

Notebooklm:

Prompt 1:

You are Data Analyst, expert dataset matcher. **INPUT VALIDATION:** If <9 PRDs OR <9 scores, output: "ERROR: Need 9 PRD_abcd.pdf + 9 score_abcd.txt"

PARALLEL PROCESSING: Split into 3 batches: A(1-5), B(6-9), C(10-13). Merge outputs.

FILE MATCHING: "PRD abcd.pdf" \leftrightarrow "score abcd.txt" by student name(abcd). **IF MISMATCH:** "ERROR: Unmatched: PRD_xy.pdf, score_efgh.txt"

RUBRIC (8 criteria): Take it from "Grading criteria.pdf" evaluation metrics section.

Output ONLY valid JSON:

```
{  
  "validation": {"status": "PASS", "matched": 9},  
  "criteria_weights": {"top2": ["Criterion1", "Criterion2"]},  
  "criteria": {"Problem Definition": {"high": ["trait1"], "low": ["trait1"]}}  
}
```

Prompt 2:

Score file has 2 scores: Non Standard score Standard score Different evaluators gave the non Standard score. then they were converted in to the Standard score How do the criteria weights impact the final PRD Scores? Please follow the output criteria specified in the original prompt, and provide me in JSON format as originally request. no citations please

Prompt 3:

I have the scores, for prds and criteria. What I am struggling with is why seemingly same solution has been marked differently.

How do we approach this problem, where different evaluators have taken a different view for similar thing?

Claude:

Prompt 1:

****You are Rubric Engineer.**** ****INPUT CHECK**:** If no JSON or "ERROR" status, output: "ERROR: Need Step 1 JSON" Using 9 PRD analysis pasted below, build 4-level rubric (4=Excellent→1=Poor). ****WEIGHT**:** Mark top 2 criteria from JSON as "HIGH_WEIGHT".
****Output ONLY YAML**:** `` ` yamlrubric:Problem Definition: # HIGH_WEIGHT4: ["Quantified user problem", "3+ stakeholder views"]3: ["Clear problem", "Some metrics"]2: ["Vague problem"]1: ["Missing problem"]

JSON: {output from notebooklm}

Prompt 2:

I am going to provide you with deeper and more clearer criteria with examples, in JSON below.

What I need is:

1. Any changes in YAML output you sill suggest, with reasons
2. Any clear new understanding that can be derived with this updated JSON

JSON: {output from notebooklm}

Prompt 3:

have i missed anything, what else should be considered? score your output out of 10

Prompt 4:

include all your suggestions and give me new yaml

ChatGPT:

Prompt 1:

****You are GPT Architect.**** ****INPUT CHECK**:** If no YAML rubric, output: "ERROR: Need Step 2 YAML" Build PRD Evaluator CustomGPT with attached YAML. Suggest what is missing, guardrails, and must haves.

Input will PRD in pdf format

Ask the user project requirements.

Output should be:

Non-Standard Score:

Problem Statement & Persona Depth: 3/5
Solution Overview (MVP) & Focus: 2/5
User Stories & Acceptance Criteria: 2/5
Technical Req. & User Flow : 2/5
PRD Structure & Executive Summary: 1/5
Launch Success Metrics (KPIs): 1/5
Overall Coherence & Professionalism : 1/5

Standard Score:

Problem Statement & Persona Depth: 3/5
Solution Overview (MVP) & Focus: 2/3
User Stories & Acceptance Criteria: 2/3
Technical Req. & User Flow : 2/2
PRD Structure & Executive Summary: 1/2
Launch Success Metrics (KPIs): 1/3
Overall Coherence & Professionalism : 1/2

Prompt 2:

Please create version 0.1 of the PRD Kasai. always give me .md file comment various parts of CustomGPT for easy human understanding YAML file will be used as a attached RAG 2 PRDs - Anuraag PRD & Krishna PRD will also be attached as RAG for evaluation. Ensure strict coherence in output, security of the logic and prompt, the purpose of this GPT. Please also add Overall Coherence & Professionalism : 1/5 in both scores ignore suggestions from point 9. optionals Implement rest and create the customgpt

Prompt 3:

give me the gpt prompt and we create it now

Custom GPT - <https://chatgpt.com/g/g-696bd0d19de8819180e79d02aef8809d-prd-pulse-check>