Promptifi

FREE PROMPT PACK

25 discovery call prompts that find the *pain.*

Pulled from the Promptifi library — 2,900+ tested AI workflows for B2B sales reps. These 25 work as one system: prep builds the hypotheses, the questions test them, the framework scores what you heard, and the post-call prompts turn a conversation into a deal plan. Paste any prompt into ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini, fill in the brackets, and run it.

INSIDE

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

Before the call

Discovery is won in the thirty minutes before it starts. These five build the brief, the hypotheses, and the agenda — their outputs feed every question you'll ask.

PROMPT 01 · BEFORE THE CALL

The call brief builder

There's a difference between a rep who researched and one who prepared: the second knows what they're listening for. The know-versus-guess split matters most — asking about things they already told you burns credibility at the fastest rate in sales.

> You are an elite deal researcher with deep expertise in pre-call intelligence — you know the difference between a rep who researched and a rep who prepared: the second one knows what they're listening for.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name, URL}`. The attendees: `{names, titles}`. How this call came to be: `{inbound, outbound, referral — and what's been said so far}`. My product: `{two sentences}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the business snapshot: what they sell, who pays, how the money flows, and the one recent change that matters — two lines each. (2) Profile each attendee: their likely stake in this conversation and the question they're privately hoping gets answered. (3) State what we already know versus what we're guessing — as two explicit lists, because asking about things they've already told us burns credibility, and treating guesses as facts burns deals. (4) Name the three things this call must establish for it to have been worth everyone's time.
> `Constraints`: two pages of research compressed to one screen. Mark every inference INFERRED. If the inbound context already answered something, flag it DO NOT RE-ASK.
> `Output`: the snapshot, the attendee profiles, the know/guess lists, the three must-establishes. I'll paste this brief into the prompts that follow.

Run this first, the day before — its output feeds prompts 2 through 25.

PRO MOVE The DO-NOT-RE-ASK list is the quiet killer feature — check it right before the call, not during prep.

PROMPT 02 · BEFORE THE CALL

The hypothesis stack

'What keeps you up at night' is a survey; three educated guesses under test is a diagnosis. Hypotheses make you sound like an insider either way — confirmed proves insight, killed proves you're actually listening.

> You are an expert diagnostician with deep expertise in hypothesis-driven discovery — you know elite reps don't ask 'what keeps you up at night'; they arrive with three educated guesses and test them, because a tested hypothesis makes the rep sound like an insider either way.
> `Inputs` — The call brief: `{paste from prompt 01}`. My product's three strongest use cases: `{list them}`. What similar customers' pain looked like: `{one or two patterns}`.
> `Method`: (1) Generate three hypotheses about this company's pain, each in the form: 'Given `{evidence from the brief}`, they likely struggle with `{specific problem}`, which costs them `{type of cost}`.' Rank by confidence. (2) For each hypothesis, write the test question — one that sounds like informed curiosity, not a pitch fishing for a yes: 'how are you handling X since `{the change}`?' beats 'do you struggle with X?' (3) Define the falsification tell for each: the answer that would kill the hypothesis, because a hypothesis I can't kill is a pitch in disguise. (4) Name the discovery I'd pivot to if all three die on the call.
> `Constraints`: hypotheses must trace to evidence in the brief — no generic industry pain. Confidence honestly labeled.
> `Output`: the three ranked hypotheses, their test questions, their kill conditions, the pivot.

Run it after the brief — discovery without hypotheses is a survey, not a sale.

`PRO MOVE` State one hypothesis out loud early in the call — 'my guess is X is the strain' — buyers correct guesses with gold.

PROMPT 03 · BEFORE THE CALL

The agenda architect

The first ninety seconds decide whose meeting this is. A stated agenda with their name in it — and a named decision this call feeds — is the fastest competence signal available to a seller.

> You are an elite meeting designer with deep expertise in the discovery agenda — you know the first ninety seconds decide whether the buyer treats this as their meeting or yours, and that a stated agenda with their name on it wins that decision.
> `Inputs` — The call: `{length, attendees, stage}`. The three must-establishes: `{paste from prompt 01}`. What the buyer said they wanted from this call: `{their words, if any}`.
> `Method`: (1) Design the arc for the available minutes: open, their context, the deep dive, the mutual fit check, next steps — with minute budgets, weighted so their talking outweighs mine at least two to one. (2) Write the spoken agenda-setting lines verbatim — thirty seconds that state what I'd like to cover, explicitly invite their additions, and name the decision this call feeds, because purpose-less calls produce purpose-less next steps. (3) Build the time-keeper triggers: what I say at the halfway mark if we're behind, and which agenda item gets sacrificed first — decided now, not live. (4) Write the closing two minutes: the summary structure and the specific next step I'll propose.
> `Constraints`: the agenda must survive contact with a buyer who arrives with their own — include the graceful yield line. Never more than four segments.
> `Output`: the timed arc, the verbatim opening, the triggers and sacrifice order, the close.

Run it the morning of — the agenda is the first demonstration of competence.

PRO MOVE Decide the sacrifice order now: which agenda item dies when time runs short is a choice you don't want to make live.

PROMPT 04 · BEFORE THE CALL

The multi-stakeholder pre-read

Three buyers in a room means three private agendas, and the real objection usually belongs to the quietest person. Mapping stakes and postures beforehand is the difference between running the meeting and merely attending it.

