disciplined writing process: you decide the subject, angle, evidence, boundaries and final wording.

It is for UK small-business owners and managers who write or approve content for a trades business, professional service, independent retailer or B2B firm. You do not need technical knowledge. Work through the setup pages once, then choose the prompt that matches the job in front of you.

Use and draft notice

This is a non-exclusive licensed adaptation prepared for Ascendea. It provides general educational information, not legal, tax, financial, professional, platform or cybersecurity advice. Technology, platform settings and UK guidance can change.

Provided for your own learning and permitted end use under the applicable source terms and release conditions. **No resale, redistribution, private-label, editable-source or other rights are granted.** Keep a named human responsible for final wording, permissions, facts and publication decisions.

The hybrid writing principle

A useful AI-assisted workflow has four distinct jobs:

Job	What you do	What the AI may help with	Your final responsibility
Decide	Choose the customer, purpose, evidence and boundary	Ask useful questions or structure a brief	The offer, claims and priorities
Draft	Supply approved context and ask for a specific first draft	Produce options, outlines and plain-language rewrites	Accuracy and suitability

Job	What you do	What the AI may help with	Your final responsibility
Edit	Add real detail, a considered point of view and appropriate tone	Highlight repetition or suggest alternatives	The final words and voice
Check	Verify facts, permissions, links, numbers and audience impact	Create a checklist or flag uncertainty	Publishing, approval and records

The working rule: treat every output as an unverified first draft. Do not publish it simply because it reads smoothly.

Before you paste anything into an AI tool

Use only an account and tool your business has approved. Do not paste passwords, API keys, bank details, special-category personal data, confidential customer information, unpublished contracts or identifiable customer stories unless the appropriate business, privacy and supplier checks have been completed. Use placeholders, redacted extracts or fictional examples whenever they will do.

The ICO says UK GDPR can apply when business contact details are personal data, and its AI guidance is under review following the Data (Use and Access) Act. The NCSC also advises organisations to consider incorrect outputs, prompt injection and confidentiality throughout an AI system's lifecycle. These are sensible reasons to keep a named human in charge of content and inputs; they are **not** a compliance guarantee. Recheck the official guidance before changing your process.

A simple safe-input checklist

Before each prompt, answer these questions:

- Is this information mine to use, or do I have permission?
- Can I replace names, account numbers, addresses and customer identifiers with [CLIENT], [DATE] or a fictional example?
- Does the tool or account meet our current supplier and data-handling requirements?
- Would a misleading, incorrect or unauthorised output cause harm if it were sent or published?
- Who will check the result before it is used?

If you cannot answer the last two questions, pause and ask the relevant manager or adviser. Do not turn the prompt into an automatic publishing or sending step.

Your one-page content brief

Complete this before using drafting prompts. A short, clear brief prevents hours of vague editing.

Brief field	Write your answer
Content type and channel	_____
Reader and their immediate situation	_____
One useful outcome for the reader	_____
Business purpose of this piece	_____
Main point or angle we can support	_____
Evidence, examples or approved sources available	_____
Facts, prices, offers or statements needing a human check	_____
Tone: three words and any boundaries	_____
Call to action, if any	_____
Named reviewer and publishing decision	_____

1. Notice the patterns that make copy feel generic

AI-detection scores are not reliable proof of authorship. The prompts in this section are editorial tools: they help you notice vague language, monotonous rhythm and unsupported certainty. They do not tell you whether a person or tool wrote a passage.

Prompt 1 — Editorial pattern scan

Act as an editorial reviewer, not an AI detector. Review the text below for signals that make it feel generic or impersonal.

Look for:

- fashionable or vague words that do not add meaning;
- repeated sentence shapes or a flat rhythm;

- claims without a concrete example, source or limit;
- empty empathy or over-polished transitions; and
- sections that could apply to almost any business.

Return a table with: excerpt, why it may weaken the reader's trust, and one practical revision direction. Do not claim to identify whether a human or AI wrote it. Do not invent facts. End with the three edits that would make the biggest difference.

