FINAL OUTPUT

128
PAGES

AI IMPLEMENTATION COURSE

AI Research Assistant Business Kit

Market Scans, Reports, and Retainer Delivery

turn a vague AI idea into a documented workflow with inputs, prompts, tools, human review, evals, and measurable output quality

REAL LESSONS + LABS + QA + SOURCE DISCIPLINE
FLASH COVER EDITION | COURSE + WORKBOOK FORMAT

Created 8 June 2026 | market_researched | Source pages: new spec

Human Rewrite Contract

WHAT CHANGED
This version rebuilds AI Research Assistant Business Kit as a real 128-page course. Pages must teach a specific decision, explain the mechanism, show an example, ask the reader to build something, and name a quality check.

NO FILLER RULE
A page fails if it only praises the topic, repeats a generic drill, defines a random word, or asks the reader to create an artifact without showing what good looks like.

READER PROMISE
turn a vague AI idea into a documented workflow with inputs, prompts, tools, human review, evals, and measurable output quality

PRIMARY DELIVERABLE
an AI workflow playbook with prompt specs, source records, SOPs, eval checks, and handoff notes

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

128-Page Course Map

PAGE ARCHITECTURE

- 1 cover
- 7 orientation and research pages
- 112 course lesson pages: 14 chapters x 8 pages
- 8 back-matter pages: capstone, rubrics, worksheets, sprint, sources, QA, package, update log

CHAPTER RHYTHM

Each chapter moves through lens, explanation, worked example, procedure, lab, checklist, repair, and mastery. The rhythm repeats so the reader can study; the actual content changes page by page.

READER PATH

The reader starts as operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders and finishes with an AI workflow playbook with prompt specs, source records, SOPs, eval checks, and handoff notes.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Current Research Spine

FRESH SOURCE BASE

- OpenAI API Docs - Prompting: Teach prompts as versioned, testable instructions with variables, examples, evals, and reusable records.
- OpenAI API Docs - Agents: Agent systems need goals, tools, workflows, optimization, tracing/evaluation, and human review where risk exists.
- NIST AI Risk Management Framework: Map AI outputs to risk, measurement, governance, transparency, human oversight, and review cadence.
- OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025: Cover prompt injection, data exposure, overreliance, insecure output handling, and model behavior risk.
- Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content: Use original explanations, clear authorship/process notes, source discipline, and extra care for health, finance, safety, and other YMYL topics.

HOW TO USE SOURCES

Treat sources as guardrails, not decoration. Platform, policy, health, legal, payment, and AI-tool details can change, so the book records dates and tells the reader what must be rechecked.

FACT/INFERENCE SPLIT

Definitions, official policy constraints, and safety notes should be labeled as source-backed. Examples, workflows, and product ideas are implementation inferences that need reader testing.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Diagnostic and Starting State

READER

This course is written for operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. The likely starting problem is not lack of motivation; it is unclear sequence, weak examples, missing evidence, and no review loop.

THREE STARTING QUESTIONS

- What would make AI Research Assistant Business Kit useful in the first 20 minutes?
- Which decision does the reader need to make first?
- What would create harm, confusion, wasted money, or false confidence if left vague?

BASELINE RECORD

Create a one-page baseline with audience, current skill, goal, constraint, time available, source confidence, and the first prompt spec.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Vocabulary Without Random Terms

KEY TERMS

- ai research assistant: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.
- market research: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.
- report templates: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.
- retainer: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.
- research assistant business: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.
- assistant business kit: define it in this book's context, show one example, and name what it is not.

PRECISION RULE

Do not define isolated words pulled from frequency counts. Define the terms a reader must understand to act safely and specifically.

VOCABULARY TEST

A term belongs in AI Research Assistant Business Kit only if it changes a decision, a recipe, a workflow, a worksheet, a risk check, or a measurable output.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Evidence, Risk, and Reader Protection

SAFETY BOUNDARY

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

EVIDENCE LADDER

- Official source or policy
- Peer-reviewed or expert source where relevant
- Documented observation
- Worked example
- Hypothesis to test
- Opinion or creative preference

PROTECTION HABIT

Before publishing or acting, re-check anything involving health, money, legal rights, platform rules, payments, privacy, child safety, food safety, or physical safety.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

How to Study and Build From Every Page

STUDY METHOD

Read one page, build the named output, compare it to the quality check, then write one revision. The goal is not page completion; it is usable evidence of learning.