> You are an expert in group dynamics with deep expertise in multi-stakeholder calls — you know that with three buyers in the room there are three private agendas, and the rep who maps them beforehand runs the meeting that the others merely attend.
> `Inputs` — The attendees: `{names, titles, anything known about each}`. Who booked the call and why: `{context}`. My product: `{one sentence}`. The brief: `{paste from prompt 01, optional}`.
> `Method`: (1) For each attendee, infer: what winning looks like for them personally, what they're afraid this meeting costs them (time, budget, control, status), and their likely posture — driver, evaluator, skeptic, or hostage. Mark inferences as such. (2) Predict the alliance map: who defers to whom, and where the private disagreement between attendees probably lives — because the real objection often belongs to the quietest person. (3) Assign each attendee one question designed for them by name, so nobody leaves having only listened. (4) Name the person whose silence would be most dangerous and the moment in the agenda where I draw them in.
> `Constraints`: posture guesses are hypotheses to test in the first ten minutes, not verdicts — pair each with its confirming tell.
> `Output`: the per-person map, the alliance read, the named questions, the silence plan.

Run it when three or more people are joining — group discovery is a different sport.

PRO MOVE Treat every posture guess as a hypothesis with a confirming tell — the first ten minutes will grade your map for you.

PROMPT 05 · BEFORE THE CALL

The question inventory auditor

Buyers grade reps by their questions — one they've never been asked is worth ten they answer weekly. The audit is merciless because filler questions don't just waste time; they teach the buyer you're like the others.

> You are an elite question editor with deep expertise in what separates a discovery question from a survey question — you know buyers grade reps by their questions, and that one question they've never been asked is worth ten they answer weekly.
> `Inputs` — My planned questions: `{paste the list}`. The hypotheses: `{paste from prompt 02}`. The call length: `{minutes}`.
> `Method`: (1) Audit every question against four failure modes: GOOGLE-ABLE (research I should have done), LEADING (fishing for the yes I want), COMMODITY (every rep asks it — 'what keeps you up at night' dies here), and ORPHAN (connects to no hypothesis and no must-establish). Tag each question, mercilessly. (2) Cut to the survivors and count: a thirty-minute call carries six to eight real questions — if more survived, rank and cut again. (3) For each survivor, write the follow-up I should have loaded — because the value is never in the first answer, it's one 'how does that play out?' deeper. (4) Sequence the survivors from context-building to consequence-probing, and mark the one question that earns the right to ask the hardest one.
> `Constraints`: if a question of mine is genuinely excellent, say KEEP and don't touch it. The hardest question never goes first.
> `Output`: the tagged audit, the sequenced survivors with loaded follow-ups, the earn-the-right marker.

Run it on your planned questions the night before — half of them are probably filler.

`PRO MOVE` The loaded follow-up column is the real product — first answers are rehearsed, the value is one 'how does that play out?' deeper.

SECTION 02 / 05

The craft of the question

The answer's quality is set by the question's construction. These five build questions that excavate, quantify, and never sound like an interrogation.

PROMPT 06 · THE CRAFT OF THE QUESTION

The pain excavation ladder

Deals are funded at the consequence and stake rungs; reps camp at the surface rung because descending feels intrusive. The ladder gives you the transitions that make depth feel like care instead of interrogation.

> You are an elite discovery interviewer with deep expertise in the excavation ladder — the questioning sequence that descends from a stated problem to its operational reality to its business consequence to its personal stake, because deals are funded at the bottom two rungs and reps camp at the top one.
> `Inputs` — The stated pain: `{what they said, verbatim if possible}`. The persona: `{title}`. My product's relevance to it: `{one sentence}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the four-rung ladder for this specific pain: SURFACE (what happens), MECHANICS (how it actually plays out day to day — 'walk me through the last time'), CONSEQUENCE (what it costs in numbers, deadlines, or risk — 'what does that do to X?'), and STAKE (what it means for the person answering — asked with care, never manipulation). Write two question options per rung. (2) For each rung, name the answer quality that earns the descent to the next — and the answer that says stop, this pain is shallow. (3) Write the transition phrases between rungs, because abrupt depth changes feel like interrogation. (4) Mark the rung where most reps stop and what staying one rung longer is worth.
> `Constraints`: the STAKE rung must be askable in front of the person's boss — if it isn't, rewrite it. No 'and how does that make you feel.'
> `Output`: the four-rung ladder with paired questions, descent criteria, transitions.

Run it on any surface-level pain — the first answer is never the real one.

PRO MOVE Memorize the descent criteria, not the questions — knowing when you've earned the next rung is the actual skill.

PROMPT 07 · THE CRAFT OF THE QUESTION

The quantification sequence

'How much does that cost you?' produces 'hard to say' every time — people won't generate numbers, but they'll happily correct one. Doing the multiplication out loud and handing it over for correction is the move that funds business cases.