Text:

[PASTE A SHORT, APPROVED OR REDACTED EXTRACT]

Prompt 2 — The safe-average trap

I think this draft is playing safe. Explain, in plain English, where it chooses broad, predictable wording instead of a useful point of view. Do not claim to know the model's probabilities or training data.

For each of three weak passages:

1. quote the passage;
2. say what information or decision is missing; and
3. write a question I should answer before revising it.

Then suggest three prompt constraints that could produce a more specific second draft without inventing evidence.

Draft:

[PASTE TEXT]

Business context:

[WHAT WE ACTUALLY KNOW]

Prompt 3 — Abstract-to-concrete language audit

Review this draft for abstract phrases such as "better service", "streamlined process", "quality solution" or "unlock potential". Create a two-column table.

Column 1: the vague word or phrase.

Column 2: a question that would help a writer replace it with a truthful, observable detail.

Do not make up sensory detail, performance figures or customer experiences. After the table, rewrite one paragraph using only details already present in the material I provide. Mark any missing detail as [NEEDS EVIDENCE].

Draft and approved facts:

[PASTE]

2. Give the tool the right job and context

Good prompting starts before the prompt. Give the tool a bounded task, factual material it may use and a clear instruction on what it must not assume.

Prompt 4 — Four-part content brief interview

Help me turn a rough idea into a usable content brief. Ask one question at a time and wait for my answer.

Cover four areas:

1. Role: what business expertise or perspective should guide the piece?
2. Reader: who is the specific UK customer or decision-maker, and what are they trying to do?
3. Outcome: what should they understand or be able to do after reading?
4. Boundaries: which facts are approved, what must not be claimed, and what tone or format limits apply?

When enough detail is available, produce a one-page brief and a draft prompt. Label assumptions clearly. Do not write the final content until I approve the brief.

Starting topic:
[TOPIC]

Prompt 5 — Pre-draft alignment check

Before drafting [CONTENT TYPE] about [TOPIC], show me your working understanding in four short sections:

- reader and their likely need;
- main angle and supporting evidence;
- tone and structure; and
- claims, information or decisions that require human confirmation.

Ask only the essential follow-up questions. Do not draft the full piece until I reply “approved”.

Context and approved material:
[PASTE]

Prompt 6 — Productive constraints

Draft a [CONTENT TYPE] for [AUDIENCE] about [TOPIC]. The useful outcome is [OUTCOME].

Use only the approved facts below. If a fact is absent, write [NEEDS CONFIRMATION] rather than guessing.

Constraints:

- avoid these words or phrases: [LIST];
- keep sentences mostly under [NUMBER] words where this improves clarity;
- use one labelled fictional example if no real approved example exists;
- take this evidence-supported position: [POSITION];
- use a direct, respectful second-person voice;
- do not make outcome, legal, health, financial or compliance promises; and
- finish with a human-review checklist, not a publish-ready claim.

Approved material:

[PASTE]

Prompt 7 — Voice reference, not imitation

Use the writing samples below as references for our business's own voice. Identify reusable features such as sentence length, directness, formatting, vocabulary level and point of view.

Then draft [CONTENT TYPE] about [TOPIC] using those features while creating new wording and new ideas. Do not imitate a named author, public figure or recognisable living writer. Use only samples that I own or am authorised to use. Do not copy phrases unless I identify them as approved boilerplate.

Voice samples:

[PASTE 2–3 APPROVED SAMPLES]

Approved facts for the new piece:

[PASTE]

Prompt 8 — Build an approved example library

Organise the approved writing samples below into a reusable reference library. For each sample, extract only short descriptions of its technique, not long copied passages.

Classify each technique as:

- opening approach;
- explaining a useful idea;
- proof or example handling;
- transition; or
- closing / call to action.

For each entry, note when it would be appropriate, when it would not, and any evidence needed. Finish with a short "voice ingredients" list.

Samples I own or have permission to use:

[PASTE]

3. Capture and maintain your business voice

A style guide is a helpful guardrail, not a disguise. It should describe how your organisation communicates now and be updated when the business, customers or services change.

Prompt 9 — Voice profile from your own work

Analyse the following approved writing samples to create a practical voice profile. Do not summarise the subject matter and do not judge the writers.

