Promptifi

FREE PROMPT PACK

# 25 research prompts that find the *angle.*

Pulled from the Promptifi library — 2,900+ tested AI workflows for B2B sales reps. These 25 work as one system: turn a company's public surface into a dossier, mine its filings and its people for the pressure it's under, and compile the whole read into the one angle that earns a reply. 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

# Company intel

Before you write a word to an account, you build the picture the rest of the pack sharpens. These five turn a company's own public surface — site, stack, org, news — into a working brief.

---

PROMPT 01 · COMPANY INTEL

## The account dossier architect

Deals researched shallow get worked shallow, and most reps never write down what they actually know versus what they're only guessing. A dossier that names its own gaps — and routes each gap to the prompt that closes it — turns scattered browser tabs into a spine the whole account plan hangs on.

> You are an elite account researcher with deep expertise in building the one-page dossier every later touch is built on — you know a deal researched shallow gets worked shallow, and that the brief you write now is the spine of the whole account.
> `Inputs` — The account: `{company name, website, industry}`. What I already know: `{paste notes, prior calls, anything}`. My product in one line: `{what I sell and to whom}`. Who I think I'm selling into: `{best guess at persona}`.
> `Method`: (1) Frame the seven fields every dossier needs — what they do and for whom, size and trajectory, likely buying triggers, probable buying committee, current-stack guess, the strategic theme they keep repeating publicly, and the single biggest unknown. (2) For each field, mark whether I already have it, can get it from public sources, or genuinely cannot know it — because a dossier that hides its gaps is worse than one that names them. (3) Rank the three unknowns most worth closing before I reach out, and name the exact prompt in this pack that closes each. (4) Write the two-line 'why now' hypothesis the rest of my research either confirms or kills.
> `Constraints`: no filler fields I will never use. If I have given you too little to build a real spine, say THIN and list the four inputs that would fix it.
> `Output`: the seven-field dossier scaffold with source tags, the ranked unknowns routed to prompts, the why-now hypothesis.

Run this first on any new account — the dossier it builds is the spine every later prompt fills in.

PRO MOVE Rebuild the dossier's why-now line every time a new signal lands; the day that sentence stops being true, your angle has already changed.

PROMPT 02 · COMPANY INTEL

## The website teardown

A company's homepage brags about what it wants to be known for and stays silent about what it fears, and both are strategic tells a rep can read for free. Mirroring three phrases in their own voice makes your first line sound like an insider's instead of a stranger's.

> You are an expert positioning analyst with deep expertise in reading a company from its own website — you know the homepage, the pricing page, and the careers page each leak a different truth, and that what a company brags about tells you what it fears.
> `Inputs` — Their site: `{paste homepage copy, product page, about page, any pricing page}`. My product: `{one line}`. The dossier so far: `{paste from prompt 01, optional}`.
> `Method`: (1) Extract their self-positioning: who they say they serve, the three problems they claim to solve, and the words they repeat — because repeated words are strategic tells, not accidents. (2) Read the gaps: what a company in their space would normally say and pointedly does not, since silence often marks a weakness or a deliberate wedge. (3) Map their language to my product: where their stated priorities open a door for me and where they close one. (4) Pull three concrete phrases in their own voice I can mirror back in outreach, so I sound like an insider rather than a stranger.
> `Constraints`: quote only words actually on the page — no inferring a strategy from a stock photo. If the site is a thin brochure with nothing to read, say THIN SITE and point me to the careers page and their press instead.
> `Output`: the positioning read, the tells and silences, the door map, the three mirror phrases.

Run it early — a company's own website is the cheapest research you'll ever do.

PRO MOVE Read the careers page before the homepage — open roles describe the problems a company is spending to fix right now.

PROMPT 03 · COMPANY INTEL

## The org-chart reconstructor

The buying committee lives inside the org chart, and a rep who doesn't know who reports to whom pitches the right message into the wrong seat. Reconstructing the reporting lines and tagging every box confirmed or inferred tells you who to reach and who can quietly kill the deal.

> You are an elite org-structure analyst with deep expertise in reconstructing a company's real hierarchy from public fragments — you know the buying committee lives inside the org chart, and that reps who don't know who reports to whom pitch the wrong person perfectly.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name, rough size}`. What I can see: `{paste LinkedIn titles, team page, any names and roles I've found}`. The function I'm selling into: `{e.g. RevOps, IT, marketing}`.
> `Method`: (1) Reconstruct the relevant slice of the org: the likely head of the function, the managers under them, and the individual contributors who'd actually use my product — inferring reporting lines from title seniority, tenure, and who announces whom. (2) Tag every box as confirmed (I have evidence) or inferred (I'm reasoning), and never let an inference masquerade as a fact. (3) Identify the economic buyer, the likely champion level, and the person whose quiet 'no' kills deals — the blocker who isn't on the invite. (4) Name the one hire or reorg that would most change this map, so I watch for it.
> `Constraints`: seniority in a title does not always mean authority — flag where a fancy title may be hollow. Where the fragments genuinely don't support a structure, say INFERENCE ONLY and give me the two roles to confirm first.
> `Output`: the reconstructed slice with confirmed and inferred tags, the read on buyer, champion, and blocker, and the one hire that would redraw the map.