NOTEBOOK SETUP

- Create a section for prompt spec.
- Create a section for source table.
- Create a section for SOP.
- Create a section for eval checklist.
- Create a section for handoff note.
- Create one source log and one error log.

COGNITIVE VALUE RULE

A high-value page reduces ambiguity. It should tell the reader what matters, why it matters, how to do it, how to check it, and what mistake to avoid.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use reader outcome and use case to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand market research, connect it to retainer, and produce a usable source table.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled source table for the chapter 'Reader Outcome and Use Case'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: market research. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Use LlamaIndex (https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index) when useful because it helps to turn source folders into retrieval systems. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the source table as a production record: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- source title
- URL or file path
- date checked
- claim supported
- confidence
- action affected

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Reader Outcome and Use Case works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating report templates as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain report templates through the fields of the SOP: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn report templates into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the SOP. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for retainer. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: retainer
- Companion concept: assistant business kit
- Output: eval checklist
- Field: test input
- Field: expected output
- Field: failure mode

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes retainer visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the eval checklist, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The eval checklist should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for research assistant business.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the handoff note needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The handoff note is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Reader Outcome and Use Case: assistant business kit'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the error log.
- Fill: error observed.
- Fill: likely cause.
- Fill: repair.
- Fill: retest case.
- Fill: owner.

TOOL STACK
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Reddit for real people using assistant business kit to build a error log. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working error log that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts assistant business kit from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank error log is a design promise; a filled error log is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the error log: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the prompt spec include task goal?
- Does the prompt spec include source context?
- Does the prompt spec include input example?
- Does the prompt spec include output format?
- Does the prompt spec include constraints?
- Does the prompt spec include review checklist?

DECISION RULE

If research assistant is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the prompt spec until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about research assistant, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the prompt spec is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the prompt spec finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of assistant business, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about assistant business as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the source table.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with assistant business.' After: 'Use this source table to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reader Outcome and Use Case: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is business kit, and what is it not?
- How does reader outcome and use case change the work?
- What does the SOP contain?
- Which field is weakest: trigger, inputs, steps?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business kit into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain business kit, build the SOP, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET

Use problem diagnosis and starting state to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand report templates, connect it to assistant business kit, and produce a usable SOP.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS

The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT

Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled SOP for the chapter 'Problem Diagnosis and Starting State'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: report templates. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Use CrewAI (https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI) when useful because it helps to test role-based agent teams. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

BUILD OUTPUT

Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE

- trigger
- inputs
- steps
- tool used
- human review
- handoff

SOURCE BOUNDARY

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Problem Diagnosis and Starting State works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating retainer as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain retainer through the fields of the eval checklist: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the eval checklist as a production record: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the eval checklist. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for research assistant business. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: research assistant business
- Companion concept: assistant business
- Output: handoff note
- Field: trigger
- Field: inputs
- Field: steps

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes research assistant business visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the handoff note, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The handoff note should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for assistant business kit.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business kit into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the error log needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The error log is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: research assistant'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the prompt spec.
- Fill: task goal.
- Fill: source context.
- Fill: input example.
- Fill: output format.
- Fill: constraints.

TOOL STACK
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search GitHub for real people using research assistant to build a prompt spec. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working prompt spec that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts research assistant from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank prompt spec is a design promise; a filled prompt spec is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the prompt spec: task goal, source context, input example, output format. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the source table include source title?
- Does the source table include URL or file path?
- Does the source table include date checked?
- Does the source table include claim supported?
- Does the source table include confidence?
- Does the source table include action affected?