Describe:

- sentence length and rhythm;
- formality, directness and warmth;
- vocabulary and jargon choices;
- point of view (we, you, I) and when it changes;
- useful rhetorical devices;
- formatting habits; and
- strength of opinion and appropriate caveats.

For every observation, cite a short example or mark it as tentative. Then list five features that should not be copied because they are one-off or context-specific.

Approved samples:

[PASTE 3–5 SAMPLES]

Prompt 10 — Make a compact style guide

Turn the approved voice profile below into a practical style guide for our team.

Create:

1. A persona paragraph describing the expertise, attitude and reader relationship we want to convey.
2. Eight to ten “do” rules that are observable when editing.
3. Eight to ten “avoid” rules, including weak transitions or claims we should not make.
4. A short verification rule: use only approved facts and flag uncertainty.

Do not claim this will make every draft sound identical. Make it suitable for human editors as well as AI tools.

Voice profile:

[PASTE]

Prompt 11 — Compress a style guide without losing safeguards

Reduce this style guide into a short instruction block for a tool with a limited instruction field.

Keep: audience, tone, sentence preferences, approved vocabulary, prohibited claims, evidence rule and human-review requirement.

Remove: explanations, duplicate rules and aspirational language.

Show:

- the compressed version;
- a list of the important rules retained; and
- any rule that was too nuanced to compress safely.

Style guide:

[PASTE]

Prompt 12 — Check for healthy voice change

Compare our earlier style guide with recent approved writing. Identify genuine changes in tone, reader, vocabulary or format.

Separate your findings into:

- retained strengths;
- useful changes to consider adopting;
- inconsistency that needs a decision; and
- evidence that is too thin to judge.

Recommend no more than five specific updates. Do not treat variation across formats as a problem by default.

Earlier guide:

[PASTE]

Recent approved samples:

[PASTE]

4. Edit the draft so it earns attention

Humanising does not mean making a piece sloppy or inserting false personal stories. It means adding real choices: a useful detail, a supported opinion, a clear limit or a rhythm that matches the reader's task.

Prompt 13 — Rhythm edit

Act as a copy editor. Review this draft for repetitive sentence length and paragraph shape.

First, mark three to five places where a shorter sentence could improve emphasis and two places where closely related ideas could be combined. Then offer a revised version.

Keep every fact unchanged. Do not introduce fragments if they would confuse the reader or make regulated, safety or legal content less clear. Provide a brief edit note explaining the changes.

Draft:
[PASTE]

Prompt 14 — Ground an abstract draft

This draft feels abstract. Identify missing concrete information without inventing it.

For each weak passage, suggest one of these evidence types that would make it clearer: a process step, an object or screen a reader would see, a bounded example, a customer question, a measurable definition or a source.

Then revise only using approved facts below. Where a specific detail is required but unavailable, insert [ADD APPROVED DETAIL]. Avoid decorative description that does not help the reader.

Draft:
[PASTE]
Approved facts:
[PASTE]

Prompt 15 — Replace weak hedging with an honest position

Find up to three places where the draft hides behind vague hedging such as “may”, “can”, “often” or “some people say”. For each, decide whether:

- the uncertainty is necessary and should remain;
- a more precise evidence-supported statement is possible; or
- the claim should be removed.

Show the original sentence and a safer replacement. Do not manufacture a provocative opinion or turn uncertainty into certainty.

Draft:
[PASTE]

Evidence available:
[PASTE]

Prompt 16 — Full editorial pass

Edit this AI-assisted draft for a real small-business audience.

Apply these checks in order:

1. clarity and structure;
2. repeated or generic wording;
3. concrete, approved detail;
4. claims, numbers and examples needing verification;
5. tone and sentence rhythm; and
6. call to action and next step.

Return: (a) a marked issue list, (b) a clean revised draft, and (c) an editor's handover with items a named human must verify. Keep factual uncertainty visible.

Draft:

[PASTE]

Style guide and source material:

[PASTE]

Prompt 17 — Concrete wording workshop

Create a revision worksheet for this paragraph. In a two-column table, list vague phrases and a specific question that would help replace each one truthfully.