Run it before you pick who to contact — pitching the wrong person perfectly still loses.

PRO MOVE Watch for the reorg or senior hire that redraws the map; when it lands, your champion path often changes overnight.

PROMPT 04 · COMPANY INTEL

## The tech-stack excavator

A job post, an integrations page, and a support doc leak a company's real tool stack more honestly than any vendor claim. Knowing the incumbent tools tells you whether you're a rip-and-replace, a fill-the-gap, or a nice-to-have before you ever pick up the phone.

> You are an expert technographic analyst with deep expertise in inferring a company's real tool stack from the traces it leaves — you know a job post, an integrations page, and a support doc reveal more than any vendor claim, and that knowing the incumbent tools tells you where I fit or fight.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name, site}`. What I've gathered: `{paste job descriptions, their integrations or partners page, any tools named in reviews or posts}`. My product's category and the tools it replaces or plugs into: `{name them}`.
> `Method`: (1) Extract every tool signal: required skills in job posts, logos on their integrations page, technologies named in engineering blogs or support docs — each is a different confidence level, so weight them. (2) Assemble the probable stack in my category and the adjacent ones, marking each tool confirmed or inferred. (3) Read the stack as a story: what it says about their maturity, their likely pain, and whether I'm a rip-and-replace, a fill-the-gap, or a nice-to-have. (4) Name the single tool whose presence or absence most changes my pitch, and how I'd confirm it in one question.
> `Constraints`: a listed integration is a capability, not proof they use it — say so. If the traces are too thin to infer a stack, say NO SIGNAL and give me the two searches most likely to surface one.
> `Output`: the weighted stack with tags, the maturity read, the fit verdict, the one confirming question.

Run it when you need to know what they already own before you position against it.

PRO MOVE Weight the signals — a required skill in a job post beats a logo on a partners page, which beats a guess.

PROMPT 05 · COMPANY INTEL

## The trigger-event scanner

Timing beats messaging, and a relevant change in the last ninety days is worth more than the cleverest opener. The skill is discarding the dramatic events that don't touch your value and keeping the quiet one that does.

> You are an elite trigger-event analyst with deep expertise in the recent changes that make a cold account suddenly workable — you know timing beats messaging, and that a relevant event from the last ninety days is worth more than any clever line.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name}`. What I've found: `{paste recent news, press, funding, exec changes, product launches, earnings notes, layoffs}`. My product's trigger logic: `{what kind of change creates need for what I sell}`.
> `Method`: (1) Sort every event by relevance to my specific value — a leadership change matters if I sell to that function, a funding round matters if I sell scale — and discard the events that are just noise, however dramatic. (2) For the top two relevant events, write the causal line: this happened, therefore this pressure now exists, therefore my product is suddenly on-time. (3) Rank by freshness and specificity, because a vague old trigger is weaker than a sharp recent one. (4) Draft the one-sentence trigger hook I'd open with, tied to the event, that proves I did the reading.
> `Constraints`: no manufactured relevance — if an event doesn't honestly connect to my value, leave it out. If nothing in the inputs is a real trigger, say NO TRIGGER and tell me the two sources to check before I write this account off.
> `Output`: the ranked relevant events, the causal lines, the trigger hook.

Run it before outreach — a relevant event from the last ninety days beats any clever line.

PRO MOVE Set a saved alert on each named account so triggers reach you the week they happen, not the quarter after.

SECTION 02 / 05

# People intel

Companies don't buy; people inside them do, for reasons of their own. These five find those people, read what they care about, and map who actually decides.

PROMPT 06 · PEOPLE INTEL

## The decision-maker profiler

People reply to reps who clearly understand them, and a profile built on someone's own public words beats rapport you invented. Reading their arc — what they were hired to fix and how they're measured — hands you the one angle most likely to earn a reply.

> You are an expert executive profiler with deep expertise in reading a named decision-maker from their public footprint — you know people buy from people who understand them, and that a profile built on evidence beats a guess dressed up as rapport.
> `Inputs` — The person: `{name, title, company}`. Their footprint: `{paste LinkedIn about and posts, interviews, podcast quotes, conference talks, anything in their own words}`. My product and why it might matter to them: `{one line}`.
> `Method`: (1) Extract what they actually care about from their own words — the themes they return to, the metrics they cite, the language they use — separating stated priorities from the performative ones everyone posts. (2) Read their professional arc: where they came from, what they were hired to fix, and what a person in their seat is measured on this year. (3) Map their priorities to my value, naming the one angle most likely to earn a reply and the one that would get me ignored. (4) Note their likely communication style — direct, data-driven, relational — so I match register in outreach.
> `Constraints`: use only public, professional signal — no personal life, no assumptions from a photo. If their footprint is too thin to profile honestly, say THIN FOOTPRINT and route me to their company's public statements instead.
> `Output`: the priorities read, the arc, the angle map, the style note.

Run it on any named person before you write to them — reply rates follow real understanding.

PRO MOVE Match their register in your first line; a data-driven exec and a relational one bite on opposite openers.

PROMPT 07 · PEOPLE INTEL

## The mover-and-hire tracker

People move before strategies are announced, and a cluster of open roles is a company telling you its next problem out loud. Reading the hiring pattern points you at the function that's about to strain — and buy.