> You are an expert value engineer with deep expertise in extracting numbers conversationally — you know 'how much does that cost you?' produces 'hard to say,' while a well-built sequence produces the figure that later funds the deal.
> `Inputs` — The established pain: `{their description}`. What kind of number probably exists: `{hours, headcount, error rate, deal slippage, churn — best guess}`. The persona: `{title, and whether they'd know the number}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the three-step sequence: FREQUENCY ('how often does that happen — weekly, monthly?'), SCOPE ('when it happens, who gets pulled in and for how long?'), and EXTRAPOLATION — where I do the multiplication out loud and hand it to them for correction: 'so that's roughly X hours a month across the team — is that high or low?' People who won't generate a number will happily correct one. (2) Prepare the deflection handlers: the two most likely dodges ('it varies,' 'I'd have to check') and the range-narrowing response to each. (3) Write the anchoring line that logs the number into the deal once they confirm it — their number, said back in their words. (4) Flag the ethics line: correct the estimate downward if they overshoot, because a number they later disown poisons the business case.
> `Constraints`: my extrapolation math must be conservative and shown. Never pretend precision the conversation didn't earn.
> `Output`: the three-step sequence verbatim, the deflection handlers, the anchoring line.

Run it when the pain is real but has no number attached — unquantified pain doesn't get budget.

PRO MOVE Their corrected number goes in the deal notes verbatim, with attribution — it's the anchor for every pricing conversation after.

PROMPT 08 · THE CRAFT OF THE QUESTION

The decision-process X-ray

'What's your decision process?' is a form, and forms get form answers. Past behavior outpredicts stated process — how they bought the last comparable tool is the real map, told as a story they enjoy telling.

> You are an elite deal-process cartographer with deep expertise in the questions that map a buying process without sounding like a census — because 'what's your decision-making process?' is a form, and forms get form answers.
> `Inputs` — The deal context: `{what we'd be selling, rough size}`. Who I'm talking to: `{title, likely role in the decision}`. What I already know about their process: `{anything}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the oblique sequence — questions that extract process through story, not interrogation: 'when you brought in `{their last comparable tool}`, how did that decision actually happen?' (past behavior outpredicts stated process); 'if you decided this was worth doing, what happens next on your side?'; 'who would be annoyed to learn about this late?' — that last one maps veto power better than any org-chart question. (2) For each question, name what I'm actually listening for in the answer: named people, sequence, timeline, past friction. (3) Prepare the gap-closer: the follow-up for when their answer skips a layer — vague answers about approval usually mean they don't know, which is itself critical data. (4) Write the summary trial: how I play the mapped process back to them at call's end for correction.
> `Constraints`: never ask more than three process questions in one call — spread the census across touches. Flag which single question matters most for this deal size.
> `Output`: the oblique sequence with listening notes, the gap-closer, the summary trial.

Run it mid-call, once trust exists — the questions that map how this deal actually gets done.

`PRO MOVE` 'Who would be annoyed to learn about this late?' is the single highest-yield question in the set — it maps veto power in one answer.

PROMPT 09 · THE CRAFT OF THE QUESTION

The interrogation remover

The same information request can feel like curiosity or a deposition — the difference is construction. WHY puts people on trial; WHAT and HOW invite explanation, and questions built on their own words never feel scripted.

> You are an expert conversation designer with deep expertise in the texture of questions — you know the same information request can feel like curiosity or like a deposition, and that the difference is construction: stems, softeners, and what came just before.
> `Inputs` — My questions: `{paste the set}`. The relationship temperature: `{first call, warm, established}`. The persona: `{title, seniority}`.
> `Method`: (1) Rewrite each question through three filters: convert WHY to WHAT/HOW (why questions put people on trial — 'why did you choose that?' becomes 'what drove that choice?'); add the earned stem where one exists ('you mentioned X — how does that connect to...?') because questions built on their words never feel like a script; and trim every question to one clause, since compound questions get half-answers. (2) For the two hardest questions in the set, add the permission wrapper: 'can I ask a more direct question?' — which paradoxically makes hard questions easier to answer. (3) Check the sequence for rhythm: no more than two questions without a give-back from me (a reflection, a relevant observation), because pure extraction exhausts goodwill. (4) Mark any question that no rewrite can save.
> `Constraints`: preserve each question's target information exactly — this is a texture pass, not a content pass. Seniority calibration: the more senior, the more direct.
> `Output`: the rewritten set, the permission wrappers, the rhythm map, the unsavables.

Run it on any question set that's technically right but socially wrong.

PRO MOVE The permission wrapper — 'can I ask a more direct question?' — paradoxically makes hard questions easier; use it twice a call, max.

PROMPT 10 · THE CRAFT OF THE QUESTION

The follow-up depth engine

First questions are prepared; follow-ups are earned — and they're where discovery is actually won. The four veins (vague word, skipped step, leaked emotion, implied number) exist in almost every answer a buyer gives.

> You are an elite active-listening coach with deep expertise in the second question — you know that first questions are prepared and follow-ups are earned, and that the rep who can generate three good follow-ups from any answer never runs out of discovery.
> `Inputs` — A real answer a prospect gave me: `{paste it as close to verbatim as I can}`. What I asked to get it: `{the question}`. What I said next at the time: `{honest — even if it was 'great, so our product...'}`.
> `Method`: (1) Mine the answer for the four follow-up veins: the VAGUE WORD worth sharpening ('slow,' 'painful,' 'sometimes' — which one, and the question that sharpens it), the SKIPPED STEP in their story, the EMOTION that leaked through word choice, and the NUMBER implied but not stated. Quote the exact words that open each vein. (2) Write the follow-up question for each vein, in speakable words. (3) Grade what I actually said next: did I descend, or did I grab the first product-shaped opening and pitch? Be blunt. (4) Give the general pattern this answer teaches, so the skill transfers: the category of tell I missed and how to hear it next time.
> `Constraints`: follow-ups under twelve words each — depth comes from aim, not length. If what I said next was actually the right move, say RIGHT MOVE.
> `Output`: the four veins with quotes, the four follow-ups, the grade, the transferable pattern.

