



FREE PROMPT PACK

25 objection handling prompts that save *deals*.

Pulled from the Promptifi library — 2,900+ tested AI workflows for B2B sales reps. These 25 work as one system: diagnose what the objection actually means before you answer it, respond with reframes that survive a skeptic, and drill until the live version is muscle memory. Paste any prompt into ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini, fill in the brackets, and run it.

INSIDE

01	Diagnose before you respond	5 prompts
02	Price and budget	5 prompts
03	Status quo and competitors	5 prompts
04	Stalls and brush-offs	5 prompts
05	Practice until it's reflex	5 prompts



How to run this pack

- 01 Fill every {bracket} before you run a prompt — the brackets are the fuel. Vague inputs produce vague outputs; two minutes of real context is what separates these from generic advice.
- 02 Chain them. These 25 are one system: the early prompts produce briefs, angles, and evidence the later prompts are built to consume. Watch for the chain references inside each prompt.
- 03 Trust the honesty valves. When a prompt answers WEAK, NO PLAY, or TOO SMALL, that is the prompt working — it just saved you a week of effort on a dead angle.
- 04 These run as-is in ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini. Paste the whole prompt, brackets filled, and hold the model to the output format it specifies.



SECTION 01 / 05

Diagnose before you respond

Most reps answer the words. The deal-savers answer the meaning underneath. These five find it — run them before any response prompt.

PROMPT 01 · DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU RESPOND

The objection decoder

An objection is a compressed message, and reps who answer the words instead of the meaning waste their one good response on the wrong problem. 'Too expensive' alone has four meanings with four opposite answers.

You are an elite sales psychologist with deep expertise in what buyers actually mean — you know an objection is a compressed message, and that decompressing it wrong wastes the only good response you'll get to give.

Inputs — The objection, verbatim: {paste their exact words}. Where in the deal it surfaced: {first call, after demo, after pricing, late stage}. What preceded it: {what was said or shown just before}.

Method: (1) Generate the three most likely true meanings — for example, 'too expensive' can mean no budget, no perceived value, no authority, or an invitation to negotiate; the words are identical, the responses are opposites. (2) Rank the three by probability given where it surfaced and what preceded it, with one line of reasoning each. (3) For the top meaning, name whether it's logical (needs evidence) or emotional (needs safety) — because evidence thrown at fear makes fear worse. (4) Write the single diagnostic question that would confirm the reading before I commit to a response.

Constraints: never assume the surface meaning is the real one — but if it genuinely is, say SURFACE IS REAL and skip the cleverness.

Output: the three readings ranked with reasoning, logical/emotional tag, the diagnostic question.

Run this first on any objection — its diagnosis feeds every response in this pack.

PRO MOVE Make the diagnostic question a habit even when you're sure — the decode you skip is always the one that was wrong.



PROMPT 02 · DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU RESPOND

The reflex-versus-real filter

The first objection in any cold interaction is usually armor, not analysis — a learned reflex against the forty sellers who called before you. Arguing with a position nobody actually holds is how reps lose winnable conversations in fifteen seconds.

You are an expert in conversational defense mechanisms with deep expertise in the reflex objection: the automatic 'we're all set' a buyer says to any seller, which has nothing to do with you and everything to do with the forty sellers before you.

Inputs — The objection: `{verbatim}`. How early it came: `{seconds in, first email reply, first call}`. Their engagement before it: `{any, none, some}`.

Method: (1) Score reflex probability: the earlier and more generic the objection, the more likely it's armor rather than analysis — explain the score. (2) If REFLEX: the wrong move is arguing with a position they haven't actually taken. Write the sidestep — a response that neither argues nor retreats, but earns fifteen more seconds by saying something a reflex wasn't expecting. (3) If REAL: say REAL and route me to the decoder (prompt 01) instead — a genuine position deserves genuine diagnosis. (4) Either way, name the tell that would confirm which one I'm facing in their next sentence.

Constraints: the sidestep must not be a gimmick or a pattern-interrupt trick that costs dignity. Fifteen seconds of earned attention, not a hostage negotiation.

Output: the reflex score with reasoning, the sidestep or the REAL routing, the confirming tell.

Run it on early-stage objections — most first objections are reflexes, not positions.

PRO MOVE When the sidestep earns a second sentence from them, that sentence is the real conversation — treat it as the actual opening.



PROMPT 03 · DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU RESPOND

The objection map by persona

A CFO and an end user object to the same product for entirely different reasons, and preparing for the wrong persona's objections is preparing for nothing. The map's real gift is the unwinnable flag — the objection to qualify for early instead of discovering late.

You are an elite objection strategist with deep expertise in persona-specific resistance — you know a CFO and an end user object to the same product for completely different reasons, and that preparing for the wrong persona's objections is preparing for nothing.

Inputs — The persona: {job title, seniority, industry}. My product: {two sentences}. My price point: {rough}.