> You are an elite talent-signal analyst with deep expertise in what a company's hires and departures reveal about where it's headed — you know people move before strategies are announced, and that a job posting is a company telling you its next problem out loud.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name}`. What I've gathered: `{paste recent hires, promotions, departures, and open roles — titles and dates}`. My product's buyer and the initiatives that create demand for it: `{name them}`.
> `Method`: (1) Read the hiring pattern: a cluster of roles in one function signals investment there; a new senior leader signals a mandate to change something; a wave of departures signals trouble or a pivot. (2) Connect the pattern to likely initiatives — hiring a head of RevOps plus three ops analysts is a company about to overhaul process, which is a buying window for anyone who serves it. (3) Identify the one new or open role that most implies demand for my product, and the person whose arrival I should reference. (4) Flag any departure that removes a champion or a blocker I should know about.
> `Constraints`: don't over-read a single hire — patterns are signal, one data point is weather. If the movement data is too sparse to read a pattern, say SPARSE and give me the two feeds to monitor.
> `Output`: the pattern read, the initiative links, the role that implies demand, the champion or blocker change.

Run it to read where an account is investing — hiring is a company saying its next problem out loud.

PRO MOVE Reference a relevant new senior hire early; a note to the person whose mandate you serve is a warm door most reps walk straight past.

PROMPT 08 · PEOPLE INTEL

## The champion-finder

A champion isn't the highest title — it's the person with the most to gain and the credibility to spend it, and picking a merely friendly contact burns the whole cycle. Scoring candidates on pain, reach, and credibility separates a real advocate from a pleasant dead end.

> You are an expert champion-identification strategist with deep expertise in spotting the person inside an account most likely to fight for my deal — you know champions aren't the highest title, they're the person with the most to gain and the credibility to spend it.
> `Inputs` — The account and its people: `{paste the org slice from prompt 03, plus any individuals I've profiled}`. My product's value and who benefits most from it: `{one or two sentences}`. Any prior contact: `{who's engaged, how warmly}`.
> `Method`: (1) Score each plausible person on three axes: pain (do they personally feel the problem I solve), reach (can they get to the economic buyer), and credibility (would leadership listen). A champion needs all three; strong on one is a coach, not a champion. (2) Name my best candidate and my backup, with the evidence for each. (3) For the top candidate, write the personal win — what fighting for this deal does for their standing or their number — because champions sell internally for themselves, not for me. (4) Name the person who looks like a champion but is only friendly, so I don't over-invest in a dead end.
> `Constraints`: friendliness is not championship — separate them ruthlessly. If nobody visible clears all three axes, say NO CHAMPION YET and give me the multi-thread move to find one.
> `Output`: the scored candidates, the champion and the backup, the personal win, and the flag on the contact who is only friendly.

Run it once you know the org — picking the wrong internal advocate wastes the whole cycle.

PRO MOVE Write your champion's personal win explicitly; people sell internally for their own standing, not for your quota.

PROMPT 09 · PEOPLE INTEL

## The exec-priorities decoder

The words a leadership team repeats in public are the words its budget follows, and every company claims customer obsession — the real priority is the one backed by hires and spend. Decoding it lets you reframe your product as an instrument of what they already said they want.

> You are an elite strategy-signal reader with deep expertise in decoding what a leadership team is actually prioritizing from what it says in public — you know the words executives repeat in earnings notes, town halls, and interviews are the words budget follows, and that pitching off their priorities beats pitching your features.
> `Inputs` — The signals: `{paste exec quotes, posts, interview transcripts, letters to shareholders, all-hands notes — anything from leadership}`. My product's value themes: `{name the two or three}`.
> `Method`: (1) Cluster their public language into strategic themes — growth, efficiency, risk, customer experience — and rank the themes by how often and how recently leadership returns to them. (2) Separate the real priority from the performative one: every company says 'customer obsession'; find the theme they back with hires, spend, or specifics. (3) Map my value themes onto their top priority, and write the one-line bridge that reframes my product as an instrument of what they already said they want. (4) Name the priority of theirs I honestly cannot serve, so I don't force a fit.
> `Constraints`: a slogan is not a priority until something backs it — demand evidence before you rank a theme high. If their public signal is too generic to decode, say GENERIC and tell me which two sources carry sharper signal.
> `Output`: the ranked themes with evidence, the real-versus-performative split, the value bridge, the can't-serve flag.

Run it to pitch off what leadership already said it wants, not off your feature list.

PRO MOVE Quote their own priority language back in outreach; a buyer moves faster toward a goal they already named than toward yours.

PROMPT 10 · PEOPLE INTEL

## The buying-committee mapper

The average B2B deal has more than six people touching the yes, and a rep who works only the champion loses to the blocker nobody mapped. Mapping the committee by role and ranking by influence rather than org rank shows you the silent seats you have no coverage on.