Drill this weekly — the follow-up question is where discovery is actually won or lost.

PRO MOVE Drill it weekly on one real answer from your calls; after a month the veins start glowing in real time.

SECTION 03 / 05

Qualification with teeth

A framework isn't a form to fill — it's a lens for judging what you heard. These five run MEDDPICC-grade qualification without the clipboard energy.

PROMPT 11 · QUALIFICATION WITH TEETH

The MEDDPICC interrogator

The framework's value was never the acronym — it's the discipline of admitting what you don't actually know. The no-evidence-means-a-2 rule is the whole prompt: hope is not a data source, and forecasts built on it die in the last week of the quarter.

> You are an elite MEDDPICC practitioner with deep expertise in honest deal scoring — you know the framework's value isn't the acronym, it's the discipline of admitting what you don't actually know.
> `Inputs` — My call notes or transcript: `{paste}`. The deal: `{size, stage, close date I'm forecasting}`.
> `Method`: (1) Score each element 0–10 with evidence quoted from my notes: Metrics (do we have THEIR numbers or mine?), Economic buyer (identified, or met?), Decision criteria (written by them, shaped by us, or unknown?), Decision process (mapped with dates?), Paper process (legal, security, procurement — even scouted?), Identified pain (their words, quantified?), Champion (tested, or just friendly? — cite the costliest thing they've done for us), Competition (named, including do-nothing?). (2) The rule: no evidence in the notes means the score is a 2, not a 5 — hope is not a data source. (3) Rank the three weakest elements and, for each, write the exact question or action that raises it, assigned to a specific next touch. (4) Verdict the forecast date against the scores: SUPPORTED, OPTIMISTIC, or FICTION.
> `Constraints`: quoted evidence or a 2 — no exceptions. The verdict must be blunt.
> `Output`: the scored eight with quotes, the three gap actions with owners, the forecast verdict.

Run it after any meaningful call — score the deal, not the vibes.

PRO MOVE Run it after every meaningful call, not just at review time — gaps found early cost a question; gaps found late cost the deal.

PROMPT 12 · QUALIFICATION WITH TEETH

The champion stress test

Untested champions are how commits die in November. The test isn't cynicism — it's respect: a real champion passes a fair ask easily, and a fan who fails one just told you the deal's actual shape.

> You are an expert in champion dynamics with deep expertise in the stress test — you know the difference between a champion and a fan is measured in spent capital, and that untested champions are how Q4 commits die in November.
> `Inputs` — The candidate: `{name, title}`. Everything they've said and done for this deal: `{list — meetings taken, intros made, information shared, words said}`. The deal: `{size, what approval requires}`.
> `Method`: (1) Audit the evidence against the three champion criteria: PERSONAL WIN (can I articulate, in one sentence, what THEY get if this closes? If I can't, neither can they), ACCESS (have they demonstrated — not claimed — access to power?), and SPENT CAPITAL (name the costliest thing they've actually done; forwarding an email is not capital). (2) Verdict: CHAMPION, FAN, or UNKNOWN — with the single strongest and weakest evidence for each criterion. (3) Design the next test: a small, fair ask that requires real internal effort — calendar access to the economic buyer, sharing the internal business case, pre-wiring a meeting — sized so a yes means something and a no is survivable. (4) Write the coaching plan if they're a FAN worth developing: what I give them (the personal win narrative, the internal pitch kit) before I ask again.
> `Constraints`: weight actions ten to one over words. If the honest verdict is UNKNOWN, say it — a wrong CHAMPION label is worse than no label.
> `Output`: the audited criteria, the verdict, the designed test, the coaching plan.

Run it before you build a forecast on someone's enthusiasm.

PRO MOVE The personal-win sentence is the tell — if you can't write what they get out of this in one line, neither can they, and they're not selling it internally.

PROMPT 13 · QUALIFICATION WITH TEETH

The economic buyer approach

Executive meetings are granted for relevance, and 'introducing myself' is not a reason an executive recognizes. Translating your deal into the one metric this title is measured on is the price of admission.

> You are an elite executive-access strategist with deep expertise in reaching economic buyers — you know the meeting is earned with relevance, granted through the champion, and wasted without a reason the executive would recognize as theirs.
> `Inputs` — The economic buyer: `{name, title, anything known}`. My champion and their strength: `{honest read}`. The deal: `{what it is, the quantified pain if we have it}`. What the executive is publicly on record caring about: `{initiatives, quotes, priorities — or UNKNOWN}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the executive-relevant reason: translate my deal into the one metric or initiative this title is measured on — if I marked UNKNOWN, name the two most likely candidates for this role and industry and the question that confirms which. (2) Choose the route: champion-led intro (default — write the exact forwardable note my champion sends), parallel executive-to-executive (when my side has a matching title), or direct (last resort — and only with a reason strong enough to survive it). Justify the choice. (3) Design the ask itself: fifteen minutes, one specific purpose, framed as protecting THEIR investment of team time, never as 'introducing myself.' (4) Prepare the meeting's opening ninety seconds — because executive meetings are graded in the first two minutes.
> `Constraints`: never go around the champion without naming the risk and getting my own sign-off on it. The ask must be declinable without awkwardness.
> `Output`: the translated reason, the routed approach with the forwardable note, the ask, the ninety-second open.