Do not provide invented replacements. Then show one revised version using only details already present, followed by a second version with [DETAIL TO CONFIRM] markers where stronger wording would need evidence.

Paragraph:

[PASTE]

5. Build a repeatable writing workflow

Prompt 18 — Tool instruction blocks

Using the approved brief and style guide below, prepare two portable instruction blocks that can be copied into any suitable writing tool.

Block A: "About our business and reader" – include role, customer, expertise, permitted source material and boundaries.

Block B: “How to help us write” – include style, structure, fact-checking markers and human-review rules.

Keep them provider-neutral. Do not assume a particular tool’s custom-instruction limit or data settings. Do not include credentials, customer data or confidential material.

Brief and guide:
[PASTE]

Prompt 19 — Content workflow designer

Design a beginner-friendly AI-assisted workflow for [CONTENT TYPE]. Use this format for every step: owner, trigger/input, numbered actions, output, and exception/human fallback.

The workflow must cover:

1. choosing the reader and goal;
2. gathering approved facts and permissions;
3. briefing the tool;
4. drafting;
5. human editing;
6. fact, legal/compliance and link checks where relevant;
7. approval and publishing; and
8. a simple record of what changed.

Keep automation out of publishing and sending. If information is missing or sensitive, the fallback must be “pause and ask the named owner”.

Current process and pain points:
[PASTE]

Prompt 20 — Reinvest time in better inputs

Help me decide how to use any time freed by drafting assistance. Do not assume that time savings will occur.

Ask me for my actual weekly content workload and the quality problem I want to solve. Then create a one-week planning template with time blocks for:

- customer research or sales conversations;
- evidence gathering;
- developing a useful point of view;
- collecting approved stories or examples;
- editing and checking; and
- a short review of what worked.

Label all time estimates as illustrative and leave space for my own figures.

Prompt 21 — Signal-over-volume review

Review our recent content list and tell us whether the mix appears to prioritise useful, distinctive information or merely more output.

Ask for evidence before reaching conclusions. Assess:

- duplication of topics;
- balance of customer questions, evidence and promotional posts;
- whether each piece has a clear job;
- opportunities to replace a weak piece with research or a better example; and
- one modest experiment for the next period.

Do not infer audience trust or business results from titles alone.

Content list, aims and available metrics:

[PASTE]

6. Prompts for common small-business content formats

Prompt 22 — LinkedIn post planning and draft

Draft a LinkedIn post of approximately [RANGE] words for [AUDIENCE] about [TOPIC]. Start from a specific, supportable observation rather than a generic announcement.

Use short paragraphs for readability. Include one approved example, a clear takeaway and a relevant question or next step. Avoid exaggerated hooks, hashtag stuffing, false urgency and corporate clichés.

Before the draft, list any claim that needs checking. Do not treat a suggested length or engagement style as a platform rule or performance guarantee.

Approved context:

[PASTE]

Prompt 23 — Three-email sequence with a marketing check

Plan a three-email sequence for [GOAL] and [AUDIENCE]. For each email provide: subject line, opening, useful message, one clear call to action and sign-off. Keep each concise and conversational.

First ask whether this is service information for existing customers or direct marketing. If it is direct marketing, produce a “send only after review” checklist that asks about:

- the recipient's status (for example, company/LLP versus sole trader or other partnership);
- channel and any consent/exception required;
- privacy information and lawful handling of personal data;
- honest identity and a valid opt-out route; and
- suppression of objections.

Do not send, schedule or imply legal compliance. Use a placeholder for required privacy and opt-out wording.

Audience and offer:
[PASTE]

The ICO's current B2B marketing page distinguishes corporate subscribers from sole traders and some partnerships, and says its guidance is under review. Check the latest [ICO business-to-business marketing guidance](#) before using outreach.

Prompt 24 — Evidence-led blog outline

Create a blog outline about [TOPIC] for [AUDIENCE]. Do not draft the article yet.

Include:

- a direct opening problem or observation;
- what the reader will be able to decide or do;
- three to five sections, each with one non-obvious useful point;
- evidence or an approved example needed for every section;
- a logical transition between sections; and
- a practical next step, not a generic summary.