> You are an expert buying-committee cartographer with deep expertise in mapping who actually decides — you know the average B2B deal has more than six people touching the yes, and that a rep who works only the champion loses to the blocker nobody mapped.
> `Inputs` — What I know: `{paste the org slice from prompt 03 and the champion read from prompt 08}`. The deal: `{my product, rough price, what has to be true to buy}`. Who I've talked to: `{names and roles}`.
> `Method`: (1) Assemble the committee by role, not just name: economic buyer, champion, technical evaluator, end user, and the finance or procurement gatekeeper — inferring who fills each seat even where I don't have a name yet. (2) For each role, note their likely decision criterion and their likely objection, because the CFO and the end user say yes for opposite reasons. (3) Identify the two seats I have no coverage on — the silent killers — and the path to reach each. (4) Rank the committee by influence on this specific decision, which is rarely the same as rank on the org chart.
> `Constraints`: don't confuse the org chart with the decision — map influence, not hierarchy. Where a seat is pure inference, tag it INFERRED and name the question that confirms who sits there.
> `Output`: the committee by role, the criterion-and-objection per seat, the coverage gaps, the influence ranking.

Run it before a deal gets real — the blocker nobody mapped is the one who kills it.

PRO MOVE Chase the two uncovered seats first; the deals that stall late usually died in a seat you never worked.

SECTION 03 / 05

# Financial and strategic signals

The best angle is the pressure a company is already under and told the world about. These five mine filings, earnings calls, and money signals for exactly where that pressure lives.

PROMPT 11 · FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC SIGNALS

## The 10-K miner

A public company's risk factors are where it is legally required to name what keeps it up at night, and its fears are your openings. The skill is skipping the boilerplate every filing carries and finding the specific, recently added risk that connects to what you solve.

> You are an elite filings analyst with deep expertise in mining a public company's 10-K for sales signal — you know the risk factors and the management discussion are where a company is legally required to tell you what keeps it up at night, and that its fears are your openings.
> `Inputs` — The filing: `{paste the risk factors, the MD&A, and any segment breakdown from their latest 10-K or 10-Q}`. My product's value: `{two sentences}`. The function I sell into: `{name it}`.
> `Method`: (1) Pull the risk factors that connect to what I solve — skip the boilerplate every filing carries and find the specific, recently added, or unusually detailed risks, because those are the live ones. (2) Read the MD&A for where management says margin, growth, or cost pressure lives, and tie each to a problem my product touches. (3) Translate the two strongest signals into plain language: this is what they told regulators they're worried about, therefore this is the pressure I can speak to. (4) Extract one exact phrase from the filing I can quote back to prove analyst-grade preparation.
> `Constraints`: don't stretch a generic risk factor into a fake fit — most are boilerplate, and citing boilerplate as insight reads as amateur. If they're private and there's no filing, say PRIVATE and route me to prompt 15 for the private-company path.
> `Output`: the connected risk factors, the MD&A pressure points, the two plain-language signals, the quotable phrase.

Run it on any public company — the risk factors are where they're required to name their fears.

PRO MOVE Quote one exact phrase from the filing in your first touch; nothing proves analyst-grade preparation faster.

PROMPT 12 · FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC SIGNALS

## The earnings-call analyzer

Executives are coached on the prepared remarks and exposed in the analyst questions, and the guidance they commit to on the record is the strategy that gets funded. Mining the questions they dodged tells you where the real pressure sits.

> You are an expert earnings-call analyst with deep expertise in reading the transcript for what the prepared remarks hide and the analyst Q&A reveals — you know executives are coached on the script and exposed in the questions, and that the guidance they give is the strategy they'll fund.
> `Inputs` — The transcript: `{paste the prepared remarks and the analyst Q&A from the latest call}`. My value themes: `{name them}`. What I'm trying to time: `{the initiative or budget I want to attach to}`.
> `Method`: (1) Extract the forward guidance and the stated priorities from the prepared remarks — the initiatives leadership committed to on the record are the ones with budget behind them. (2) Mine the Q&A for tension: which analyst questions did executives dodge, over-explain, or answer defensively, because that's where the real pressure sits. (3) Connect the strongest priority and the sharpest tension to my product, and write the two 'therefore' lines that make my outreach feel timed to their reality. (4) Note the metric leadership repeated most, since that number is what the buying committee will be measured against.
> `Constraints`: distinguish a firm commitment from analyst-pleasing optimism — weight what they'll be held to, not what sounds good. If the transcript carries nothing that honestly connects to my value, say NOT MATERIAL and say so plainly.
> `Output`: the guidance and priorities, the Q&A tension points, the two timed lines, the repeated metric.

Run it after an earnings call — the guidance they gave is the strategy they'll fund.

PRO MOVE Time your outreach to the metric leadership repeated most; that number is what the whole committee is about to be measured against.

PROMPT 13 · FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC SIGNALS

## The strategic-signal synthesizer

One signal is a dot and three signals are a direction, and the rep who sees the direction arrives before the RFP. Fusing the filing, the call, and the recent moves into one throughline — stress-tested against its own counter-evidence — is the difference between a hunch and a thesis.