Run it when you know who holds the money but haven't met them.

PRO MOVE Default to the champion-led route with the forwardable note — the direct route is a last resort, and going around a champion has a body count.

PROMPT 14 · QUALIFICATION WITH TEETH

The metrics case builder

The business case is the part of your deal that travels without you — forwarded to people you'll never meet, squinted at by finance. Their numbers, conservative floors, and visible arithmetic are what survive the trip.

> You are an expert business-case writer with deep expertise in the metrics section — the part of the deal that survives after you leave the room, gets forwarded to people you'll never meet, and either holds up under a CFO's squint or doesn't.
> `Inputs` — The numbers discovery produced: `{paste — their admissions about hours, errors, slippage, churn, whatever we got, with who said each}`. My product's mechanism: `{how it changes those numbers, honestly}`. My price: `{number}`. Their fiscal context: `{anything known}`.
> `Method`: (1) Sort the numbers into THEIRS (said by them — gold) and MINE (my assumptions — clearly labeled liabilities). Build the case using theirs wherever possible. (2) Construct the before/after arithmetic: current state cost, realistic improvement range (never a point estimate — a range with a conservative floor), payback period at the floor. Show every step. (3) Write the one-paragraph narrative version in the champion's voice — the version that gets pasted into their internal email. (4) Run the CFO squint: attack your own case the way finance will — the assumption they'll reject, the number they'll ask for a source on — and pre-write the honest answers.
> `Constraints`: conservative floor or nothing — a business case that overpromises converts one deal and poisons the renewal. If the discovery numbers are too thin, say THIN and list what the next call must capture.
> `Output`: the sorted numbers, the arithmetic, the champion paragraph, the squint with answers.

Run it once discovery has produced numbers — turn their answers into their business case.

PRO MOVE Write the champion's paragraph version first; the artifact that gets pasted into their internal email is the one that does the selling.

PROMPT 15 · QUALIFICATION WITH TEETH

The red flag detector

Every rep tells their manager a deal story that's slightly better than the evidence — not lying, just hoping in narrative form. Reading the story against the raw facts is the cheapest loss prevention in sales.

> You are an elite deal skeptic with deep expertise in the red flags reps train themselves not to see — because a pipeline review with yourself is the cheapest loss prevention in sales.
> `Inputs` — The deal story as I'd tell my manager: `{write it naturally, selling it}`. The raw facts: `{stage, age, meetings held, who's engaged, next step and its date}`.
> `Method`: (1) Read my deal story against the raw facts and flag every gap between narrative and evidence — 'strong interest' backed by one meeting six weeks ago, a 'champion' who's never introduced anyone, a next step with no date. Quote my own optimistic phrases back at me. (2) Screen for the classic tells: single-threaded, no economic buyer contact, no quantified pain, prospect-controlled timeline, silence reframed as 'they're busy,' and the deal aging past my average cycle. (3) Rank the three most dangerous flags and, for each, name the test that would confirm or clear it within one touch. (4) Deliver the verdict a good manager would: REAL, WOUNDED (name the treatment), or ZOMBIE (name the kill criteria and the calendar date).
> `Constraints`: be harder on the deal than I was — that's the entire point. But clear the flags the evidence actually clears; manufactured pessimism is as useless as optimism.
> `Output`: the narrative-versus-evidence gaps, the tell screen, the three flags with tests, the verdict.

Run it on any deal that feels good — feelings are exactly what this prompt audits.

PRO MOVE Run it on the deal you feel best about this quarter — good feelings are exactly what the tell screen exists to audit.

SECTION 04 / 05

Running the room

The plan meets the humans. These five handle the live moments — the open, the drift, the curveball, and the close that actually locks a next step.

PROMPT 16 · RUNNING THE ROOM

The first five minutes

Buyers decide early — mostly subconsciously — whether this is a conversation between professionals or a vendor screening. The permission question ('if this doesn't look like a fit, tell me and we'll wrap early') paradoxically buys the whole meeting.

> You are an elite call-opening coach with deep expertise in the first five minutes of discovery — where the buyer decides, mostly subconsciously, whether this is a conversation between professionals or a vendor screening.
> `Inputs` — The call: `{who, how it came to be, video or phone}`. The brief: `{paste from prompt 01, or key facts}`. My natural style: `{one line — warm, dry, direct, whatever's true}`.
> `Method`: (1) Write the rapport open that isn't weather: one observation from research that's professionally interesting and invites a comment — about their business, not their LinkedIn photo — calibrated to my natural style, because borrowed charm reads as borrowed. (2) Write the credibility frame: two sentences that establish why I'm worth thirty minutes — pattern knowledge from their world, not my company's founding story. (3) Script the agenda handoff (or pull from prompt 03) with the one addition that changes everything: the permission question — 'and if at any point this doesn't look like a fit, tell me and we'll wrap early — fair?' — which paradoxically buys the whole meeting. (4) Name the two early tells to watch: the sign they're engaged, and the sign I'm losing the room before minute ten.
> `Constraints`: total scripted material under ninety seconds of speech — the point is a strong launch, not a monologue. Nothing that couldn't survive them having a bad day.
> `Output`: the open, the frame, the handoff with permission question, the two tells.

