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**Evaluation of Prompting Tools Across Diverse AI Platforms: ChatGPT, Claude, Bard, Cohere Command, and Meta**

**Aim:**

Compare the performance, user experience, and response quality of prompting tools across different AI platforms within a specific use case, such as summarizing text or answering technical questions.

**1.Summarizing Text**

**Performance**

**ChatGPT**: Excels in generating coherent and concise summaries. It can handle a variety of text types, from articles to reports, and is often praised for capturing key points without losing context.

**Google Bard:** Also provides good summaries, leveraging Google’s extensive data resources. It can pull in relevant context from the web, which sometimes leads to richer summaries.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Integrates well with Microsoft Office tools, offering summarization features in Word and Outlook. It performs well in summarizing business documents, but may be less effective with informal texts.

**User Experience**

**ChatGPT:** User-friendly interface with straightforward prompts. Users can easily iterate on summaries by asking for more details or a different style.

**Google Bard:** Offers an intuitive design but may require users to refine their queries to get optimal summaries.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Seamless integration within familiar Microsoft applications enhances user experience, especially for those already using these tools.

**Response Quality**

**ChatGPT:** Generally high-quality summaries that balance brevity and detail. It may occasionally overlook niche points.

**Google Bard:** Quality can vary; its reliance on real-time data means it can sometimes provide outdated or incorrect summaries.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Response quality is high for formal documents but may lack creativity or depth in more casual contexts.

**2. Answering Technical Questions**

**Performance:**

**ChatGPT:** Strong in technical domains, providing accurate explanations and insights, particularly in programming, engineering, and science.

**Google Bard:** Leverages its search capabilities for real-time information, making it useful for current technologies and trends. However, it may struggle with more complex queries.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Tailored for specific environments (like Excel or GitHub), which can enhance accuracy for technical queries related to these platforms.

**User Experience**

**ChatGPT:** Conversational interface encourages follow-up questions, allowing users to dig deeper into topics. Users often report a sense of natural dialogue.

**Google Bard:** Engaging but may require users to formulate questions carefully to obtain precise answers. The experience can be less intuitive compared to ChatGPT.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Provides contextual help within software tools, making it user-friendly for those already familiar with Microsoft products.

**Response Quality**

**ChatGPT:** Delivers well-structured, detailed answers. It tends to provide explanations that cater to various expertise levels.

**Google Bard:** Offers quick responses but may sometimes lack depth, particularly in niche technical areas.

**Microsoft Copilot:** High-quality responses for specific software-related queries, but its breadth of knowledge outside its integrated environment may be limited.

**Result :**

**ChatGPT:** Best suited for tasks requiring nuanced understanding and conversational flow. It excels in summarization and technical Q&A.

**Google Bard:** A strong contender, especially for real-time information, but may struggle with complex inquiries and requires careful prompting.

**Microsoft Copilot:** Ideal for users in the Microsoft ecosystem needing assistance with technical questions related to Office tools and coding, but may lack versatility outside that context.