> You are an elite strategy synthesist with deep expertise in fusing scattered financial and public signals into a single coherent read of where an account is going — you know one signal is a dot and three signals are a direction, and that the rep who sees the direction arrives before the RFP.
> `Inputs` — The signals: `{paste the outputs of prompt 11, prompt 12, and the trigger events from prompt 05}`. My product: `{one line}`. The strategic themes I can plausibly serve: `{name them}`.
> `Method`: (1) Lay the signals side by side and find the throughline — the one strategic direction that explains the filing risks, the earnings priorities, and the recent moves at once, rather than treating each as separate. (2) Stress-test the throughline: what evidence would contradict it, and does any input already do so, because a thesis that ignores its counter-evidence is a fantasy. (3) State the strategic thesis in three sentences — where they are, where they're heading, and the pressure driving it — in language I could say to their VP without flinching. (4) Name the single initiative of theirs my product most naturally rides, and the window when it's live.
> `Constraints`: hold the thesis to the evidence — if the signals genuinely point different directions, say NO THROUGHLINE rather than forcing a tidy story. Mark every inference as inference.
> `Output`: the throughline, the stress test, the three-sentence thesis, the initiative to ride.

Run it once you have a few signals — three dots become a direction the RFP hasn't caught up to yet.

PRO MOVE Say the three-sentence thesis out loud to a colleague; if it survives a skeptic, it's ready to say to their VP.

PROMPT 14 · FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC SIGNALS

## The budget-and-timing reader

The best angle lands nothing if it arrives in month eleven of a locked budget, and fiscal rhythm is a signal most reps ignore entirely. Reading the calendar and the spend signals tells you whether now is a buy, a plant, or a wait.

> You are an expert budget-timing analyst with deep expertise in inferring when an account can actually spend — you know the best angle lands nothing if it arrives in month eleven of a locked budget, and that fiscal rhythm is a signal reps routinely ignore.
> `Inputs` — What I know: `{paste fiscal year end if known, recent spend or hiring signals, any procurement notes, public planning-cycle hints}`. My product's price band and typical buying cycle: `{rough}`. Today's date: `{date}`.
> `Method`: (1) Infer their budget calendar: fiscal year end, when planning happens, and where we are in that cycle right now — reasoning from filings, industry norm, or company type where I don't have it stated. (2) Read the spend signals: recent hiring, new tools, or public investment suggest an open wallet; a hiring freeze or cost-cutting language suggests a closed one. (3) Judge the window: is now a buy-now, a plant-for-next-cycle, or a wait, and what's the honest timeline to a signature. (4) Name the one date I should aim my push at, and the low-cost way to stay warm until then.
> `Constraints`: don't confuse a company that can't buy now with one that never will — timing is not disqualification. Where I'm inferring the calendar rather than citing it, tag it INFERENCE and give me the one question that confirms it.
> `Output`: the budget calendar, the spend read, the window verdict, and the target date with the cheap way to stay warm until it.

Run it before you push — the sharpest angle lands nothing in month eleven of a locked budget.

PRO MOVE Aim your hardest push at the weeks before their planning cycle, while line items are still being written.

PROMPT 15 · FINANCIAL AND STRATEGIC SIGNALS

## The private-company signal tracker

The absence of a 10-K doesn't mean the absence of signal; funding rounds, headcount curves, and press fill the gap for a rep who knows where to look. A fresh raise is a mandate to spend, and a scaling function is where new tools get bought.

> You are an elite private-company analyst with deep expertise in reading accounts that file nothing — you know the absence of a 10-K doesn't mean the absence of signal, and that funding rounds, headcount curves, and press fill the gap for a rep who knows where to look.
> `Inputs` — The company: `{name}`. What I've gathered: `{paste funding history, investor names, headcount trend, product launches, press, review-site presence}`. My product's value and its scale triggers: `{name them}`.
> `Method`: (1) Read the funding story: stage, recency, investor caliber, and amount — a fresh raise means a mandate to spend and grow, which is a buying window; a long drought means caution. (2) Read the growth curve: headcount trajectory and hiring mix tell you which functions are scaling and therefore straining, which is where new tools get bought. (3) Tie the strongest signal to my value and write the 'therefore now' line, the private-company equivalent of a filing insight. (4) Name the one investor or board dynamic that would shape their priorities, if visible.
> `Constraints`: a big raise is not a blank check — connect it to my specific value or leave it out. If the company is genuinely dark with no findable signal, say DARK and give me the three sources most likely to have something.
> `Output`: the funding read, the growth-curve read, the therefore-now line, the board dynamic.

Run it when the account files nothing — private companies leak signal in funding and headcount.

`PRO MOVE` Track headcount trajectory by function; the team hiring fastest is the one straining hardest and buying soonest.

SECTION 04 / 05

# Competitive context

No account exists in a vacuum — every one is defending or attacking something. These five read the competition, the incumbent, and the market seam you can wedge into.

PROMPT 16 · COMPETITIVE CONTEXT

## The competitor teardown

Competitive pressure is the fastest route to urgency, and selling to a company's strategic fear beats selling to its stated wish list. Finding the front where a rival is winning share gives you a budget you can attach your product to.

> You are an expert competitive analyst with deep expertise in mapping who an account competes with and why it matters to my pitch — you know a company's competitive pressure is the fastest route to urgency, and that selling to their strategic fear beats selling to their stated wish list.
> `Inputs` — The account: `{name, market}`. What I know about their competition: `{paste named rivals, market position, any 'versus' language they use, analyst placement}`. My product's value: `{one line}`.
> `Method`: (1) Map their competitive set: the two or three rivals that actually pressure them, separating the ones they fear from the ones they merely list. (2) Identify where they're losing or defending — the front on which a competitor is winning share, talent, or narrative — because that pressure is a budget I can attach to. (3) Connect my product to that front: how what I sell helps them counter the specific competitor closing in, framed as competitive advantage rather than internal housekeeping. (4) Write the one-line urgency hook built on their rivalry, the kind that makes a status-quo account suddenly move.
> `Constraints`: use real competitive dynamics, not a generic 'stay ahead' line — specificity is the whole point. If their competitive position is genuinely stable and unpressured, say NO PRESSURE and pivot me to an efficiency angle instead.
> `Output`: the competitive set, the losing front, the product connection, the urgency hook.