Run it before any first call — the tone is set before the agenda starts.

PRO MOVE Calibrate the open to your natural style honestly; borrowed charm reads as borrowed, and dry beats fake-warm every time.

PROMPT 17 · RUNNING THE ROOM

The live summary weapon

The live summary is the highest-payoff behavior in discovery: it proves listening, tests understanding, earns the next hard question, and banks quotable evidence — in one move. Their words verbatim, not synonyms, is what creates the 'this person gets it' effect.

> You are an expert in active-listening mechanics with deep expertise in the live summary — the moment a rep plays back what they heard, which simultaneously proves listening, tests understanding, earns the next hard question, and creates quotable deal evidence.
> `Inputs` — A stretch of prospect talk: `{paste a real answer or monologue from a call — transcript or memory}`. Where in the call it happened: `{context}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the summary the way top reps do: compress their three minutes into two sentences using THEIR key phrases verbatim — not synonyms, their words, because hearing their own language back is what creates the 'this person gets it' effect. (2) Attach the verification tail: '...did I get that right?' or 'what am I missing?' — the invitation to correct, which produces the most honest data of the call. (3) Attach the bridge: the follow-up question the summary just earned, one rung deeper (borrow the ladder from prompt 06). (4) Coach the cadence: where in a thirty-minute call the two or three summaries belong, and the tell that one is overdue — usually when they've given three answers and I've banked none.
> `Constraints`: two sentences maximum per summary — a long summary is a second monologue. Their words verbatim, marked in the output so I can see which phrases I kept.
> `Output`: the summary with kept phrases marked, the tail, the bridge, the cadence coach.

Drill it until reflex — the single highest-payoff behavior in discovery.

PRO MOVE Two summaries per thirty minutes is the cadence — when they've given three answers and you've banked none, one is overdue.

PROMPT 18 · RUNNING THE ROOM

The mid-call objection handler

Price questions at minute twelve punish both dodging and over-answering — the honest range plus a frame beats either. The classification matters: a genuine question, a derailment, and a test each reward a different response.

> You are an elite discovery tactician with deep expertise in the mid-discovery objection — the 'how much does this cost?' at minute twelve, the 'we tried something like this before,' the 'I only have fifteen minutes now' — moments that reward composure and punish both dodging and over-answering.
> `Inputs` — My product and rough price: `{facts}`. The three mid-call curveballs I most expect or fear: `{name them}`. My call plan: `{the agenda and hypotheses, briefly}`.
> `Method`: (1) For each curveball, classify it: genuine question (answer it — dodging 'what's the price?' twice destroys more trust than any number), derailment (honor it in one sentence, then name the return path aloud), or test (they're checking whether I'm a peer or a supplicant — respond with calibrated directness). (2) Write the response for each: the early price question gets the honest range plus the frame — 'depends on X and Y, which is part of what I'm hoping to understand today'; the we-tried-it-before gets curiosity, not defense — 'what happened?' is the best possible next question; the time cut gets instant triage — which agenda piece survives. (3) For each, write the pivot line that returns us to discovery without the gears grinding. (4) Name the curveball that should actually change my call plan rather than be handled.
> `Constraints`: every response under 30 spoken words before the conversation returns to them. No price-dodging beyond one reframe.
> `Output`: the classified curveballs, the responses, the pivots, the plan-changer.

Run it to prep for objections that arrive DURING discovery — different rules than late-stage.

PRO MOVE Never dodge price twice; the second dodge costs more trust than any number you could have said.

PROMPT 19 · RUNNING THE ROOM

The quiet-room activator

Silence in the room is never silence afterward — the quiet stakeholder kills deals in meetings you're not invited to. An easy, named, early invitation is the cheapest insurance in group selling.

> You are an expert group facilitator with deep expertise in the silent stakeholder — the attendee who says nothing for forty minutes and then kills the deal in a meeting you're not in, because silence in the room is never silence afterward.
> `Inputs` — The attendees and my read on each: `{paste from prompt 04, or describe}`. Who I expect to dominate: `{name}`. Who I expect to go quiet: `{name, and their likely private concern}`.
> `Method`: (1) Design the named invitation for the quiet one — a question directed to them by name, in their domain, easy to answer well: '`{Name}`, you'd see this from the `{their function}` side — how does this land there?' Sequenced early, because minute-five participation begets minute-thirty participation. (2) Design the dominator management: the respectful redirect that banks their point and opens the floor — 'that's exactly what I want to dig into — before we do, let's hear the `{function}` angle.' (3) Prepare the disagreement-surfacing move for when two attendees' answers quietly conflict — name it neutrally: 'I'm hearing two different pictures of X — which is closer?' (4) Define the post-call follow-up specifically for the quiet one: the individual note that gives them a private channel for the concern they didn't voice.
> `Constraints`: invitations must be genuinely easy to answer — putting the quiet person on the spot with a hard question teaches them to stay silent. Never referee, always curate.
> `Output`: the named invitation, the redirect, the surfacing move, the private-channel note.

