

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### I. TOOLS & SOFTWARE

1. RSTUDIO [HTTPS://POSIT.CO/DOWNLOAD/RSTUDIO-DESKTOP/](https://posit.co/download/rstudio-desktop/)
2. BIBLIOMETRIX (R PACKAGE) [HTTPS://WWW.BIBLIOMETRIX.ORG/](https://www.bibliometrix.org/)
3. VOSVIEWER [HTTPS://WWW.VOSVIEWER.COM/](https://www.vosviewer.com/)
4. MENDELEY [HTTPS://WWW.MENDELEY.COM/](https://www.mendeley.com/)
5. CREXPLORER [HTTPS://ANDREAS-THOR.GITHUB.IO/CREXPLORER/](https://andreas-thor.github.io/crexplorer/)
6. OPENREFINE [HTTPS://OPENREFINE.ORG/](https://openrefine.org/)
7. THONNY + MATPLOTLIB + SEABORN [HTTPS://THONNY.ORG/](https://thonny.org/)
8. POWERBI [HTTPS://WWW.MICROSOFT.COM/EN-US/POWER-PLATFORM/PRODUCTS/POWER-BI](https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/power-platform/products/power-bi)
9. MICROSOFT EXCEL [HTTPS://WWW.MICROSOFT.COM/EN-US/MICROSOFT-365/EXCEL](https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-365/excel)

### II. DATA SOURCES, DATA COLLECTION & PREPARATION

1. SCOPUS
2. WEB OF SCIENCE
3. PUBLISH OR PERISH
4. DIMENSIONS
5. ETC.

### III. PROTOCOL

1. [PRISMA 2020 FOR ABSTRACTS](#)
2. [PRISMA 2020 CHECKLIST](#)
3. [PRISMA FLOW DIAGRAM](#)

FLOW DIAGRAMS CAN ALSO BE GENERATED USING A SHINY APP AVAILABLE AT  
[HTTPS://WWW.ESHACKATHON.ORG/SOFTWARE/PRISMA2020.HTML](https://www.eshackathon.org/software/prisma2020.html)

NOTE: THE PRISMA 2020 FLOW DIAGRAM TEMPLATES ARE DISTRIBUTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION (CC BY 4.0) LICENSE, WHICH PERMITS OTHERS TO DISTRIBUTE, REMIX, ADAPT AND BUILD UPON THIS WORK, FOR COMMERCIAL USE, PROVIDED THE ORIGINAL WORK IS PROPERLY CITED. TO VIEW A COPY OF THIS LICENSE, VISIT [HTTPS://CREATIVECOMMONS.ORG/LICENSES/BY/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

### IV. THE FANTASTIC 4 STEPS OF WRITING

STEP	ACTION	NOTES
1. <b>PRE-WRITING</b>	PLANNING/PREPARATION/RESEARCH	FASE PERSIAPAN, RISET LITERATUR, OUTLINE
2. <b>DRAFTING</b>	WRITING/COMPOSITION/INITIAL DRAFT	MENULIS DRAF AWAL TANPA FOKUS PADA KESEMPURNAAN
3. <b>MAKE IT BETTER (MIB)</b>	REVISING/EDITING/CONTENT REVISION	MEMPERBAIKI STRUKTUR, ARGUMEN, DAN ISI SECARA MENYELURUH
4. <b>MAKE IT CORRECT (MIC)</b>	PROOFREADING/COPYEDITING/POLISHING	MEMPERBAIKI BAHASA, TATA LETAK, DAN KESALAHAN KECIL

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### V. FORMULA

---

#### 1. PRE-WRITING

---

I AM PREPARING AN ACADEMIC ARTICLE AND I NEED YOUR HELP TO DEVELOP A DETAILED OUTLINE USING THE IMRDC STRUCTURE (INTRODUCTION, METHOD, RESULTS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION). PLEASE GENERATE A STRUCTURED OUTLINE THAT IS LOGICALLY ORGANIZED, CLEARLY REFLECTS SCHOLARLY STANDARDS, AND ALIGNS WITH THE RESEARCH TOPIC DESCRIBED BELOW.

RESEARCH TOPIC: *[INSERT YOUR TOPIC OR WORKING TITLE HERE]*  
(OPTIONAL: INCLUDE ABSTRACT OR PROBLEM BACKGROUND HERE FOR RICHER CONTEXT)

PLEASE ENSURE THAT:

1. THE INTRODUCTION IDENTIFIES THE BACKGROUND, SIGNIFICANCE, AND RESEARCH GAP.
2. THE METHOD INCLUDES DATA SOURCES, ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES, AND RESEARCH DESIGN.
3. THE RESULTS SECTION ANTICIPATES THE TYPE OF FINDINGS (QUANTITATIVE/QUALITATIVE).
4. THE DISCUSSION INTERPRETS FINDINGS, CONNECTS TO LITERATURE, AND NOTES IMPLICATIONS.
5. THE CONCLUSION SUMMARIZES KEY INSIGHTS AND SUGGESTS FUTURE DIRECTIONS.

OUTPUT THE OUTLINE IN NUMBERED OR BULLET FORMAT WITH 1-2 SENTENCES FOR EACH POINT TO CLARIFY ITS FOCUS.

---

#### 2. DRAFTING - BY YOURSELF!

---

#### 3. MAKE IT BETTER (MIB)

---

YOU ARE AN EXPERT JOURNAL REVIEWER AND MY SUPERVISOR. PLEASE EVALUATE THE ARTICLE'S ALIGNMENT WITH THE AIMS AND SCOPE OF THE FOLLOWING JOURNAL. PROVIDE A DETAILED AND CRITICAL ASSESSMENT BASED ON THE QUESTIONS BELOW. USE CONCRETE EXAMPLES AND SUGGEST IMPROVEMENTS WHERE NECESSARY.