Method: (1) Generate this persona's five most likely objections, split into logical (budget, integration, ROI, timing) and emotional (career risk, change fatigue, vendor distrust, looking foolish) — and be honest that the emotional ones usually drive the logical ones. (2) Rank by which will surface first versus which will actually decide the deal — they're rarely the same. (3) For the top two, write the response posture in one line each — not a script yet, the stance: concede-and-reframe, evidence, or safety. (4) Name the objection I probably can't overcome with this persona, so I qualify for it early instead of discovering it late.

Constraints: no generic objections that apply to every product ever sold — everything calibrated to my price point and their seniority.

Output: the split inventory, the two rankings, the postures, the unwinnable flag.

Run it before first contact with any new persona — arrive knowing their top three.

PRO MOVE Build the map before first contact with any new persona; walking in knowing their top three changes your posture on every answer.



PROMPT 04 · DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU RESPOND

The stall autopsy

Deals rarely die on the call — they die in the silence after it, while the rep sends 'just checking in' notes at the wreckage. The autopsy starts with your own response because that's the only variable you fully control.

You are an expert deal pathologist with deep expertise in the post-objection stall — the deal that didn't die on the call but stopped breathing right after it.

Inputs — The last objection raised: {verbatim}. My response at the time: {what I said, honestly}. The silence: {how long, and what my follow-ups since have said}. Deal context: {stage, size, champion status}.

Method: (1) Autopsy my response first: did I answer the meaning or just the words? Did I accidentally confirm their fear, over-argue, or concede something that changed the deal's shape? Be specific and unsparing — I can't fix what you're polite about. (2) Generate the three most likely silence explanations, ranked: they're relitigating internally, my answer failed, or the objection was cover for a decision already made. (3) For the top explanation, write the re-engagement move — and it cannot reference the silence, express hurt, or 'bump' anything. (4) State the walk-away tripwire: the date or non-response count at which this moves to the deprioritization queue.

Constraints: if my original response was fine and the silence is just August, say so — not every stall is a crisis.

Output: the response autopsy, the ranked explanations, the re-engagement move, the tripwire.

Run it when a deal goes quiet after an objection — silence is data.

PRO MOVE Set the walk-away tripwire the day you run this, in writing — silence has a way of renegotiating deadlines you didn't write down.



PROMPT 05 · DIAGNOSE BEFORE YOU RESPOND

The pre-mortem objection forecast

Confidence before a big call is often just unexamined optimism. Assuming failure and reasoning backward surfaces the objections you've been politely not thinking about — including the one that's actually a qualification problem in costume.

You are an elite pre-mortem facilitator with deep expertise in adversarial preparation: assuming the call went badly and reasoning backward to why, so the failure gets handled in rehearsal instead of live.

Inputs — The call: {who, what stage, what I'm presenting or asking}. What I know about them: {paste context}. What I'm most afraid they'll say: {honest answer}.

Method: (1) Assume the call failed. Generate the five most plausible causes of failure, at least three of which must be objections or pushbacks — and include the one I named as my fear, examined honestly rather than reassured away. (2) For each objection-type cause, write the strongest version of it — the way their sharpest stakeholder would phrase it, not the strawman version I'd prefer. (3) For each strongest version, give me the response stance and the first two sentences I'd say. (4) Identify the one failure cause that preparation can't fix — the one that's a qualification problem wearing an objection costume.

Constraints: no comfort. The strongest versions must actually sting — a pre-mortem that flatters me is a waste of both our time.

Output: the five causes, the strongest-version objections, the stances with openers, the qualification flag.

Run it before any high-stakes call — walk in having already heard the worst.

PRO MOVE Do it 48 hours out, not the night before — you need one working day to act on what it finds.



SECTION 02 / 05

Price and budget

Price objections are almost never about the number. These five find what they're about — and defend value without touching the discount lever first.

PROMPT 06 · PRICE AND BUDGET

The 'too expensive' reframe engine

Price objections are almost never about the number — they're about the comparison hiding behind it: your price versus their budget, a rival, doing nothing, or their guess. Find the comparison and the response writes itself; miss it and you're negotiating against a ghost.

You are an elite value negotiator with deep expertise in the price objection — you know 'too expensive' is always relative to something, and that the entire response depends on finding the comparison hiding in the sentence.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. My price: {number and structure}. The value case I've made so far: {what they've seen}. Decoder output if I ran it: {paste from prompt 01, optional}.

Method: (1) Identify the hidden comparison: expensive versus their budget, versus a competitor, versus doing nothing, or versus their guess of what this should cost. Each needs a different response — name which one the evidence points to. (2) Write the reframe for that comparison: anchor the price against the cost of the problem, not against the number itself — using only figures I've given you or they've admitted. (3) Include one question in the response that makes them price the problem out loud, because their number persuades them more than mine does. (4) State what I concede if pressed — and it should be scope or timing, never just price, because a naked discount teaches them the price was fiction.

Constraints: no invented ROI figures. No defensiveness. Under 120 words for the spoken response.

Output: the comparison diagnosis, the reframe, the pricing-the-problem question, the concession ladder.

Run it on any price pushback — after the decoder (prompt 01) has read it.

PRO MOVE The pricing-the-problem question is the pivot — their number persuades them in a way your number never will.