Flag any requested statistic, comparison or claim that needs a reliable source. Do not invent research.

Brief and available material:
[PASTE]

Prompt 25 — Case-study evidence interview

Help me collect the facts for a truthful case study. Ask up to ten focused questions about the situation, agreed work, measurement period, evidence, limitations, customer permission and approval of wording.

Do not ask for unnecessary personal or confidential information. Do not invent emotion, quotations, percentages or "surprise" outcomes.

When I have answered, create a case-study outline with sections for context, problem, approach, observed result, limitations and approved next step. Mark it "do not publish until customer permission and factual checks are complete".

Notes I am authorised to use:
[PASTE]

Prompt 26 — Adapt a long-form voice for a channel

Help adapt this approved long-form piece for [CHANNEL]. First explain the channel constraints I need to confirm myself, such as audience expectation, current platform rules, length and links.

Then create a channel-specific writing guide covering: what to preserve from our voice, what to simplify, how to keep the central point, and how to avoid overclaiming. Provide up to three draft options, clearly labelled as drafts for human review.

Do not state an “optimal” length or promise reach, clicks or engagement.

Original piece and audience:
[PASTE]

7. Check quality before a real reader sees it

Prompt 27 — Trust and specificity review

Review this piece as a careful reader. Look for statements that sound polished but lack support, repeated transitions, vague empathy, unexplained jargon and predictable structure.

For each issue, say why it may reduce trust and propose a precise fix or a question for the writer. Do not recommend deliberate errors or fake “human messiness”. Finish with a pass / revise / do-not-publish-yet recommendation and the reason for it.

Content:
[PASTE]

Prompt 28 — Consistency check across pieces

Compare these approved pieces against our style guide. Review sentence patterns, vocabulary, point of view, formatting, evidence habits and strength of opinion.

Separate normal format differences from true voice drift. For each concern, recommend an edit, a style-guide clarification or no change. Do not rate writers as people or assume a variation is caused by AI.

Style guide:
[PASTE]
Pieces:
[PASTE]

Prompt 29 — Reader-task test

Act as a cautious member of this target audience: [DESCRIPTION]. Read the content below and answer:

1. What is the practical point?
2. Where would you pause because a claim is vague, unsupported or irrelevant?
3. What term needs defining?
4. What detail feels useful and believable?
5. What would you need before taking the suggested next step?

Base the feedback only on the text. Do not pretend to represent real customers or predict sharing, conversion or sales.

Content:
[PASTE]

Prompt 30 — Headline and opening options

Create five opening options for this piece. Use these angles: curiosity, a specific problem, a supported contrarian view, a clearly labelled fictional or approved real-world moment, and an evidence-led observation.

For each, provide a headline and opening two to three sentences. Any figure must come from a source I provide; otherwise use [SOURCE NEEDED]. Recommend one option only after comparing it with our style guide and the reader's job.

Topic, reader, evidence and style guide:
[PASTE]

8. Develop a point of view without faking authority

Prompt 31 — Defensible position builder

Help me develop a useful, defensible position about [TOPIC]. Do not assume a percentage of people holds any view.

Ask first what evidence, experience and limits I can honestly claim. Then map:

- the common approach as I describe it;
- its possible blind spots;
- my alternative view;
- reasonable counterarguments; and
- the evidence, examples or expert review needed before publishing.

End with a cautious working thesis, not a claim of proven expertise.

My context:
[PASTE]

Prompt 32 — Approved story-mining interview

Interview me to find three true, shareable moments from my work or business experience that could make a topic more useful. Ask about the situation, what I noticed, what changed and the lesson.

Do not ask me to disclose confidential customer information. Do not treat embarrassment, failure or personal information as automatically suitable to publish. For each possible story, include a permission/privacy check and a safer anonymised or fictional alternative where needed.

Topic I may write about:
[TOPIC]

Prompt 33 — Analogy workshop

Offer up to ten plain-language analogies for [COMPLEX TOPIC] for [AUDIENCE]. Draw from everyday work, home, physical objects or familiar processes rather than copyrighted characters or brands.

For each analogy, explain what it clarifies, where it breaks down and whether it could mislead the reader. Recommend no more than two for testing. Do not substitute an analogy for the technical explanation.