##### 0. JOURNAL FIT (SCOPE CHECK):

BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH A DETAILED REVIEW, PLEASE EVALUATE WHETHER THE ARTICLE ALIGNS WITH THE SCOPE AND FOCUS OF THE TARGET JOURNAL:

JOURNAL NAME: *[INSERT JOURNAL NAME]*

JOURNAL LINK: *[INSERT LINK TO JOURNAL'S AIMS AND SCOPE]*

ARTICLE TITLE: *[INSERT TITLE]*

BRIEF ARTICLE SUMMARY: *[INSERT 3-5 SENTENCE SUMMARY OR ABSTRACT]*

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

- (I) DOES THE ARTICLE MATCH THE AIMS AND SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL? CHECK IF THE JOURNAL'S FOCUS ALIGNS WITH THE PAPER'S FIELD, TARGET AUDIENCE, AND METHODOLOGIES.
- (II) DOES THE JOURNAL HAVE ANY SPECIFIC FORMATTING OR SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS THAT NEED TO BE ADHERED TO (E.G., WORD LIMITS, SECTION STRUCTURE, CITATION STYLE)? ENSURE THAT THE ARTICLE MEETS ALL THESE REQUIREMENTS BEFORE FOCUSING ON CONTENT.
- (III) IS THE ARTICLE A GOOD FIT FOR THIS JOURNAL? RATE THE FIT ON A SCALE FROM 1 TO 5 AND EXPLAIN YOUR RATIONALE.

IF THE ARTICLE IS A GOOD FIT, PROCEED TO THE CONTENT REVIEW BELOW. IF NOT, SUGGEST ALTERNATIVES OR ADJUSTMENTS THAT COULD MAKE THE ARTICLE MORE SUITABLE.

### 1. TITLE:

- (I) DOES THE TITLE ACCURATELY REFLECT THE CONTENT OF THE PAPER?
- (II) COULD THE TITLE BE MORE ENGAGING OR REFLECTIVE OF THE PAPER'S SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION? CAN THE TITLE BE MORE 'CATCHY', IF SO HOW?
- (III) HOW MAY THE TITLE BE IMPROVED? COULD IT BE MADE MORE SPECIFIC OR COMPELLING?
- (IV) OFFER 1-3 ALTERNATIVE TITLE SUGGESTIONS THAT ARE MORE ACCURATE, ENGAGING, OR SCHOLARLY.
- (V) ENSURE THE PROPOSED TITLES REFLECT KEY ELEMENTS SUCH AS METHOD, SCOPE, RESEARCH THEME, OR GEOGRAPHIC/TEMPORAL FOCUS (IF APPLICABLE).

### 2. ABSTRACT:

- (I) HOW WELL DOES THE ABSTRACT OVERVIEW THE PAPER? IS THE ABSTRACT MISSING ANY KEY INFORMATION ABOUT METHODS OR FINDINGS?
- (II) DOES THE ABSTRACT CLEARLY PRESENT THE RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY, MAIN FINDINGS, AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE PAPER?
- (III) IS ANY KEY COMPONENT MISSING OR INSUFFICIENTLY EXPLAINED (E.G., DATA SOURCE, ANALYSIS METHOD, KEY RESULTS)?
- (IV) DOES THE ABSTRACT RAISE ANY CURIOSITY ABOUT THE RESEARCH? IF NOT, WHAT COULD MAKE IT MORE ENGAGING?
- (V) WHAT CAN BE IMPROVED TO CLARIFY THE MAIN FINDINGS? IDENTIFY ANY UNCLEAR OR MISSING INFORMATION AND SUGGEST HOW TO BETTER CLARIFY THE MAIN FINDINGS.
- (VI) SUGGEST A REVISED VERSION OF THE ABSTRACT (OPTIONAL) THAT INTEGRATES ALL ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS IN A CLEAR, CONCISE, AND ENGAGING MANNER.

### 3. INTRODUCTION:

- (I) DOES THE INTRODUCTION EFFECTIVELY EXPLAIN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH FROM BOTH THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PERSPECTIVES? IF LACKING, SUGGEST HOW THE AUTHOR CAN BETTER FRAME THE SIGNIFICANCE.
- (II) IS THE RESEARCH GAP CLEARLY IDENTIFIED—WHETHER THEORETICAL, EMPIRICAL, OR METHODOLOGICAL?
- (III) ARE THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS OR HYPOTHESES EXPLICITLY STATED AND WELL JUSTIFIED? IF NOT, PROPOSE HOW THEY SHOULD BE FORMULATED OR JUSTIFIED.
- (IV) WHAT CAN BE IMPROVED IN THE INTRODUCTION? PROVIDE CONSTRUCTIVE CRITIQUE WITH CONCRETE EXAMPLES ON HOW TO STRENGTHEN THE INTRODUCTION.
- (V) OPTIONALLY SUGGEST HOW TO IMPROVE ACADEMIC TONE OR STRUCTURE. (OPTIONAL)

#### 3.1. PROMPT FOR BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY INTRODUCTION (PRE-WRITING GUIDANCE):

##### 3.1.1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT:

- A) INTRODUCE THE BROADER RESEARCH FIELD OR TOPIC AREA UNDER STUDY.
- B) EXPLAIN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS FIELD AND WHY IT MERITS BIBLIOMETRIC INVESTIGATION.

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### 3.1.2. ROLE OF BIBLIOMETRICS:

- A) BRIEFLY DESCRIBE BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS AS A METHOD, ITS PURPOSE, AND ITS RELEVANCE IN MAPPING SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT, TRENDS, AND IMPACT IN THE FIELD.
- B) HIGHLIGHT HOW BIBLIOMETRICS CAN UNCOVER PATTERNS NOT EASILY VISIBLE THROUGH TRADITIONAL REVIEWS.