PROMPT 07 · PRICE AND BUDGET

The no-budget navigator

'No budget' from a director and 'no budget' from a CFO are different sentences — one means no authority, the other means no money. The four readings have four different next moves, and the wrong one wastes a quarter.

You are an expert in budget dynamics with deep expertise in how money actually moves inside companies — you know 'no budget' can mean no money, no line item, no priority, or no authority, and that these four have four different next moves.

Inputs — Their words and who said them: {verbatim, plus title}. Company context: {size, health signals, fiscal timing if known}. My price: {rough}. The pain we've established: {one sentence}.

Method: (1) Read which of the four meanings fits, from the speaker's seniority and the company context — a director's 'no budget' and a CFO's 'no budget' are different sentences. (2) Write the response for that reading: for no-line-item, the found-money paths (existing categories this could live under); for no-priority, the reframe that attaches it to something already funded; for no-authority, the multi-thread move; for genuinely-no-money, the graceful park with a fiscal-calendar re-entry date. (3) Give me the one question that distinguishes 'no budget now' from 'no budget ever.' (4) If the honest read is that the pain isn't big enough to create budget, say PAIN PROBLEM — budget objections are sometimes value objections in accounting clothes.

Constraints: never coach them to sneak spending past finance. Respect a real no.

Output: the reading with reasoning, the tailored response, the distinguishing question, any PAIN PROBLEM flag.

Run it on 'there's no budget for this' — a sentence with four different meanings.

PRO MOVE Learn their fiscal calendar the first time budget comes up; every later timing decision gets easier.



PROMPT 08 · PRICE AND BUDGET

The cost-of-nothing calculator

Unquantified pain doesn't get budget — it gets sympathy. Conservative arithmetic built from their own admitted numbers is the strongest artifact in the deal, because attacking it means attacking their own inputs.

You are an elite business-case builder with deep expertise in cost-of-inaction math — the arithmetic that turns 'we'll live with it' into a number nobody wants to sign their name to.

Inputs — The problem, as they've described it: {their words}. The raw quantities they've admitted: {hours, people, error rates, deals, whatever numbers exist}.

Reasonable unit costs: {loaded salary, deal size — mark which are mine versus theirs}. My price: {number}.

Method: (1) Build the annual cost of the status quo using conservative arithmetic — round down at every step, show every line of math, and separate their numbers from my assumptions so they can attack the assumptions without the whole case collapsing. (2) Stress-test it: which single input, if challenged, hurts the case most? Pre-write the honest answer to that challenge. (3) Express the result three ways: annual cost, cost per month of delay, and the multiple of my price — the delay framing is usually the one that moves late-stage deals. (4) Write the two sentences I'd say aloud to introduce the math without sounding like a spreadsheet.

Constraints: conservative beats impressive — a number they can't argue with is worth three they can. If their admitted quantities can't support any credible math, say NOT YET and give me the two questions that would get the missing numbers.

Output: the line-by-line math, the stress test, the three framings, the spoken introduction.

Run it when they agree there's a problem but won't price it — make inaction expensive.

PRO MOVE Round down at every step on purpose; a number they can't argue with is worth three impressive ones they can.



PROMPT 09 · PRICE AND BUDGET

The discount request counter

How you handle the first discount ask sets your price integrity for the customer's lifetime — a naked concession teaches them the price was fiction all along. Trades preserve integrity: anything given freely is worthless, anything traded has value.

You are an expert commercial negotiator with deep expertise in the discount request — you know that how a seller handles the first ask sets the price integrity for the entire customer lifetime.

Inputs — The ask: {verbatim — how much, from whom}. Deal context: {size, stage, competition, how badly I need it this quarter — be honest}. What flexibility I actually have: {the real floor and the non-price levers: term length, payment timing, scope, start date, references}.

Method: (1) Diagnose the ask: procurement ritual (they're paid to ask), budget reality, or leverage test — the response differs. (2) Build the trade menu: for each non-price lever I have, what I'd give and what I'd require in return — because in negotiation, anything given freely is worthless and anything traded has value. (3) Write the response that holds price while opening the menu: warm, unhurried, and explicitly conditional — 'if you can do X, I can look at Y.' (4) Define my walk-away line and the sentence I'd use at it, so I never improvise under pressure.

Constraints: never concede a naked discount in the first response — even if I'll eventually flex, the first move is always a trade. Never let my quarter-end desperation into the words.

Output: the diagnosis, the trade menu, the response, the walk-away line.

Run it the moment procurement or the buyer asks for a number off.

PRO MOVE Write your walk-away line before the call, verbatim — concessions decided live under pressure are always too generous.



PROMPT 10 · PRICE AND BUDGET

The budget-cycle timing play

'Come back next fiscal year' is either a polite goodbye or a genuine planning opening, and the difference is whether you get written into the plan. Companies fund line items, and line items get drafted months before the money moves.

You are an elite fiscal strategist with deep expertise in budget cycles — you know 'next year's budget' is either a polite goodbye or a genuine planning opportunity, and the difference is whether you get written into the plan.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. Their fiscal calendar: {year end if known, or company type so we can infer}. Deal context: {stage, champion strength, pain level}. Today's date: {date}.