Run it before multi-stakeholder calls — the silent attendee is where deals leak.

PRO MOVE Send the quiet one an individual follow-up with a private channel for the concern they didn't voice — that note has saved more group deals than any demo.

PROMPT 20 · RUNNING THE ROOM

The next-step lock

A discovery that ends in 'we'll circle back' was a donation to their calendar. The lock standard — action, attendees, date, purpose — exists because meetings without a purpose get cancelled by whoever's week gets busy first.

> You are an elite closing mechanic with deep expertise in the last five minutes of discovery — where reps who did everything right go soft, accept 'we'll circle back,' and turn a great conversation into pipeline fiction.
> `Inputs` — The call's likely outcomes: `{good fit, partial fit, unclear}`. The natural next step for each: `{demo, exec intro, pilot scoping, more discovery}`. The date of this call: `{date}`.
> `Method`: (1) Write the closing summary: what I heard (two sentences, their words), the honest fit statement — including the partial-fit version that names what we're NOT right for, because voluntary honesty beats three case studies — and the next step. (2) Build the next-step proposal to the lock standard: specific action, specific attendees, specific date offered ('Thursday or Monday?'), and a stated purpose — because a meeting without one gets cancelled by whoever's calendar fills first. (3) Script the soft-answer counter: when they say 'send some times' or 'let me check with the team,' the gentle hold — 'happy to — while we're both here, does the week of the 20th work?' — that converts intent into ink. (4) Write the mutual-homework close: what I owe them by when, what I'm asking them to bring — because a two-sided next step survives their Monday.
> `Constraints`: never lock a next step the call didn't earn — the partial-fit close with a smaller step beats an overreached demo that no-shows. Date in the calendar before the call ends, always attempted.
> `Output`: the summary structure, the lock-standard proposal, the soft-answer counter, the mutual homework.

Run it before every call — a discovery that ends in 'we'll be in touch' was a donation.

PRO MOVE Practice the soft-answer counter until it's reflex; 'send me some times' is where locked deals quietly come undone.

SECTION 05 / 05

After the call

The call was the raw material. These five refine it — into evidence, into the follow-up that gets forwarded, and into the plan for call two.

PROMPT 21 · AFTER THE CALL

The transcript miner

A thirty-minute call contains six sentences that matter enormously and twenty-five minutes of context — and memory keeps the wrong ones. Verbatim extraction within the hour is the difference between evidence and paraphrase.

> You are an elite conversation analyst with deep expertise in mining call transcripts — you know a thirty-minute discovery contains six to ten sentences that matter enormously and twenty-five minutes of context, and your job is to never lose the six.
> `Inputs` — The transcript or my detailed notes: `{paste}`. My hypotheses going in: `{paste from prompt 02, optional}`. The deal: `{stage, size}`.
> `Method`: (1) Extract the verbatim gold: every sentence where they stated pain, named a number, revealed process, mentioned a stakeholder, flagged a timeline, or showed emotion — quoted exactly, with speaker, because paraphrase destroys evidentiary value. (2) Run the hypothesis audit: which of my going-in hypotheses were confirmed, killed, or untested — with the quote that decided each. (3) List what the call did NOT establish — the questions I planned but never asked, the topics they steered around — because the dodge list is often more diagnostic than the answer list. (4) Flag the single most important sentence of the call and say why in one line.
> `Constraints`: quotes exact or marked [approx]. The dodge list must distinguish 'ran out of time' from 'they steered away' — only the second one is a signal.
> `Output`: the verbatim gold sorted by category, the hypothesis audit, the dodge list, the sentence of the call.

Run it within an hour of any recorded call — the gold decays with your memory.

PRO MOVE The dodge list is the sleeper output — the topics they steered around are often more diagnostic than anything they said.

PROMPT 22 · AFTER THE CALL

The gap analyzer

The post-call glow makes every rep overestimate what they actually established — 'sensed' is not 'quoted.' The vehicle assignment is the fix for the other failure: piling every gap onto the next call turns it into an interrogation.

> You are an expert deal auditor with deep expertise in the gap between a good conversation and a qualified deal — you know the post-call glow makes every rep overestimate what they actually established.
> `Inputs` — The mined call output: `{paste from prompt 21}`. The MEDDPICC score if run: `{paste from prompt 11, optional}`. What the agreed next step is: `{the locked step and date}`.
> `Method`: (1) Build the established/missing ledger across the six things a deal needs: quantified pain, decision process, economic buyer, timeline driver, competition picture, and champion evidence — with the quote that establishes each, or the word MISSING. (2) For every MISSING item, assign its collection vehicle: which upcoming touch naturally carries it — the follow-up email can confirm process; only a live call can test a champion — because assigning everything to 'next call' is how next calls become interrogations. (3) Rank the missing items by deal risk: which unknown, if it breaks badly, kills this deal? (4) Write the one question I'd ask if I could only ask one more.
> `Constraints`: the glow discount — anything I 'sensed' but can't quote goes in MISSING. Vehicles must be realistic for the relationship stage.
> `Output`: the ledger with quotes, the vehicle assignments, the risk ranking, the one question.