### 3.1.3. CURRENT STATE OF LITERATURE:

- A) SUMMARIZE PREVIOUS BIBLIOMETRIC STUDIES (IF ANY) RELEVANT TO THIS TOPIC OR RELATED AREAS.
- B) IDENTIFY KEY FINDINGS AND LIMITATIONS IN THOSE EXISTING STUDIES.

### 3.1.4. RESEARCH GAP:

- A) CLEARLY ARTICULATE THE GAP OR UNANSWERED QUESTIONS THAT THE CURRENT BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY AIMS TO ADDRESS.
- B) EXPLAIN WHY FILLING THIS GAP IS IMPORTANT FOR ADVANCING UNDERSTANDING IN THE FIELD.

### 3.1.5. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES/QUESTIONS:

- A) STATE THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OR RESEARCH QUESTIONS GUIDING THE BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS.
- B) OPTIONALLY, JUSTIFY THE CHOICE OF THESE OBJECTIVES BASED ON THE IDENTIFIED GAP AND THE POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS.

### 3.1.6. SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY:

- A) CLARIFY THE SCOPE (E.G., TIMEFRAME, DISCIPLINES, TYPES OF PUBLICATIONS) AND WHAT THE STUDY INTENDS TO CONTRIBUTE ACADEMICALLY OR PRACTICALLY.
- B) EMPHASIZE HOW THE STUDY WILL ADD VALUE OR NEW INSIGHTS BEYOND PREVIOUS BIBLIOMETRIC RESEARCH.

## 4. LITERATURE REVIEW (OPTIONAL):

- (I) ARE THE REFERENCES SUFFICIENTLY COMPREHENSIVE, COVERING RECENT AND SEMINAL WORK IN THE FIELD?
- (II) THIS IS TO CHECK WHETHER THE PAPER IS CITING ENOUGH RECENT AND INFLUENTIAL WORK.
- (III) ARE THERE ANY RELEVANT STUDIES OR THEORIES THE AUTHOR(S) OVERLOOKED? IF THERE ARE KEY REFERENCES MISSING, THIS QUESTION PROMPTS THE REVIEWER TO SUGGEST THEM, IMPROVING THE PAPER'S ACADEMIC DEPTH.
- (IV) HOW WELL DOES THE LITERATURE REVIEW JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR THIS RESEARCH? HELPS ENSURE THE REVIEW CONNECTS LOGICALLY TO THE STUDY, RATHER THAN JUST LISTING PREVIOUS WORK.
- (V) DOES THE REVIEW LOGICALLY JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR THE CURRENT RESEARCH? PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS.

## 5. METHODOLOGY:

- (I) IS THE RESEARCH METHOD SUFFICIENTLY RIGOROUS TO SUPPORT THE CONCLUSIONS MADE?
- (II) ARE THERE ANY BIASES OR LIMITATIONS IN THE METHODOLOGY THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED?
- (III) COULD THE METHODOLOGY BE MORE CLEARLY EXPLAINED TO ALLOW REPLICATION BY ANOTHER RESEARCHER?
- (IV) ARE THE PROCEDURES, SAMPLING TECHNIQUE, AND INSTRUMENTS DESCRIBED ADEQUATELY?
- (V) HOW CAN THIS METHOD SECTION BE IMPROVED? IDENTIFY POTENTIAL BIASES OR LIMITATIONS AND SUGGEST CONCRETE IMPROVEMENTS.



## **NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)**

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### **5.1. PROMPT FOR BIBLIOMETRIC METHODOLOGY SECTION (PRE-WRITING GUIDANCE):**

#### **5.1.1. RESEARCH DESIGN AND OBJECTIVES:**

- A) BRIEFLY DESCRIBE THE OVERALL APPROACH OF THE BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS.
- B) SPECIFY THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS OR OBJECTIVES GUIDING THE BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY.

#### **5.1.2. DATA SOURCE(S):**

- A) IDENTIFY THE DATABASES OR SOURCES OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA (E.G., WEB OF SCIENCE, SCOPUS, GOOGLE SCHOLAR).
- B) JUSTIFY THE CHOICE OF THESE DATABASES BASED ON COVERAGE, RELIABILITY, AND RELEVANCE TO THE RESEARCH TOPIC.

#### **5.1.3. SEARCH STRATEGY:**

- A) DETAIL THE SEARCH TERMS, KEYWORDS, AND BOOLEAN OPERATORS USED.
- B) SPECIFY ANY INCLUSION OR EXCLUSION CRITERIA (E.G., PUBLICATION YEARS, DOCUMENT TYPES, LANGUAGES).
- C) DESCRIBE ANY FILTERS OR LIMITS APPLIED TO REFINE THE DATASET.

#### **5.1.4. DATA EXTRACTION:**

- A) EXPLAIN HOW BIBLIOMETRIC DATA (E.G., TITLES, AUTHORS, AFFILIATIONS, CITATIONS, KEYWORDS) WERE EXTRACTED.
- B) MENTION ANY SOFTWARE OR TOOLS USED (E.G., BIBLIOMETRIX R PACKAGE, VOSVIEWER).

#### **5.1.5. DATA PROCESSING AND CLEANING:**

- A) DESCRIBE STEPS TAKEN TO CLEAN AND STANDARDIZE DATA (E.G., REMOVING DUPLICATES, CORRECTING AUTHOR NAMES, CONSOLIDATING KEYWORDS).
- B) OUTLINE ANY CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED AND SOLUTIONS APPLIED.

#### **5.1.6. ANALYTICAL METHODS:**

- A) SPECIFY THE BIBLIOMETRIC INDICATORS CALCULATED (E.G., CITATION COUNTS, H-INDEX, CO-CITATION ANALYSIS).
- B) DESCRIBE NETWORK ANALYSES CONDUCTED (E.G., CO-AUTHORSHIP, KEYWORD CO-OCCURRENCE, THEMATIC MAPPING).
- C) DETAIL THE SOFTWARE AND ALGORITHMS USED FOR VISUALIZATION AND ANALYSIS.