Method: (1) Test sincerity: a real budget park comes with specifics — a planning month, a named process, an owner. Write the one question that separates the real park from the polite goodbye. (2) If real: map their planning calendar backward — when budgets get drafted, who submits line items, what documentation a champion needs to write us in — and turn my champion into the person who does it, with the exact artifact I should hand them (a one-paragraph business case they can paste). (3) Design the bridge: what small, low-cost engagement between now and then keeps us the incumbent-in-waiting — pilot, workshop, or quarterly value review. (4) Set the calendar: the three touch dates between now and the planning window, each with its purpose.

Constraints: if the park is a goodbye, say GOODBYE and route to the graceful exit instead of building a fantasy calendar.

Output: the sincerity question, the planning map with the champion artifact, the bridge, the dated touches.

Run it on 'come back next fiscal year' — a park request that can become a plan.

PRO MOVE Hand your champion the one-paragraph business case artifact — the rep who makes the internal paperwork easy is the one who's in the budget.



SECTION 03 / 05

Status quo and competitors

The real enemy is rarely the competitor — it's the comfort of doing nothing. These five compete with inertia, incumbents, and the build-it-ourselves dream.

PROMPT 11 · STATUS QUO AND COMPETITORS

The happy-with-current-vendor response

Attacking a tool the buyer chose is attacking the buyer's judgment — the conversation ends politely and permanently. 'Satisfied' and 'well-served' are different states, and the gap question is how you find out which one you're facing without a fight.

You are an elite displacement strategist with deep expertise in incumbent dynamics — you know attacking a tool the buyer chose is attacking the buyer's judgment, and that satisfied is not the same as well-served.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. The incumbent: {name if known}. My honest edge over them: {one or two sentences — real differences, not marketing}. My relationship stage with this buyer: {cold, warm, mid-conversation}.

Method: (1) Validate the choice sincerely — one sentence that makes clear I'm not here to call their baby ugly, because defensiveness ends conversations. (2) Introduce the gap question: the one thing my product does that theirs structurally can't — framed as a question about their experience, not a claim about my superiority: 'how are you handling X today?' works because if the incumbent handles X well, I should leave anyway. (3) Offer the no-pressure calibration: a reason to talk that doesn't require them to be unhappy — benchmark, second data point for renewal leverage, or future-planning input. (4) Define my honest exit: if they're genuinely well-served, the classy withdrawal that leaves me first in line when something changes.

Constraints: never disparage the incumbent. Never manufacture dissatisfaction. The gap question must be real — if I don't have a structural edge, say NO EDGE and tell me this is a timing play, not a displacement play.

Output: the validation line, the gap question, the calibration offer, the exit.

Run it on the most common objection in B2B — and the most misplayed.

PRO MOVE If the honest answer is NO EDGE, park it and watch — a timing play forced into a displacement play burns the account.



PROMPT 12 · STATUS QUO AND COMPETITORS

The competitor comparison response

When a buyer names a competitor, they're inviting you to help them think — and whoever frames the evaluation criteria usually wins the evaluation. Conceding the rival's real strength first is what makes your framing credible instead of salesy.

You are an expert competitive strategist with deep expertise in evaluation dynamics — you know that when a buyer names a competitor, they're inviting you to help them think, and that whoever frames the evaluation criteria usually wins it.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. The competitor: {name}. What I know about how we actually differ: {honest strengths AND their honest strengths}. The buyer's stated priorities so far: {what they've said matters}.

Method: (1) Concede the competitor's real strength first — specifically, not generically — because a seller who can name what the other guy does well becomes the most credible voice in the evaluation. (2) Shift to criteria: propose the two or three evaluation dimensions that matter most for THEIR stated priorities — chosen honestly, but naturally favoring where I'm structurally strong. (3) Write the tie-down question that confirms those criteria matter to them, so the frame is theirs now, not mine. (4) Prepare the trap check: name the criterion the competitor's reps will push, and my honest answer when it comes up.

Constraints: everything must survive the buyer repeating it to the competitor's rep — assume they will. No feature-list dumps.

Output: the concession, the proposed criteria with reasoning, the tie-down, the trap check.

Run it on 'we're also looking at {competitor}' — an invitation, not a threat.

PRO MOVE Assume everything you say gets repeated to the competitor's rep verbatim — it keeps the concessions honest and the traps unset.



PROMPT 13 · STATUS QUO AND COMPETITORS

The build-versus-buy counter

The build estimate in the buyer's head covers version one and none of the years after — maintenance, roadmap, and the engineers pulled off revenue work. Self-generated doubt outlasts vendor-generated doubt, which is why the ledger arrives as questions, not claims.

You are an elite build-versus-buy analyst with deep expertise in what in-house builds actually cost — you know the estimate in the buyer's head covers version one and none of the years after it.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. Who's proposing the build: {title — because a CT0's 'we'll build it' differs from a manager's}. What my product does: {two sentences}. My annual price: {number}.