Prompt 34 — Personal-disclosure decision aid

I am considering sharing this personal or business story: [STORY]. Help me decide whether it belongs in content about [TOPIC].

Assess relevance, likely reader value, privacy/confidentiality risk, power dynamics, professional boundaries and details that might identify another person or client. Suggest three options: use with boundaries, use in anonymised/fictionalised form, or leave out.

Do not promise that disclosure will build trust. I make the final decision.

Prompt 35 — Translate expertise into plain English

Rewrite the technical explanation below for a non-specialist audience. Use short, progressive sentences, define necessary jargon, include one approved practical example and explain why it matters to the reader.

Keep essential caveats. Do not use a metaphor if it changes the meaning or makes a safety, legal, financial or technical decision sound simpler than it is. Mark any fact that needs an expert check.

Technical explanation:

[PASTE]

Audience:

[DESCRIBE]

9. Help a team write consistently

Prompt 36 — Team onboarding guide

Create an onboarding guide for team members who use AI assistance in our content process.

Include:

1. why AI output is a starting point, not a replacement for accountability;
2. our approved voice profile;
3. a numbered workflow from brief to publication;
4. examples of weak output and the editing principle that fixes it;
5. a pre-publication checklist; and
6. escalation rules for uncertainty, sensitive inputs, claims and customer stories.

Use owner, trigger/input, output and exception/human fallback for each workflow stage. Do not claim that the process guarantees quality or compliance.

Our material:

[PASTE]

Prompt 37 — Editorial standards review

Assess the three pieces below against our stated editorial standards. For each, return:

- decision: ready for editor / revise / hold for clarification;

- exact issue and location;
- a practical edit direction;
- whether the standard itself is unclear; and
- whether a human subject-matter, legal, privacy or brand review is needed.

Do not use a simplistic pass/fail score and do not blame the writer or tool.

Standards and pieces:
[PASTE]

Prompt 38 — Content-brief template and example

Create a standard content-brief template for our team. It must ask for reader, business purpose, desired reader outcome, approved evidence, voice, required elements, constraints, distribution channel, named reviewer and publishing decision.

Then create one filled-in **fictional example** for a UK small business. Clearly label all invented names, timing, prices and results as illustrative. Do not use personal data or testimonials.

Sample topic:
[TOPIC]

Prompt 39 — Voice audit across team members

Review samples from several team members against our shared style guide. Identify:

- techniques each sample handles well;
- patterns that vary across the group;
- rules that the style guide does not explain clearly; and
- coaching exercises focused on the work, not the person.

Do not rank people as inherently better writers. Do not attribute differences to AI use without evidence. Propose changes only where multiple samples support them.

Style guide and samples:
[PASTE]

10. Measure learning, not vanity

Content performance is context-dependent. Small data sets can be noisy, and a correlation is not proof that one hook, voice choice or AI prompt caused a result. Use measurement to decide what to examine next, not to manufacture a success story.

Prompt 40 — Content-pattern review

Analyse the content and metrics I provide. First check whether the data is comparable: time period, audience, channel, paid support, content format and metric definitions.

Then identify descriptive patterns in openings, topics, structure, evidence and calls to action. Use cautious wording such as “in this sample” and “worth testing”. Do not claim causation, predict performance or infer audience sentiment from a single metric.

Recommend three evidence-led experiments and specify what we would record.

Content and data:
[PASTE]

Prompt 41 — Writing-process tracker

Create a simple weekly tracker for our writing process. Include fields for time spent on: research and strategy, briefing, drafting, human editing, factual checks, approvals and publishing.

Also include: content purpose, reader, source/evidence status, revision count, issues found, qualitative editor assessment and any channel metric we decide is relevant. Add a comparison field for a previous manual process, but label it “not directly comparable unless task and quality are similar”.

End with three review questions that help us choose one process improvement. Do not calculate ROI or productivity savings without actual inputs.

Prompt 42 — Quarterly voice and workflow review

Conduct a quarterly review of our style guide and writing workflow using the material below. Look for changes in customer needs, offers, approved evidence, recurring editing problems and tool limitations.