#### **5.1.7. PRISMA COMPLIANCE (FOR SLR OR MIXED STUDIES)**

- A) STATE WHETHER THE SYSTEMATIC REVIEW PROTOCOL WAS REGISTERED (E.G., PROSPERO), WITH REGISTRATION DETAILS.
- B) PROVIDE OR REFERENCE THE PRISMA FLOW DIAGRAM OUTLINING IDENTIFICATION, SCREENING, ELIGIBILITY, AND INCLUSION OF STUDIES.
- C) DESCRIBE RISK OF BIAS ASSESSMENT AND HOW IT INFLUENCED SYNTHESIS.
- D) EXPLAIN STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS HETEROGENEITY AND SENSITIVITY ANALYSES, IF META-ANALYSIS IS PERFORMED.

#### **5.1.8. LIMITATIONS AND BIAS CONSIDERATIONS:**

- A) DISCUSS POTENTIAL BIASES INHERENT IN THE DATA SOURCES OR METHODS (E.G., LANGUAGE BIAS, DATABASE COVERAGE LIMITATIONS).
- B) EXPLAIN HOW THESE LIMITATIONS WERE ADDRESSED OR ACKNOWLEDGED.

#### **5.1.9. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS: (IF APPLICABLE)**

- A) STATE ANY ETHICAL ISSUES RELATED TO DATA USE OR REPORTING.

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### 6. RESULTS:

- (I) ARE THE RESULTS CLEARLY AND LOGICALLY PRESENTED? IF NOT, WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD MAKE THE PRESENTATION STRONGER?
- (II) DOES THE ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS ADEQUATELY SUPPORT THE CLAIMS MADE?
- (III) ARE THERE ANY IMPORTANT FINDINGS THAT COULD BE FURTHER EXPLORED OR EXPLAINED?
- (IV) HOW CAN THE RESULTS SECTION BE IMPROVED? SUGGEST AREAS WHERE THE RESULTS COULD BE FURTHER EXPLORED OR BETTER PRESENTED.

#### 6.1. PROMPT FOR BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY RESULTS SECTION (PRE-WRITING GUIDANCE):

##### 6.1.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS:

- A) PRESENT KEY QUANTITATIVE DATA SUCH AS THE TOTAL NUMBER OF PUBLICATIONS, PUBLICATION TRENDS OVER TIME, DISTRIBUTION BY DOCUMENT TYPE, AND LANGUAGE.
- B) INCLUDE DESCRIPTIVE DATA ON AUTHORSHIP (E.G., NUMBER OF AUTHORS, MOST PROLIFIC AUTHORS), INSTITUTIONS, AND COUNTRIES INVOLVED.

##### 6.1.2. CITATION ANALYSIS:

- A) SUMMARIZE CITATION METRICS SUCH AS TOTAL CITATIONS, AVERAGE CITATIONS PER PUBLICATION, H-INDEX, AND INFLUENTIAL PUBLICATIONS.
- B) HIGHLIGHT TOP-CITED PAPERS, AUTHORS, AND JOURNALS IN THE DATASET.

##### 6.1.3. CO-AUTHORSHIP AND COLLABORATION NETWORKS:

- A) DESCRIBE FINDINGS ON CO-AUTHORSHIP PATTERNS AT THE AUTHOR, INSTITUTIONAL, OR COUNTRY LEVEL.
- B) PRESENT NETWORK VISUALIZATIONS (IF APPLICABLE) AND KEY METRICS (E.G., NETWORK DENSITY, CENTRALITY MEASURES).

##### 6.1.4. KEYWORD AND THEMATIC ANALYSIS:

- A) REPORT RESULTS OF KEYWORD CO-OCCURRENCE ANALYSIS, IDENTIFYING MAJOR RESEARCH THEMES AND EMERGING TOPICS.
- B) INCLUDE VISUAL REPRESENTATIONS LIKE THEMATIC MAPS OR WORD CLOUDS WHERE RELEVANT.

##### 6.1.5. TEMPORAL AND TREND ANALYSIS:

- A) ILLUSTRATE TRENDS OVER TIME, SUCH AS SHIFTS IN RESEARCH FOCUS, GROWING TOPICS, OR EVOLVING COLLABORATIONS.

##### 6.1.6. VISUALIZATION TOOLS:

- A) INDICATE THE TYPES OF FIGURES, TABLES, AND NETWORK DIAGRAMS USED TO PRESENT RESULTS CLEARLY.
- B) ENSURE ALL VISUALS ARE WELL LABELED AND REFERENCED APPROPRIATELY IN THE TEXT.

##### 6.1.7. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS:

- A) SUMMARIZE THE MOST IMPORTANT QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE RESULTS WITHOUT INTERPRETING THEIR BROADER SIGNIFICANCE (WHICH BELONGS TO THE DISCUSSION SECTION).

### 7. DISCUSSION:

- (I) DOES THE DISCUSSION ADEQUATELY TIE THE RESULTS TO THE BROADER LITERATURE?
- (II) ARE THE IMPLICATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY TO THE FIELD MADE CLEAR?
- (III) IS THE DISCUSSION OVERLY SPECULATIVE, OR DOES IT STAY GROUNDED IN THE FINDINGS?  
DOES THE DISCUSSION REMAIN GROUNDED IN THE DATA WITHOUT UNDUE SPECULATION?

## **NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)**

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

(IV) HOW CAN THE DISCUSSION BE IMPROVED? PROVIDE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENHANCE CLARITY AND DEPTH IN THE DISCUSSION.

### **7.1. PROMPT FOR BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY DISCUSSION SECTION (PRE-WRITING GUIDANCE):**

#### **7.1.1. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS:**

- A) EXPLAIN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MAIN RESULTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIVES.
- B) DISCUSS PATTERNS, TRENDS, OR ANOMALIES OBSERVED IN THE BIBLIOMETRIC DATA.