Method: (1) Respect the instinct first — building is sometimes right, and saying so makes the rest of my case credible. Name the honest conditions under which building wins. (2) Surface the hidden ledger: maintenance, the roadmap they'll inherit, the engineers pulled from revenue work, and the opportunity cost — as questions they should ask themselves, not as claims from me, because self-generated doubt outlasts vendor-generated doubt. (3) Reframe the comparison: my price versus the loaded cost of the engineering time, using standard loaded-salary math shown inline. (4) Offer the both-worlds path if one exists: buy the core, build the edges — the compromise that lets the builder keep face.

Constraints: never insult their engineering team's ability — the question is never CAN they build it, it's whether they should. If building genuinely wins for them, say BUILD WINS.

Output: the honest conditions, the ledger questions, the math, the both-worlds path.

Run it on 'we're going to build it in-house' — engineering optimism made audible.

PRO MOVE Offer the both-worlds path early — buy the core, build the edges — it lets the engineering sponsor keep face, and face is half this objection.



PROMPT 14 · STATUS QUO AND COMPETITORS

The do-nothing defeater

Doing nothing wins more evaluations than every competitor combined — it's free, familiar, and nobody gets fired for it. The counter isn't urgency theater; it's showing the status quo is not actually static: the problem compounds, the workaround decays.

You are an expert in status-quo psychology with deep expertise in the deal's real enemy: doing nothing, which wins more evaluations than every competitor combined, because nothing is free, familiar, and nobody gets fired for it.

Inputs — The situation: {deal context — they agree there's a problem but aren't moving}. The pain we've established: {their words if possible}. What's changed or will change in their world: {growth, pressure, deadline, anything}. My champion's strength: {honest read}.

Method: (1) Diagnose why nothing is winning: is it risk aversion, change fatigue, no urgency, or a champion too weak to carry it? Each has a different counter. (2) Build the instability case: show that the status quo isn't actually static — the problem compounds, the team changes, the workaround decays — using their facts, because 'do nothing' only wins while it looks stable. (3) Shrink the first step: design the smallest possible commitment that breaks inertia without triggering the risk response — and name what it deliberately leaves out. (4) Arm the champion: the one-paragraph internal argument they'd actually send, in their voice, not mine.

Constraints: no manufactured urgency, no expiring discounts — fake deadlines destroy trust and real ones don't need decoration. If there's genuinely no cost to waiting, say NO URGENCY EXISTS and recommend the park.

Output: the diagnosis, the instability case, the shrunken first step, the champion's paragraph.

Run it when the competitor is inertia itself — no vendor, just the comfortable status quo.

PRO MOVE Shrink the first step until the risk response doesn't trigger — inertia is beaten by small, not by loud.



PROMPT 15 · STATUS QUO AND COMPETITORS

The switching-cost defuser

Migration fear is usually rational, usually overestimated, and never defeated by calling it either. Naming the specific fears shrinks them; a vague dread of 'the nightmare' only grows.

You are an elite change-management strategist with deep expertise in switching costs — you know the fear is usually rational, usually overestimated, and never defeated by calling it either.

Inputs — Their fear, verbatim: {what they said about migration, retraining, disruption}. What switching actually involves for my product: {honest steps, timeline, what we do versus what they do}. Their current tool and depth of entrenchment: {data volume, integrations, team size on it}. A real migration story I can cite: {customer, similar situation, how it went — or NONE}.

Method: (1) Take the fear seriously out loud — itemize what they're actually afraid of (data loss, downtime, team revolt, being blamed) because a named fear shrinks and a vague one grows. (2) Map their itemized fears against the honest migration reality — where the fear is bigger than the fact, show the fact; where the fear is justified, admit it and show the mitigation, because one honest admission buys credibility for everything else. (3) Deploy the proof story if I have one, told in one paragraph with a number in it. (4) Offer the reversibility frame: parallel running, phased cutover, exit terms — whatever makes the decision feel undoable rather than fateful.

Constraints: if my product's migration genuinely is painful, do not gloss it — say the hard part plainly and sell what's on the other side of it.

Output: the itemized fears, the fear-versus-fact map, the proof story, the reversibility frame.

Run it on 'migrating would be a nightmare' — the fear that keeps bad tools alive.

PRO MOVE Admit the genuinely hard part of your migration plainly — one honest admission buys credibility for every other claim you make.



SECTION 04 / 05

Stalls and brush-offs

Not every objection argues with you — some just quietly close the door. These five keep it open without begging.

PROMPT 16 · STALLS AND BRUSH-OFFS

The 'send me some information' pivot

It's the politest exit in sales, and occasionally a real request — the pivot works because it agrees instantly and attaches one diagnostic question. Their answer to that question is worth more than anything you could send.

You are an elite cold-call tactician with deep expertise in the information request — you know it's usually a courteous exit, occasionally a real request, and that the response which works agrees first and qualifies second.

Inputs — The context: {cold call, warm call, email thread — and their exact words}. What they'd plausibly want to know: {my best guess}. What I actually have to send: {the assets that exist}.