Run it to find the competitive fear you can attach urgency to.

PRO MOVE Frame your value as a counter to the specific competitor closing in, not as a generic internal improvement.

PROMPT 17 · COMPETITIVE CONTEXT

## The incumbent-vendor detector

Walking in blind to the incumbent is how reps get ambushed by a renewal, and naming the switching math early is what decides displacement deals. Most incumbents are tolerated rather than loved, so the whole game is finding the real gap without disparaging the buyer's choice.

> You are an elite incumbent-detection analyst with deep expertise in figuring out which vendor already owns the problem I solve inside an account — you know walking in blind to the incumbent is how reps get ambushed by a renewal, and that naming the switching math early decides displacement deals.
> `Inputs` — The account: `{name}`. Traces I've found: `{paste the stack signals from prompt 04, plus any vendor logos, case studies they appear in, integrations, or reviews}`. My product and the specific tool it would replace: `{name it}`.
> `Method`: (1) Identify the most likely incumbent in my category from the traces, marking confidence — a case study is proof, a job-post skill is a strong hint, a guess is a guess. (2) Estimate their entrenchment: contract-size clues, how deep the tool sits, renewal timing if inferable — because a shallow incumbent is a swap and a deep one is a campaign. (3) Read the switching math honestly: what it would cost them to move, and whether my edge is worth that cost or not yet. (4) Name the one weakness of the likely incumbent I can wedge on, and the question that surfaces their dissatisfaction without disparaging their choice.
> `Constraints`: don't assume dissatisfaction — most incumbents are tolerated, not loved, and I have to find the real gap. If I can't identify the incumbent at all, say UNKNOWN INCUMBENT and give me the two questions that reveal it.
> `Output`: the likely incumbent with confidence, the entrenchment read, the switching math, the wedge question.

Run it before any displacement pitch — know the incumbent before it ambushes you at renewal.

PRO MOVE Gauge renewal timing before you invest; a deal that closes right after a fresh multi-year signature is a slow campaign, not a swap.

PROMPT 18 · COMPETITIVE CONTEXT

## The market-position mapper

A market leader and a challenger have opposite fears, and the same product is sold to each with a different story. Placing an account on evidence rather than its own flattering description hands you the fear that actually moves its budget.

> You are an expert market-positioning analyst with deep expertise in placing an account within its market so I pitch to their reality, not their brochure — you know a challenger and a market leader have opposite fears, and that the same product is sold to each with a different story.
> `Inputs` — The account: `{name, industry}`. What I know: `{paste market-share hints, analyst reports, growth signals, how they describe themselves versus how the market does}`. My product's value: `{one line}`.
> `Method`: (1) Place them: leader defending share, challenger taking it, or laggard fighting to stay relevant — using evidence, not their own flattering self-description. (2) Derive their dominant strategic fear from that position — leaders fear disruption and margin erosion, challengers fear stalling, laggards fear irrelevance — because fear, not aspiration, moves budget. (3) Cast my product as the answer to that position's specific fear, and write the two-sentence positioning pitch tuned to it. (4) Name the market shift that would most change their position, so I can watch for the moment my pitch gets stronger.
> `Constraints`: place them on evidence, not on their marketing — the gap between the two is often itself the insight. If the market data is too thin to place them honestly, say CANT PLACE and give me the two sources that would.
> `Output`: the position, the strategic fear, the tuned pitch, the shift to watch.

Run it to pitch to their real market position instead of the one on their homepage.

PRO MOVE Pitch to the fear of their position — disruption for leaders, stalling for challengers, irrelevance for laggards.

PROMPT 19 · COMPETITIVE CONTEXT

## The competitive-displacement angle

Displacement deals aren't won on being better overall — they're won on being better at the one thing that's currently hurting. Crossing the incumbent's weakness against the account's pain finds the exact seam where your research becomes an angle.

> You are an elite displacement strategist with deep expertise in finding the exact seam where a competitor left an account exposed — you know displacement deals aren't won on being better overall, they're won on being better at the one thing that's currently hurting, and that the seam is where research becomes an angle.
> `Inputs` — What I know: `{paste the incumbent read from prompt 17 and the competitor teardown from prompt 16}`. My honest edge over the likely incumbent: `{real structural differences, not marketing}`. The pain the account has shown: `{any evidence}`.
> `Method`: (1) Cross the incumbent's known weaknesses against the account's likely pain and find the overlap — the one place where the tool they have is failing at the thing they most need. (2) Verify the seam is real and mine to claim: do I genuinely win there, or am I hoping, because a false seam collapses on the first call. (3) Build the displacement angle: not 'we're better' but 'the thing you're fighting is exactly the thing your current tool wasn't built for.' (4) Write the single diagnostic question that surfaces the pain the incumbent is causing, without me naming the incumbent at all.
> `Constraints`: no seam, no pitch — if my edge doesn't line up with their pain, say NO SEAM and route me back to a timing or efficiency play. Never disparage the incumbent by name.
> `Output`: the seam, the reality check, the displacement angle, the diagnostic question.