#### **7.1.2. COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS STUDIES:**

- A) RELATE YOUR FINDINGS TO PRIOR BIBLIOMETRIC AND EMPIRICAL STUDIES IN THE FIELD.
- B) HIGHLIGHT CONSISTENCIES OR DISCREPANCIES AND PROVIDE POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS.

#### **7.1.3. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS:**

- A) DISCUSS HOW THE RESULTS CONTRIBUTE TO THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS OR KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT IN THE DISCIPLINE.

#### **7.1.4. PRACTICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS:**

- A) ELABORATE ON THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE FINDINGS ON RESEARCH PRACTICES, FUNDING PRIORITIES, OR POLICY-MAKING.

#### **7.1.5. STRENGTHS OF THE STUDY:**

- A) HIGHLIGHT UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS AND METHODOLOGICAL STRENGTHS THAT ENHANCE THE STUDY'S VALIDITY AND RELEVANCE.

#### **7.1.6. LIMITATIONS:**

- A) ACKNOWLEDGE THE STUDY'S LIMITATIONS, INCLUDING DATA SOURCE RESTRICTIONS, METHODOLOGICAL CONSTRAINTS, OR BIASES.
- B) SUGGEST HOW THESE LIMITATIONS COULD AFFECT THE INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS.

#### **7.1.7. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS:**

- A) PROPOSE SPECIFIC AREAS OR QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER BIBLIOMETRIC OR EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION BUILDING ON YOUR STUDY'S FINDINGS.

### **8. CONCLUSION:**

- (I) DOES THE CONCLUSION EFFECTIVELY SUMMARIZE THE KEY FINDINGS WITHOUT INTRODUCING NEW DATA OR IDEAS?
- (II) DOES THE CONCLUSION PROVIDE MEANINGFUL INSIGHTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH?
- (III) IF YOU ONLY READ THE CONCLUSION, WOULD YOU UNDERSTAND THE MAJOR CONTRIBUTION OF THIS STUDY?
- (IV) HOW CAN THE CONCLUSION BE IMPROVED? RECOMMEND IMPROVEMENTS TO STRENGTHEN THE CONCLUSION'S IMPACT.

### **9. CLARITY AND READABILITY:**

- (I) IS THE PAPER EASY TO FOLLOW, OR ARE THERE SECTIONS THAT ARE CONFUSING OR OVERLY COMPLEX?
- (II) ARE THERE ANY SECTIONS WHERE THE AUTHOR(S) SHOULD SIMPLIFY LANGUAGE OR STRUCTURE TO IMPROVE CLARITY? IDENTIFY ANY SECTIONS WHERE LANGUAGE OR SENTENCE STRUCTURE COULD BE SIMPLIFIED OR CLARIFIED, AND PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS.

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### 10. NOVELTY AND CONTRIBUTION:

- (I) HOW ORIGINAL OR NOVEL IS THE CONTRIBUTION OF THIS RESEARCH?
- (II) DOES THIS PAPER ADDRESS AN UNDER-RESEARCHED AREA IN THE FIELD, OR IS IT BUILDING ON ESTABLISHED WORK?
- (III) COULD THIS PAPER BE A MAJOR CONTRIBUTION TO ITS FIELD? IF NOT, WHAT IMPROVEMENTS WOULD ELEVATE IT TO THAT LEVEL? SUGGEST WAYS TO ENHANCE THE PAPER'S ORIGINALITY AND SIGNIFICANCE.

### 11. OVERALL QUALITY:

- (I) DOES THE PAPER MAKE A CLEAR AND VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO ITS FIELD?
- (II) ARE THERE ANY SIGNIFICANT FLAWS OR WEAKNESSES THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE PUBLICATION?
- (III) IF THIS PAPER IS PLAGIARIZED OR SELF-PLAGIARIZED, PLEASE NOTE THAT HERE. REPORT ANY SIGNS OF PLAGIARISM OR SELF-PLAGIARISM, IF DETECTED.
- (IV) WHAT IS YOUR SUMMARY OF THE PAPER? PROVIDE A CONCISE SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTING KEY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.

### 12. REFERENCES AND CITATIONS:

- (I) ARE THE KEY REFERENCES CURRENT, RELEVANT, AND ACCURATELY CITED?
- (II) COULD THE PAPER BENEFIT FROM ADDITIONAL REFERENCES, ESPECIALLY TO RECENT WORK IN THE FIELD? RECOMMEND ANY ADDITIONAL KEY REFERENCES THAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED.

### 14. STRENGTHS

- (I) WHAT ARE THE STRENGTHS OF THIS PAPER?
- (II) WHAT DID YOU LIKE ABOUT IT?
- (III) WHAT DID THE AUTHOR DO REALLY WELL?

### 15. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- (I) ARE THERE ANY MAJOR CORRECTIONS NEEDED?
- (II) LIST HERE ANY MAJOR SPELLING OR GRAMMATICAL ISSUES YOU NOTED!
- (III) WHAT IS YOUR OVERALL RECOMMENDATION ON HOW TO IMPROVE THE PAPER? PROVIDE CLEAR, ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE MANUSCRIPT.
- (IV) RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PAPER ON A SCALE FROM 1 (LOWEST) TO 10 (HIGHEST), AND EXPLAIN YOUR RATING.

---

## 4. MAKE IT CORRECT (MIC)

---

### 15. PROMPT FOR ACADEMIC PROOFREADING

#### 15.1. GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX:

- A) IDENTIFY AND CORRECT GRAMMATICAL ERRORS, AWKWARD PHRASING, AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE ISSUES.
- B) SUGGEST IMPROVEMENTS TO IMPROVE SENTENCE CLARITY AND FLOW WITHOUT CHANGING THE INTENDED MEANING.