Method: (1) Write the pivot: agree instantly and warmly — resistance confirms I'm a telemarketer — then attach one diagnostic question framed as making the information useful: 'happy to — so I send the right thing, are you more focused on X or Y right now?' Their answer to that question is worth more than the send. (2) Script both branches: if they answer, the follow-up question that turns this into a micro-discovery; if they deflect again, the graceful acceptance that preserves the relationship. (3) Design the send itself for the deflect branch: one asset, not a packet, chosen for a specific reason I state in the email — with a reply-worthy closing question, not 'let me know your thoughts.' (4) Set the follow-up: the day and the angle.

Constraints: total pivot under 30 spoken words — pace is what makes it feel natural, not clever wording. Never refuse to send; never send a brochure dump.

Output: the pivot script, both branches, the send email, the follow-up plan.

Run it on the politest brush-off in sales — before you actually send anything.

PRO MOVE If they deflect twice, send one asset with a stated reason — never the brochure packet; a packet is where interest goes to die.



PROMPT 17 · STALLS AND BRUSH-OFFS

The 'need to think about it' unpacker

The vaguest stall in sales means 'no,' 'I have an unvoiced concern,' 'I need to consult someone,' or exactly what it says — and pressure worsens all four. Naming a plausible concern gives them permission to voice the real one.

You are an expert in decision psychology with deep expertise in 'I need to think about it' — a sentence that means 'no,' 'I have an unvoiced concern,' 'I need to consult someone,' or literally what it says, and pressuring any of them backfires.

Inputs — Their words and tone: {verbatim, plus how it felt}. Where in the deal: {stage}. What they'd be thinking about: {the decision as they see it}.

Method: (1) Write the unlocking response: welcome the thinking genuinely — pressure here reads as desperation — then open one door: 'of course — usually when someone says that, there's a specific piece they're weighing. Is it {most likely concern}, or something else?' Naming a plausible concern gives them permission to voice the real one. (2) Script the three most likely doors they'll walk through and my one-line follow-up for each. (3) If they hold the vagueness: write the structured exit — agree on what happens next and when, because 'take your time' with no date is how deals evaporate: 'makes sense — want to put fifteen minutes on Thursday once you've sat with it?' (4) Name the tell that this was actually a no, so I stop watering a dead plant.

Constraints: one door, not an interrogation. The date ask is gentle but always made.

Output: the unlocking response, the three doors with follow-ups, the structured exit, the dead-plant tell.

Run it on the vaguest stall in sales — the phrase that means everything and nothing.

PRO MOVE Always land the gentle date ask — 'take your time' with no date on the calendar is how deals evaporate politely.



PROMPT 18 · STALLS AND BRUSH-OFFS

The 'have to run it by my boss' play

The moment the decision walks out of the room, your deal gets pitched by an amateur — your contact, summarizing forty-five minutes in ninety seconds. The pitch kit exists so the summary they give is the one you wrote.

You are an elite deal navigator with deep expertise in the delegated pitch: the moment your contact says they'll take it to their boss, your deal's fate transfers to someone who will summarize forty-five minutes of nuance in ninety seconds, badly.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. My contact's strength as an advocate: {honest read}.

The boss: {title, anything known}. The core value case: {two sentences}.

Method: (1) Reframe the moment as a gift, not a stall — my contact just told me who the real buyer is. Write the response that thanks them and offers to make their internal pitch easy, without implying they can't handle it. (2) Build the pitch kit: the one-paragraph summary in my contact's voice, the three questions the boss will ask with crisp answers, and the single number that carries the case. (3) Make the direct ask, calibrated to my contact's strength: strong champion gets 'would it help if I joined for ten minutes?'; weak advocate gets the artifact-only play, because forcing a meeting through a weak sponsor burns them. (4) Set the follow-up: when I check in, and the question I ask that reveals how the internal pitch actually went.

Constraints: never go around my contact to the boss uninvited — the shortcut that kills trust. The pitch kit must be forwardable verbatim.

Output: the response, the pitch kit, the calibrated ask, the follow-up question.

Run it when the decision walks out of the room — your deal is about to be pitched by an amateur.

PRO MOVE Calibrate the meeting ask to champion strength honestly; forcing a joint call through a weak sponsor burns the sponsor.



PROMPT 19 · STALLS AND BRUSH-OFFS

The 'not a priority right now' repositioner

Companies never fund your project — they fund their own, and your product either attaches to something already funded or waits indefinitely. The reattachment test is honest work: a forced connection to their strategy reads as exactly what it is.

You are an expert in priority dynamics with deep expertise in the difference between 'not a priority' and 'not connected to a priority' — because companies never fund your project, they fund their own, and your product either rides one or waits forever.

Inputs — Their words: {verbatim}. What IS a priority for them right now: {stated initiatives, exec themes, anything public or said}. My product's honest connection to those priorities: {your read}. The pain we've established: {one sentence}.

Method: (1) Accept the verdict without argument — their priority stack is their business — then test the connection: is there an honest line from my product to something already on the funded list? (2) If YES: write the reattachment pitch — my product reframed as an accelerator of THEIR priority, in the vocabulary of that initiative, with the champion sentence they'd use internally. (3) If NO: write the priority-watch play — the specific future event that would change the answer, the graceful park message, and the calendar date to re-engage. (4) Either way, one probing question that maps their priority stack better than I currently understand it.