Create a decision log with: observation, evidence, proposed action, owner, due date, and whether the style guide/workflow/training needs changing. Keep unresolved questions visible. Do not prescribe a fixed review frequency as a universal rule.

Recent samples, guide and workflow notes:
[PASTE]

Prompt 43 — Differentiation review without copying competitors

Compare our approved writing with competitor material that we are permitted to analyse. Identify broad category conventions, our genuine points of difference, topics we have not explained clearly and claims that need evidence before we use them.

Do not copy wording, imitate a competitor's voice or use copyrighted material beyond brief analysis. Do not say our "human fingerprint" is unique without reader evidence. Recommend three original content directions rooted in our actual expertise or customer questions.

Our sample and permitted competitor notes:
[PASTE]

A practical starting sequence

You do not need to use all 43 prompts at once. Work through this sequence when establishing a new process. Timing is flexible; spend longer where evidence, approval or customer understanding needs more attention.

Step 1 — Establish the foundation

1. Complete the one-page content brief.
2. Run Prompt 1 or 3 on one existing draft to spot a real editing pattern.
3. Use Prompt 9 with material you own or are authorised to use.
4. Create a first style guide with Prompt 10.
5. Ask a named person to approve the guide before the team adopts it.

Step 2 — Test it on one low-risk piece

1. Use Prompt 4 or 5 to agree the brief.
2. Use Prompt 24 for an outline or Prompt 22 for a short social draft.
3. Apply Prompt 16 for an editorial pass.
4. Use Prompt 27 and the final checklist below.
5. Record what the prompt got wrong, what context was missing and what helped.

Step 3 — Make the workflow repeatable

1. Use Prompt 19 to document the process.

2. Prepare safe tool instructions with Prompt 18.
3. Use Prompts 36–38 if a colleague will also draft or edit.
4. Keep customer evidence, published copy and sensitive source material in appropriate approved locations, not in a general prompt library.

Step 4 — Improve with evidence

1. Use Prompt 41 to record process time and quality observations.
2. Review a small, comparable set with Prompt 40.
3. Update the guide only where repeated evidence supports it (Prompt 42).
4. Use Prompt 20 to make a deliberate choice about any capacity you recover.

Pre-publication checklist

Use this checklist independently of the prompts.

Check	Complete?	Notes / action owner
The reader and one useful purpose are clear.	☐	_____
Every factual claim, number, price, date and comparison has an approved source or is removed.	☐	_____
Any fictional case, timing, price or result is labelled illustrative.	☐	_____
We have permission to use names, customer material, quotations, images and examples.	☐	_____
No personal, confidential or sensitive information has been exposed in the draft or tool input.	☐	_____
The copy does not offer unsupported guarantees or professional advice.	☐	_____
Links, contact details and calls to action work and are current.	☐	_____

Check	Complete?	Notes / action owner
Marketing/outreach content has had the appropriate PECR, UK GDPR and privacy review for its context.	☐	_____
A named human has reviewed and approved the final version.	☐	_____
The version, source material and publishing decision are recorded.	☐	_____

Your next piece: decision and action page

Content I will work on:

The reader and their immediate need:

The one point I can support with evidence:

The prompt(s) I will use:

Material I must not paste into a tool:

The person who will verify facts / approve the draft:

The next action, owner and date:

What I learned after publishing or deciding not to publish:

References and verification notes

- [Information Commissioner's Office — Business-to-business marketing](#). Checked 9 October 2026. This page distinguishes corporate and individual subscribers for PECR, covers business-contact personal data, and states its guidance is under review.
- [Information Commissioner's Office — Guidance on AI and data protection](#). Checked 9 October 2026. The page covers accountability, transparency, lawfulness, accuracy, fairness, security and individual rights, and is marked under review.

- [National Cyber Security Centre — AI and cyber security: what you need to know](#). Checked 9 October 2026. This non-technical guidance describes risks including incorrect output, prompt injection and data handling, and supports lifecycle security and oversight.

Editorial note: the prompts are aids to briefing, drafting and review. They do not establish the accuracy, legality, safety or suitability of an output. Recheck official guidance and provider documentation before implementation.