#### 15.2. SPELLING AND PUNCTUATION:

- A) HIGHLIGHT SPELLING MISTAKES, TYPOS, AND INCORRECT PUNCTUATION MARKS.
- B) CORRECT INCONSISTENCIES IN PUNCTUATION USAGE (COMMAS, SEMICOLONS, PERIODS, QUOTATION MARKS).



## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### 15.3. ACADEMIC STYLE AND TONE:

- A) ENSURE THE WRITING MAINTAINS A FORMAL, OBJECTIVE, AND SCHOLARLY TONE APPROPRIATE FOR ACADEMIC PUBLICATIONS.
- B) SUGGEST REPHRASING FOR OVERLY INFORMAL OR VAGUE EXPRESSIONS.

### 15.4. CONSISTENCY:

- A) CHECK FOR CONSISTENCY IN TERMINOLOGY, ABBREVIATIONS, AND FORMATTING (E.G., HEADINGS, CITATIONS).
- B) FLAG INCONSISTENCIES AND RECOMMEND STANDARDIZATION.

### 15.5. CLARITY AND READABILITY:

- A) IDENTIFY CONFUSING OR OVERLY COMPLEX SENTENCES AND SUGGEST CLEARER ALTERNATIVES.
- B) RECOMMEND BREAKING UP LONG PARAGRAPHS OR SENTENCES TO ENHANCE READABILITY.

### 15.6. REFERENCES AND CITATIONS:

- A) SPOT-CHECK REFERENCES FOR PROPER FORMATTING ACCORDING TO THE TARGET CITATION STYLE.
- B) POINT OUT INCOMPLETE OR INCONSISTENT CITATIONS.

### 15.7. OVERALL SUGGESTIONS:

- A) PROVIDE A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MANUSCRIPT'S OVERALL LANGUAGE QUALITY.
- B) HIGHLIGHT THE TOP 3 AREAS NEEDING THE MOST ATTENTION FOR IMPROVEMENT.

---

## ADDITIONAL | CONVERT TO CSL REFERENCE STYLE

YOU ARE A CITATION FORMATTING ASSISTANT. PLEASE CONVERT THE FOLLOWING LIST OF REFERENCES INTO THE SPECIFIED CITATION STYLE USING PROPER CSL FORMATTING.

TARGET STYLE: *INSERT YOUR TARGET STYLE HERE, E.G., APA 7TH EDITION, IEEE, CHICAGO, VANCOUVER*

### REFERENCES:

1. AUTHOR(S). (YEAR). TITLE. JOURNAL, VOLUME(ISSUE), PAGES. DOI/LINK
2. *PASTE YOUR FULL REFERENCES HERE*

### INSTRUCTIONS:

- A) ENSURE THAT ALL REFERENCES FOLLOW THE CORRECT FORMATTING FOR THE CHOSEN CITATION STYLE.
- B) STANDARDIZE PUNCTUATION, CAPITALIZATION, AUTHOR NAME ORDER, ITALICS, AND DATE PLACEMENT AS REQUIRED.
- C) VERIFY THAT ALL DOI LINKS ARE ACTIVE AND CORRECTLY LEAD TO THE REFERENCED ARTICLES.
- D) IF ANY INFORMATION (E.G., VOLUME, ISSUE, PAGE NUMBERS, OR DOI) IS MISSING, MARK IT AS [MISSING] OR [TO BE COMPLETED].
- E) FOR DOIS, FORMAT THEM AS FULL URLS (E.G., [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/XXXXX](https://doi.org/xxxxx)) AS PER MOST STYLE GUIDELINES.

PLEASE RETURN THE FULLY FORMATTED REFERENCE LIST ONLY. DO NOT INCLUDE COMMENTARY OR EXPLANATIONS.

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### HOW TO USE IT:

1. PASTE REFERENCES INTO THE REFERENCE SECTION BEFORE RUNNING THE PROMPT.
2. MANUALLY VERIFY DOI LINKS AFTER AI PROCESSES THEM TO ENSURE THEY MATCH THE CITED PAPER (**SOMETIMES TITLES ARE SIMILAR BUT NOT EXACT**).
3. OPTIONALLY, USE CROSSREF ([HTTPS://SEARCH.CROSSREF.ORG/](https://search.crossref.org/)) TO CHECK DOI ACCURACY.