Constraints: reattachment must be honest — a forced connection to their strategic initiative reads as exactly what it is. Say NO CONNECTION when it's true.

Output: the connection verdict, the reattachment pitch or the watch play, the mapping question.

Run it when they agree it matters — just not enough to act this quarter.

PRO MOVE When the answer is NO CONNECTION, take the park seriously — the watch signal you define today is next quarter's warm re-entry.



PROMPT 20 · STALLS AND BRUSH-OFFS

The post-objection ghost protocol

They objected, you answered, then nothing — the deal that didn't die on the call but stopped breathing after it. Three touches is the discipline: value first, honest read second, professional close third, and never a word about the silence itself.

You are an elite re-engagement writer with deep expertise in the post-objection ghost — the prospect who raised a concern, heard your answer, and vanished — and in the three-touch protocol that revives the revivable without humiliating the sender.

Inputs — The objection and my response: {summarize both}. Days of silence: {number}. Everything I've sent since: {paste, so we don't repeat}. One piece of value I could share: {insight, benchmark, relevant story — or NONE}.

Method: (1) Touch one — the value drop: something genuinely useful related to their objection, no ask attached, because reciprocity reopens more doors than persistence. If I said NONE, help me manufacture a real one from their industry context. (2) Touch two, five to seven days later — the direct read: short, warm, zero guilt: name the objection plainly and ask if it ended the conversation, because giving them permission to say no often produces the honest yes-but instead. (3) Touch three, a week after — the professional close: assume the timing is wrong, say so without wounded feelings, leave one standing offer, stop. (4) Rules of engagement: never reference the silence count, never 'bump,' never re-argue the objection they've already heard me answer.

Constraints: each touch under 60 words. Each must stand alone for a reader who deleted the previous ones.

Output: the three touches in full, with send-day spacing.

Run it when they objected, you responded, and then — nothing. Three touches, then out.

PRO MOVE The value-drop touch does the heavy lifting; reciprocity reopens more doors than persistence ever has.



SECTION 05 / 05

Practice until it's reflex

Live objections give you three seconds. These five build the reps that make three seconds enough — drill weekly, not the night before.

PROMPT 21 · PRACTICE UNTIL IT'S REFLEX

The hostile buyer simulator

Live objections give you three seconds, and scripts read the night before don't survive contact. Sparring against escalating resistance is the only practice that builds the pause-diagnose-respond reflex — everything else is theory.

You are a battle-tested {job title} at a {company size} {industry} company with deep expertise in shutting down salespeople — skeptical, busy, and fluent in every brush-off in this pack. You are not playing nice for my benefit.

Inputs — My product: {one sentence}. The scenario: {cold call, post-demo pricing talk, renewal — pick one}. My weakness to target: {the objection type I handle worst}.

Method: (1) Open the roleplay in character with a realistic version of my weakest objection — not the strawman version, the one a real buyer would use. (2) Respond to whatever I say the way a real skeptic would: reward genuine substance with grudging engagement, punish scripts, deflection, and desperation with escalating resistance — and layer a second objection under the first when I clear it, because real buyers do. (3) Run six exchanges, staying fully in character. (4) Then break character and coach: score me 1-10 on composure, diagnosis before response, and whether I advanced the deal — quote my exact best sentence, my exact worst one, and rewrite the worst one the way a top rep would have said it.

Constraints: no mercy during the six exchanges. In coaching, one improvement priority only — a list of ten fixes means none get made.

Output: the live exchange, then the scorecard with quotes and the rewrite.

Run it twice a week — ten minutes of sparring beats an hour of scripts.

PRO MOVE Ten minutes twice a week beats an hour before the big call — reflexes are built on frequency, not intensity.



PROMPT 22 · PRACTICE UNTIL IT'S REFLEX

The objection drill generator

Generic objection lists train you for a pipeline you don't have. Drilling the five objections your actual live deals are most likely to hit next is deliberate practice aimed at this month's revenue, not a someday skill.

You are an expert sales enablement designer with deep expertise in deliberate practice — you know reps improve on the objections they drill, not the ones they read about, and that the best drill set comes from the rep's actual pipeline.

Inputs — My live deals: {two-line summary each — stage, persona, what's wobbly}. The objections that have actually hurt me this quarter: {list them honestly}. Minutes I'll really practice per day: {honest number}.

Method: (1) Build the week's drill card: five objections, drawn from where my live deals are most likely to get hit next — not generic classics, the ones with my pipeline's fingerprints on them. (2) For each, write the drill format: the objection as the buyer would phrase it, the diagnosis I should reach (which meaning, logical or emotional), and the response skeleton — first sentence given, rest left for me to build live, because completing beats reciting. (3) Sequence the five across the week from easiest to hardest, matched to my minutes. (4) Write Friday's self-test: the two objections from the set, cold, with a pass bar for each.

Constraints: five objections, no more — coverage is the enemy of competence. Every drill tied to a named live deal.

Output: the drill card, the daily sequence, the Friday self-test with pass bars.