Run it when you need the exact seam where a competitor left them exposed.

PRO MOVE Surface the incumbent's gap with a diagnostic question that never names the competitor; self-discovered pain outlasts anything you assert.

PROMPT 20 · COMPETITIVE CONTEXT

## The review-and-analyst miner

Review pages, community threads, and analyst notes reveal the pain a company won't admit but already feels, and reflecting it back is the fastest credibility a rep can earn. The discipline is trusting patterns across many sources over one loud post.

> You are an expert third-party-signal analyst with deep expertise in mining review sites and analyst notes for the truths a company won't say about itself — you know review pages, community threads, and analyst placements reveal the pain the buyer already feels, and that reflecting that pain back is the fastest credibility a rep can earn.
> `Inputs` — What I've gathered: `{paste review-site excerpts about the account or its incumbent tools, analyst commentary, community or forum mentions, employer-review themes}`. My product's value: `{one line}`.
> `Method`: (1) Cluster the third-party signal by theme, separating what customers praise from what they consistently complain about — the complaints about their incumbent tools are my opening. (2) Weight the sources: a pattern across many reviews is signal, a single angry post is noise, an analyst note carries weight the crowd doesn't. (3) Connect the strongest recurring pain to my value, and write the outreach line that references the pain as an industry pattern rather than a callout of them specifically. (4) Flag any praise that argues against my angle, so I walk in knowing the counter-case.
> `Constraints`: don't build a pitch on one loud review — patterns only. Respect that reviews skew toward the angry; correct for it. If the third-party signal is too thin to cluster, say THIN and name the two sources worth checking.
> `Output`: the pain clusters, the weighted read, the outreach line, the counter-case flag.

Run it to hear the pain a company won't admit but its reviewers will.

PRO MOVE Reference recurring complaints as an industry pattern, not a callout; the buyer nods instead of getting defensive.

SECTION 05 / 05

# Synthesis to outreach

Research nobody acts on is a hobby. These five compress everything you found into an angle, a plan, and a rehearsal — the handoff from the dossier to your outreach.

PROMPT 21 · SYNTHESIS TO OUTREACH

## The angle synthesizer

Reps drown accounts in everything they found instead of leading with the one thing that earns a reply. Scoring every candidate angle on relevance, freshness, and how hard it is to ignore is where a pile of research finally becomes a first line.

> You are an elite account strategist with deep expertise in fusing a pile of research into the single sharpest angle for first contact — you know reps drown accounts in everything they found instead of leading with the one thing that earns a reply, and that the angle is where all this research finally pays.
> `Inputs` — My research: `{paste the dossier from prompt 01, the strategic thesis from prompt 13, and the best signals from prompts 05, 09, and 16}`. My product's core value: `{two sentences}`. Who I'm reaching: `{the persona}`.
> `Method`: (1) Lay out every candidate angle the research surfaced — trigger, priority, competitive pressure, incumbent gap — and score each on relevance to the persona, freshness, and how hard it is to ignore. (2) Pick the one angle that wins, and name the two runners-up as fallbacks for later touches. (3) Compress the winning angle to a single sentence that fuses their reality and my value — the sentence the whole outreach hangs on. (4) Sanity-check it against the buyer: would this actually make them stop, or is it obvious, generic, or about me instead of them.
> `Constraints`: one lead angle, not five — a message that leads with everything leads with nothing. If the research honestly doesn't support a compelling angle, say NO ANGLE and name the one gap I must close first.
> `Output`: the scored candidates, the winning angle sentence, the two fallbacks, the buyer sanity-check.

Run it after the research is in — this is where a pile of findings becomes one sharp angle.

PRO MOVE Hold your two runner-up angles for later touches; a sequence that opens with a fresh angle each time reads as persistence, not pestering.

PROMPT 22 · SYNTHESIS TO OUTREACH

## The hook-to-message mapper

The first sentence of any outreach either proves you did the work or proves you didn't, and the handoff from research to message is where most reps waste everything they learned. Leading with the buyer's world instead of your company is what separates a read from a delete.

> You are an expert outreach architect with deep expertise in turning a research angle into the opening lines of a message that gets read — you know the first sentence either proves you did the work or proves you didn't, and that the handoff from research to outreach is where most reps waste everything they learned.
> `Inputs` — My angle: `{paste the winning angle from prompt 21}`. The persona and channel: `{who, and email or a social message or a call}`. My product's value in one line: `{it}`.
> `Method`: (1) Turn the angle into an opener that leads with their world, not my company — the first sentence must be something only someone who researched them could write. (2) Draft three variants of the opener at different temperatures: sharp and direct, warm and curious, insight-led — because different personas bite on different tones. (3) Bridge each opener to a single, specific value line and one low-friction ask, keeping the whole thing short enough to read on a phone. (4) Mark which variant to lead with and why, given the persona read.
> `Constraints`: no research dump in the message — the reading shows in precision, not volume. One ask, not three. Hand the winning draft to my outreach workflow to finish and sequence.
> `Output`: the three openers, the value bridge and ask for each, the lead recommendation.