## VI. REFERENCES

1. AGUILLO, I. F. (2012). IS GOOGLE SCHOLAR USEFUL FOR BIBLIOMETRICS? A WEBOMETRIC ANALYSIS. *SCIENTOMETRICS*, 9(1), 343-351. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S11192-011-0582-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-011-0582-8)
2. ALISON COOKE, SMITH, J., BOOTH, A., & WATHEN, C. N. (2012). BEYOND PICO: THE SPIDER TOOL FOR QUALITATIVE EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS. *QUALITATIVE HEALTH RESEARCH*, 22(10), 1435-1443. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1177/1049732312452938](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732312452938)
3. ARIA, M., & CUCCURULLO, C. (2017). BIBLIOMETRIX: AN R-TOOL FOR COMPREHENSIVE SCIENCE MAPPING ANALYSIS. *JOURNAL OF INFORMETRICS*, 11(4), 959-975. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1016/J.JOI.2017.08.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.08.007)
4. CARRERA-RIVERA, A. (2022). HOW-TO CONDUCT A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW: A QUICK GUIDE FOR COMPUTER SCIENCE RESEARCH. *METHODS*, 9, 101895. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1016/J.MEX.2022.101895](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2022.101895)
5. DAY, R. A., & GASTEL, B. (2011). *HOW TO WRITE AND PUBLISH A SCIENTIFIC PAPER* (7TH ED.). CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
6. DRUMMOND, G. B. (2013). METHODS. IN G. M. HALL (ED.), *HOW TO WRITE A PAPER* (5TH ED., PP. 16-21). WILEY.
7. ELSEVIER. (N.D.). *THE USE OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN WRITING FOR ELSEVIER* RETRIEVED MAY 15, 2025, FROM [HTTPS://WWW.ELSEVIER.COM/ABOUT/POLICIES-AND-STANDARDS/THE-USE-OF-GENERATIVE-AI-AND-AI-ASSISTED-TECHNOLOGIES-IN-WRITING-FOR-ELSEVIER](https://www.elsevier.com/about/policies-and-standards/the-use-of-generative-ai-and-ai-assisted-technologies-in-writing-for-elsevier)
8. FENNER, M., SCHELIGA, K., & BARTLING, S. (2014). REFERENCE MANAGEMENT. IN S. BARTLING & S. FRIESIKE (EDS.), *OPENING SCIENCE* (PP. 109-118). SPRINGER. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00026-8_8)
9. HAMES, I. (2013). *PEER REVIEW AND MANUSCRIPT MANAGEMENT IN SCIENTIFIC JOURNALS: GUIDELINES FOR GOOD PRACTICE*. WILEY-BLACKWELL.
10. HARRIS, A. J. L. (2022). GUIDELINES ON MANUSCRIPT FORMAT, STRUCTURE, AND STYLE: AVOIDING EDITORIAL HOLDUPS IN THE PUBLICATION PROCESS. *BULLETIN OF VOLCANOLOGY*, 84, 32. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S00445-022-01619-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00445-022-01619-8)
11. MOHER, D., LIBERATI, A., TETZLAFF, J., ALTMAN, D. G., & THE PRISMA GROUP. (2009). PREFERRED REPORTING ITEMS FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS AND META-ANALYSES: THE PRISMA STATEMENT. *PLOS MEDICINE*, 6(7), E1000097. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1000097](https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1000097)
12. NEES JAN VAN ECK, & WALTMAN, L. (2010). SOFTWARE SURVEY: VOSVIEWER, A COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR BIBLIOMETRIC MAPPING. *SCIENTOMETRICS*, 84(2), 523-538. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S11192-009-0146-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3)
13. PAGE, M. J., MCKENZIE, J. E., BOSSUYT, P. M., BOUTRON, I., HOFFMANN, T. C., MULROW, C. D., SHAMSEER, L., TETZLAFF, J. M., AKL, E. A., BRENNAN, S. E., CHOU, R., GLANVILLE, J., GRIMSHAW, J. M., HRÓBJARTSSON, A., LALU, M. M., LI, T., LOPER, E. W., MAYO-WILSON, E., MCDONALD, S., ... MOHER, D. (2021). THE PRISMA 2020 STATEMENT: AN UPDATED GUIDELINE FOR REPORTING SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS. *BMJ*, 372, N71. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1136/BMJ.N71](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71)
14. PASSAS, I. (2024). BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS: THE MAIN STEPS. *ENCYCLOPEDIA*, 4(2), 1014-1025. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.3390/ENCYCLOPEDIA4020065](https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia4020065)
15. PROSKE, A., WENZEL, C., & QUEITSCH, M. B. (2023). REFERENCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS. IN O. KRUSE ET AL. (EDS.), *DIGITAL WRITING TECHNOLOGIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION* (PP. 203-223). SPRINGER. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/978-3-031-36033-6\\_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36033-6_14)
16. SAMALA, A. D., RAWAS, S., WANG, T., ET AL. (2025). UNVEILING THE LANDSCAPE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN EDUCATION: A COMPREHENSIVE TAXONOMY OF APPLICATIONS, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE PROSPECTS. *EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES*, 30, 3239-3278. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S10639-024-12936-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12936-0)
17. SAMALA, A. D., ET AL. (2024). EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FOR GLOBAL EDUCATION: A COMPREHENSIVE EXPLORATION OF TRENDS, INNOVATIONS, CHALLENGES, AND FUTURE HORIZONS. *SN COMPUTER SCIENCE*. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S42979-024-03538-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-024-03538-1)
18. SMITH, R. (2013). INTRODUCTION. IN G. M. HALL (ED.), *HOW TO WRITE A PAPER* (5TH ED., PP. 6-15). WILEY.
19. UNESCO. (2023). GUIDANCE FOR GENERATIVE AI IN EDUCATION AND RESEARCH. [HTTPS://UNESDOC.UNESCO.ORG/ARK:/48223/PF0000386693/PDF/386693ENG.PDF.MULTI](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693/pdf/386693eng.pdf.multi)
20. DIREKTORAT PEMBELAJARAN DAN KEMAHASISWAAN, DIREKTORAT JENDERAL PENDIDIKAN TINGGI, RISET DAN TEKNOLOGI, KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET DAN TEKNOLOGI, REPUBLIK INDONESIA. (2024) *PANDUAN PENGGUNAAN GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (GENAI) PADA PEMBELAJARAN DI PERGURUAN TINGGI*. [HTTPS://LLDIKT3.KEMDIKBUD.GO.ID/WP-CONTENT/UPLOADS/2024/11/BUKU-PANDUAN--PENGGUNAAN-GENERATIVE-AI-PADA-PEMBELAJARAN-DI-PERGURUAN-TINGGI-CETAK.PDF](https://lldikti3.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/BUKU-PANDUAN--PENGGUNAAN-GENERATIVE-AI-PADA-PEMBELAJARAN-DI-PERGURUAN-TINGGI-CETAK.PDF)

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### VII. DECLARATION OF ETHICAL USE, LICENSING, AND ETHICS STATEMENT

THIS FRAMEWORK AND ITS RELATED MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED FOR ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL USE UNDER THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND COMMITMENTS TO UPHOLD ACADEMIC ETHICS AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY:

#### 1. RESPONSIBLE USE, ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, AND TRANSPARENCY

USERS AGREE TO USE THIS FRAMEWORK RESPONSIBLY, ENSURING ACADEMIC HONESTY, ORIGINALITY, AND AVOIDANCE OF PLAGIARISM OR ANY UNETHICAL PRACTICES. THE FRAMEWORK IS INTENDED AS A SUPPORT TOOL TO ENHANCE ORIGINAL WORK, NOT TO REPLACE CRITICAL THINKING OR THE AUTHOR'S INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTION. USERS ARE ENCOURAGED TO DISCLOSE THE EXTENT OF AI INVOLVEMENT IN THEIR SCHOLARLY WORKS TO MAINTAIN TRANSPARENCY AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY.