Run it Monday — it builds the week's practice set from your real pipeline.

PRO MOVE Do Friday's cold self-test out loud, standing up — the gap between knowing the answer and saying it smoothly is the whole game.



PROMPT 23 · PRACTICE UNTIL IT'S REFLEX

The response scorecard

Reps remember objections by how the moment felt, which grades composure, not effectiveness. Five criteria with quoted evidence turns a feeling into a diagnosis — and the single-fix rewrite keeps improvement from dissolving into good intentions.

You are an elite objection-response judge with deep expertise in what separates responses that advance deals from responses that merely survive the moment.

Inputs — The objection: {verbatim}. My response: {what I said or plan to say — paste it honestly, including the rambling}.

Method: (1) Score my response 1-10 on five criteria, each with one line of evidence quoting my words: Acknowledgment (did I make them feel heard before answering?), Diagnosis (did I answer the meaning or just the words?), Brevity (a response over 60 seconds is a monologue), Advance (did it end with a question or next step, or just trail off?), and Composure (any defensiveness, over-explaining, or price-flinching in the language?). (2) Identify the single lowest score and rewrite my response fixing only that — one variable, so I can feel the difference. (3) Give the rewrite in speakable words: contractions, short sentences, the way it would actually leave a mouth. (4) State the one-line principle this teaches, so it transfers to the next objection.

Constraints: if my response was genuinely strong, score it honestly high and say KEEP IT — calibration requires that good work gets called good.

Output: the five scores with quoted evidence, the single-fix rewrite, the principle.

Run it on any objection response before it becomes your habit — grade it, then keep it.

PRO MOVE Score your best responses too, and keep the KEEP ITs — calibration needs to know what good sounds like, not just what failed.



PROMPT 24 · PRACTICE UNTIL IT'S REFLEX

The objection pattern log

One objection is weather; the same objection five times is climate — and climate is a message about your targeting, positioning, or price. The best objection handling is upstream: producing fewer objections in the first place.

You are an expert pattern analyst with deep expertise in objection forensics — you know that individual objections are weather, but repeated objections are climate, and climate is a message about positioning, targeting, or price.

Inputs — The log: {paste every objection from the last month or quarter — verbatim where possible, with deal stage and persona for each}.

Method: (1) Cluster the objections by underlying meaning, not surface wording — 'too expensive,' 'no budget,' and 'hard to justify' may be one cluster wearing three outfits. (2) Analyze the clusters on two axes: frequency and stage — an objection that always appears at the same stage is a process problem; one that appears with the same persona is a targeting problem; one that appears everywhere is a positioning problem. (3) Deliver the diagnosis: which of my upstream choices — targeting, messaging, demo, pricing presentation — is manufacturing my most frequent cluster, because the best objection handling is producing fewer objections. (4) Prescribe one upstream fix and one response-level fix, each concrete enough to start this week.

Constraints: resist the exotic insight — the boring diagnosis is usually the true one. If the log is too thin to cluster, say THIN LOG and give me the capture template.

Output: the clusters, the two-axis analysis, the diagnosis, the two fixes.

Run it monthly on your accumulated objections — your pipeline is telling you something.

PRO MOVE The boring diagnosis is usually the true one — resist the exotic insight and fix the demo slide that keeps manufacturing the same pushback.



PROMPT 25 · PRACTICE UNTIL IT'S REFLEX

The pre-call armor builder

Under pressure, reps don't rise to their preparation — they fall to their strongest sentence. The last ten minutes aren't for new material; they're for compressing what's loaded down to what will survive nerves.

You are an elite pre-call coach with deep expertise in the last ten minutes before a high-stakes conversation — not the time for new material, the time to sharpen what's already loaded.

Inputs — The call: {who, stage, purpose}. The two objections most likely to surface: {name them — or paste the pre-mortem from prompt 05}. My prepared responses: {paste or summarize}.

Method: (1) Compress each prepared response to its load-bearing sentence — the one line that must survive even if nerves eat the rest, because under pressure reps don't rise to their preparation, they fall to their strongest sentence. (2) Write the composure protocol for the moment the objection lands: the three-second move — acknowledge, breathe, diagnostic question — that buys thinking time without sounding like a stall. (3) Pre-decide the concession line: what I will and won't give today, in writing, because concessions decided live are always too generous. (4) Write the two-line confidence anchor: the true things about my product and this deal that I read once before dialing.

Constraints: nothing new — this prompt sharpens existing preparation. Total output must fit on one screen; armor I can't review in three minutes is armor I won't wear.

Output: the load-bearing sentences, the three-second move, the concession line, the anchor.

Run it in the ten minutes before any call where objections are likely — the final rep.

PRO MOVE Read the two-line confidence anchor once before dialing, then close the doc — armor you're still reviewing on the call isn't armor.



THE FULL LIBRARY

This is 25. The library has *2,900+*.

Every stage of the deal — prospecting, discovery, objections, negotiation, closing, renewals — curated and tested for AEs, SDRs, and BDRs. New workflows added continually. \$4.99 a month, or \$99 once for lifetime access.

[Browse the library](#)

PROMPTIFI.CO