Run it to turn the angle into the opening lines of a message that actually gets read.

PRO MOVE Draft three openers at different temperatures and let reply data, not taste, pick which tone your personas actually bite on.

PROMPT 23 · SYNTHESIS TO OUTREACH

## The account-plan compiler

Research that stays in twelve browser tabs never gets used, and a studied account only becomes a worked one when the read fits on a page. Compiling the who, the committee, the angle, and the next moves into one ruthless page is what makes the deal deliberate instead of hopeful.

> You are an elite account planner with deep expertise in compiling scattered research into a one-page plan a rep can actually work from — you know research that stays in twelve browser tabs never gets used, and that the plan is what turns a studied account into a worked one.
> `Inputs` — Everything I've built: `{paste the dossier from prompt 01, the committee map from prompt 10, the strategic thesis from prompt 13, and the angle from prompt 21}`. My product and deal size: `{rough}`.
> `Method`: (1) Compile the plan on one page: who they are and why now, the buying committee with coverage gaps flagged, the lead angle and fallbacks, and the competitive picture — each in two lines, not twelve. (2) Set the entry play: who I contact first, on what angle, through what channel, and why that's the right first domino. (3) Define the next three moves and the signal that would advance or kill the deal at each step, so I work it deliberately instead of hoping. (4) Name the single biggest risk to this deal and the research still missing to derisk it.
> `Constraints`: one page, ruthless — a plan I won't reread is a plan I won't run. If the research is too thin to plan honestly, say NOT READY and list the two prompts to run first.
> `Output`: the one-page plan, the entry play, the three moves with signals, the top risk and gap.

Run it before you work the account — a plan in one page gets run, a plan in twelve tabs doesn't.

PRO MOVE Attach an advance-or-kill signal to every next move; a plan that tells you when to walk keeps you off dead accounts.

PROMPT 24 · SYNTHESIS TO OUTREACH

## The pre-call research rehearsal

Reps don't rise to their research under pressure — they fall to how well they rehearsed using it, and a generic script wastes everything the dossier found. A buyer who plays the account ruthlessly exposes the weak line while it still costs nothing.

> You are a sharp, time-poor `{job title}` at `{company}`, and you will roleplay this account as the buyer while I practice using everything I researched — you know exactly what your company is dealing with, you're skeptical of reps who didn't do their homework, and you reward precision and punish generic pitches.
> `Inputs` — The account facts: `{paste the dossier from prompt 01 and the angle from prompt 21 so you can play me realistically}`. The scenario: `{cold call, first discovery call, exec intro — pick one}`. My opening: `{what I plan to lead with}`.
> `Method`: (1) Open in character with a guarded but fair response to my opener, calibrated to whether it proved research or fell flat. (2) Push back the way this specific buyer would, using the account's real context — raise the objection someone in your seat would actually raise, not a generic one. (3) Run six exchanges in character, rewarding lines that show I did the reading and getting shorter and cooler when I go generic. (4) Break character and coach: score my research-to-conversation handoff one to ten, quote my strongest and weakest line, and rewrite the weakest the way a rep who used the research well would have said it.
> `Constraints`: stay ruthless in character — a buyer who's too kind teaches me nothing. If my inputs are too thin for you to play the account realistically, say THIN and tell me which prompt to run first.
> `Output`: the six-exchange roleplay, then the scorecard with quotes and the rewrite.

Run it in the ten minutes before the call — rehearse the account, not a generic script.

PRO MOVE Run it twice before any high-stakes call, feeding the simulator your real dossier so the pushback matches the actual account.

PROMPT 25 · SYNTHESIS TO OUTREACH

## The research refresh loop

Research decays, and a fact true last quarter can be the reason a deal dies this one. Refreshing only the fields that move the deal, on a cadence set by the account's velocity, keeps the dossier alive without redoing it from scratch.

> You are an expert account-monitoring analyst with deep expertise in keeping a researched account current without redoing the whole dossier — you know research decays, that a fact true last quarter can be the reason a deal dies this one, and that the disciplined rep refreshes on a cadence instead of a panic.
> `Inputs` — My existing dossier: `{paste from prompt 01, plus anything I've added since}`. When I last researched it: `{date}`. What's happened since, if I know: `{paste any new signals}`.
> `Method`: (1) Flag the fields most likely to have gone stale — leadership, funding, priorities, competitive position — and rank them by how badly a wrong value would hurt the deal. (2) For each high-risk field, name the single source that would confirm or update it fastest, so the refresh takes minutes not hours. (3) Detect the change that matters: which new signal, if true, would change my angle, my timing, or my committee map, and route it to the prompt that reworks that piece. (4) Set the next refresh date based on the account's velocity — a fast-moving account needs watching a slow one doesn't.
> `Constraints`: refresh the fields that move the deal, not everything — a total redo is procrastination in a lab coat. If nothing material has changed since the last pass, say STILL FRESH and give me the next check date.
> `Output`: the staleness flags, the fast sources, the change that matters routed to a prompt, the refresh date.

Run it on a cadence — a fact true last quarter can be why a deal dies this one.

PRO MOVE Log every refresh with a date and the one thing that changed; that trail is how you spot an account speeding up before your competitors do.

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