Run it after the miner — it converts what you heard into what you still need.

PRO MOVE Answer the 'one question' output honestly and put it in the calendar invite agenda — it's usually the deal's hinge.

PROMPT 23 · AFTER THE CALL

The follow-up email that gets forwarded

The post-discovery email isn't a thank-you note — it's the deal's first written artifact, built for people who weren't on the call. The forward test is the real send criterion: does this make your contact look smart to their boss?

> You are an elite deal-communication writer with deep expertise in the post-discovery email — the most under-leveraged document in sales, because it isn't a thank-you note: it's the deal's first written artifact, built to be forwarded to people who weren't on the call.
> `Inputs` — The mined call: `{paste from prompt 21, or key points}`. The locked next step: `{action, date, attendees}`. My homework and theirs: `{what each side owes}`. The likely forward audience: `{who my contact reports to or consults}`.
> `Method`: (1) Write the email in the forwardable structure: one warm line (not gratitude theater), the WHAT WE HEARD section — three bullets maximum, each anchored in their verbatim language, ordered by what the forward audience cares about; the WHERE THAT POINTS line — one sentence connecting their situation to a path, without pitching; the NEXT STEP block with date, attendees, purpose; and the mutual homework split. (2) Run the forward test: would this email make my contact look smart to their boss for having taken the call? Revise until yes — that's the actual send criterion. (3) Strip every phrase that smells of template: 'great connecting,' 'as discussed,' 'per our conversation.' (4) Write the subject line: their initiative's name, not mine.
> `Constraints`: under 150 words. Their words outnumber mine in the HEARD section. Zero attachments unless one was promised.
> `Output`: the email, the forward-test verdict, the subject line.

Run it same-day, every time — this email is the artifact your champion forwards upward.

PRO MOVE Subject line is their initiative's name, never yours — you're writing an internal document that happens to come from outside.

PROMPT 24 · AFTER THE CALL

The internal deal review brief

Reps who narrate their pipeline get skeptical questions; reps who brief it get useful coaching. Leading with the honest top risk builds more credibility with a manager than any polished win story.

> You are an expert sales operator with deep expertise in the internal deal review — you know the difference between a rep who narrates their pipeline and one who briefs it: the second one gets useful coaching instead of skeptical questions.
> `Inputs` — The deal's evidence base: `{paste the miner and gap outputs from prompts 21-22, or summarize}`. The forecast: `{stage, amount, close date}`. What I want from my manager: `{air cover, exec help, deal strategy, just visibility}`.
> `Method`: (1) Write the brief in the format managers actually process: SITUATION (two sentences, evidence-based), WHY THEY'LL BUY (the quantified pain in their words), WHY WE MIGHT LOSE (the honest top risk — leading with it builds more credibility than burying it), WHAT'S NEXT (the locked step), and THE ASK (what I need from my manager, specifically — 'nothing, FYI' is a valid ask). (2) Pressure-test the close date against the decision process evidence: if the math doesn't support the date, move the date in the brief before my manager moves it for me. (3) Pre-answer the three questions this manager always asks. (4) Keep the whole thing under 200 words — a brief that needs scrolling is a memo.
> `Constraints`: every claim traceable to a quote or artifact. The risk section is mandatory and must be real.
> `Output`: the five-part brief, the date verdict, the pre-answered questions.

Run it before pipeline review — walk in with the brief your manager wishes everyone wrote.

`PRO MOVE` Move your own close date before the evidence forces your manager to — self-corrected forecasts build a reputation that compounds.

PROMPT 25 · AFTER THE CALL

The second-call architect

Call two with the same questions is a rerun, and buyers don't attend reruns. Opening with a synthesis of call one — plus one thing you did because of what they said — is the strongest trust signal available: demonstrated follow-through.

> You are an elite deal choreographer with deep expertise in the second call — where deals either compound or stall, because call two with the same questions is a rerun, and buyers don't attend reruns.
> `Inputs` — Everything from call one: `{paste the miner and gap outputs, prompts 21-22}`. Who's attending call two: `{names — same people, or new faces}`. The stated purpose we locked: `{from the next-step lock}`.
> `Method`: (1) Open with proof of listening: design the first three minutes around a synthesis of call one — 'since we talked, I've been thinking about `{their exact phrase}`' — plus one thing I did because of what they said, because demonstrated follow-through is the strongest trust signal available to a seller. (2) Build the advance agenda: this call's job is the top two MISSING items from the gap analysis, woven into the stated purpose — name exactly where in the flow each gets its moment. (3) Handle the new faces: for each first-time attendee, the sixty-second recap protocol that catches them up without making the veterans sit through a rerun — and the named question that makes them glad they came. (4) Design this call's next-step lock: what the step after this one should be if it goes well, and its smaller fallback if it goes sideways.
> `Constraints`: zero repeated questions from call one — reference their prior answers instead. The advance agenda serves their stated purpose first, my gaps second.
> `Output`: the listening open, the advance agenda with gap placements, the new-face protocol, the two-tier lock.

Run it two days before call two — the sequel has to advance the plot, not recap it.

PRO MOVE Design the fallback next step before the call; when the room goes sideways, the smaller ask you prepared is what saves the thread.

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