#### 2. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, ATTRIBUTION, AND LICENSING

ALL CONTENT HEREIN IS THE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OF ITS CREATOR(S). PROPER ATTRIBUTION MUST BE GIVEN WHEN USING OR MODIFYING ANY PART OF THIS MATERIAL. USAGE MUST COMPLY WITH THE APPLICABLE CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSE (CC BY-NC), WHICH PERMITS NON-COMMERCIAL USE WITH APPROPRIATE CREDIT. USERS MAY ADAPT OR MODIFY THE FRAMEWORK FOR THEIR OWN USE, PROVIDED SUCH MODIFICATIONS ARE CLEARLY DOCUMENTED. REDISTRIBUTION OF ORIGINAL OR MODIFIED CONTENT REQUIRES PROPER CREDIT AND ADHERENCE TO THESE TERMS.

#### 3. PLAGIARISM PREVENTION AND HANDLING

USERS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ORIGINALITY, ACCURACY, AND INTEGRITY OF ANY CONTENT PRODUCED USING THIS FRAMEWORK. IT IS STRONGLY RECOMMENDED TO EMPLOY PLAGIARISM DETECTION SOFTWARE (E.G., TURNITIN, GRAMMARLY PREMIUM, ITHENTICATE) BEFORE SUBMISSION. IF PLAGIARISM IS DETECTED, IMMEDIATE CORRECTIVE ACTIONS SHOULD BE TAKEN, INCLUDING REVISION OR CONSULTATION WITH ACADEMIC SUPERVISORS.

#### 4. DATA PRIVACY AND PROTECTION

USERS MUST ENSURE THAT ANY PERSONAL OR SENSITIVE DATA USED WITHIN THIS FRAMEWORK COMPLIES WITH PRIVACY LAWS AND ETHICAL STANDARDS TO PROTECT INDIVIDUALS' RIGHTS AND CONFIDENTIALITY.

#### 5. LIABILITY AND COMPLIANCE

THE CREATOR(S) ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY MISUSE OR ETHICAL VIOLATIONS ARISING FROM THE USE OF THIS FRAMEWORK. USERS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COMPLYING WITH INSTITUTIONAL, LEGAL, AND JOURNAL POLICIES, INCLUDING ETHICAL GUIDELINES REGARDING ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGIES SUCH AS AI.

#### 6. AI LIMITATIONS AND CRITICAL VERIFICATION

USERS SHOULD REMAIN AWARE OF THE LIMITATIONS OF AI TECHNOLOGIES AND EXERCISE CRITICAL JUDGMENT WHEN INTEGRATING AI-GENERATED CONTENT INTO THEIR WORK.

#### 7. INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLISHER POLICY COMPLIANCE

USERS ARE ADVISED TO COMPLY WITH SPECIFIC ETHICAL GUIDELINES AND POLICIES OF THEIR INSTITUTIONS OR PUBLISHERS, IN ADDITION TO THIS FRAMEWORK'S PROVISIONS.

#### 8. COMMITMENT TO ETHICAL SCHOLARSHIP

BY USING THIS FRAMEWORK, USERS ACKNOWLEDGE AND ACCEPT FULL ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL RESULTING SCHOLARLY WORK AND COMMIT TO UPHOLDING THE HIGHEST STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY.



THIS MATERIAL IS LICENSED UNDER THE [CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NONCOMMERCIAL \(CC BY-NC\) LICENSE](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

## NOTES TO SHARE - 2 - PROMPTING\_V.2.2 (THE FANTASTIC 4)

WRITTEN ON 10. DEC. 2024 (PP. 1-12)

LAST UPDATED ON 18. APR. 2025

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA ([AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID](mailto:AGARIADNE@FT.UNP.AC.ID))

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

### ADDITIONAL | PLAGIARISM CHECKER

#### TOOLS PLAGIARISME CHECKER

1. TURNITIN

[HTTPS://WWW.TURNITIN.COM/](https://www.turnitin.com/)

2. GRAMMARLY PREMIUM

[HTTPS://WWW.GRAMMARLY.COM/PLAGIARISM-CHECKER](https://www.grammarly.com/plagiarism-checker)

3. ITHENTICATE

[HTTPS://WWW.ITHENTICATE.COM/](https://www.ithenticate.com/)

### DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROMPTING FRAMEWORK, THE AUTHOR UTILIZED OPENAI'S CHATGPT AS AN ASSISTIVE TOOL TO HELP GENERATE IDEAS, STRUCTURE CONTENT, AND IMPROVE CLARITY. ALL OUTPUTS PROVIDED BY CHATGPT WERE CRITICALLY REVIEWED, REVISED, AND INTEGRATED BY THE AUTHOR TO ENSURE ACCURACY, ORIGINALITY, AND ALIGNMENT WITH ACADEMIC AND ETHICAL STANDARDS.

THE AUTHOR TAKES FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FINAL CONTENT, INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS, AND INTEGRITY OF THE FRAMEWORK. THIS USE OF AI TOOLS COMPLIES WITH INSTITUTIONAL AND SCHOLARLY ETHICAL GUIDELINES, EMPHASIZING TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN AI-ASSISTED ACADEMIC WORK.

---

DR. AGARIADNE DWINGGO SAMALA  
FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG, INDONESIA

SCOPUS ID: [57881288600](#)  
ORCID ID: [0000-0002-4425-0605](#)  
GOOGLE SCHOLAR: [TIMXJXCAAAAJ](#)

- TO BE CONTINUED -