DECISION RULE

If assistant business is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the source table until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about assistant business, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the source table is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the source table finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of business kit, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about business kit as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the SOP.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with business kit.' After: 'Use this SOP to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Problem Diagnosis and Starting State: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is research, and what is it not?
- How does problem diagnosis and starting state change the work?
- What does the eval checklist contain?
- Which field is weakest: test input, expected output, failure mode?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain research, build the eval checklist, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use core concepts and mental models to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand retainer, connect it to assistant business, and produce a usable eval checklist.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled eval checklist for the chapter 'Core Concepts and Mental Models'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: retainer. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Use Pydantic AI (https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai) when useful because it helps to validate model outputs with typed schemas. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the eval checklist as a production record: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- test input
- expected output
- failure mode
- score
- reviewer
- revision

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Core Concepts and Mental Models works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating research assistant business as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain research assistant business through the fields of the handoff note: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the handoff note as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the handoff note. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for assistant business kit. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: assistant business kit
- Companion concept: research
- Output: error log
- Field: error observed
- Field: likely cause
- Field: repair

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business kit into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes assistant business kit visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the error log, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The error log should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for research assistant.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the prompt spec needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The prompt spec is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Core Concepts and Mental Models: assistant business'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the source table.
- Fill: source title.
- Fill: URL or file path.
- Fill: date checked.
- Fill: claim supported.
- Fill: confidence.

TOOL STACK
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Etsy for real people using assistant business to build a source table. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working source table that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts assistant business from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank source table is a design promise; a filled source table is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the source table: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the SOP include trigger?
- Does the SOP include inputs?
- Does the SOP include steps?
- Does the SOP include tool used?
- Does the SOP include human review?
- Does the SOP include handoff?

DECISION RULE

If business kit is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the SOP until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about business kit, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the SOP is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the SOP finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of research, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about research as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the eval checklist.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with research.' After: 'Use this eval checklist to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Core Concepts and Mental Models: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is assistant, and what is it not?
- How does core concepts and mental models change the work?
- What does the handoff note contain?
- Which field is weakest: trigger, inputs, steps?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain assistant, build the handoff note, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use source evidence and boundaries to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand research assistant business, connect it to research, and produce a usable handoff note.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled handoff note for the chapter 'Source Evidence and Boundaries'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: research assistant business. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Use LangGraph (https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph) when useful because it helps to build agent workflows as visible graphs. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the handoff note as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- trigger
- inputs
- steps
- tool used
- human review
- handoff

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Source Evidence and Boundaries works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating assistant business kit as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain assistant business kit through the fields of the error log: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business kit into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the error log as a production record: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the error log. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for research assistant. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: research assistant
- Companion concept: business
- Output: prompt spec
- Field: task goal
- Field: source context
- Field: input example

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes research assistant visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the prompt spec, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The prompt spec should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for assistant business.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the source table needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The source table is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Source Evidence and Boundaries: business kit'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the SOP.
- Fill: trigger.
- Fill: inputs.
- Fill: steps.
- Fill: tool used.
- Fill: human review.

TOOL STACK
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Pinterest for real people using business kit to build a SOP. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working SOP that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts business kit from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank SOP is a design promise; a filled SOP is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the SOP: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the eval checklist include test input?
- Does the eval checklist include expected output?
- Does the eval checklist include failure mode?
- Does the eval checklist include score?
- Does the eval checklist include reviewer?
- Does the eval checklist include revision?

DECISION RULE

If research is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the eval checklist until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about research, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the eval checklist is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the eval checklist finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of assistant, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about assistant as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the handoff note.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with assistant.' After: 'Use this handoff note to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Evidence and Boundaries: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is business, and what is it not?
- How does source evidence and boundaries change the work?
- What does the error log contain?
- Which field is weakest: error observed, likely cause, repair?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain business, build the error log, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use inputs, tools, and setup to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand assistant business kit, connect it to business, and produce a usable error log.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled error log for the chapter 'Inputs, Tools, and Setup'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: assistant business kit. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Use LlamaIndex (https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index) when useful because it helps to turn source folders into retrieval systems. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the error log as a production record: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- error observed
- likely cause
- repair
- retest case
- owner
- date

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Inputs, Tools, and Setup works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating research assistant as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain research assistant through the fields of the prompt spec: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the prompt spec as a production record: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the prompt spec. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for assistant business. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: assistant business
- Companion concept: market research
- Output: source table
- Field: source title
- Field: URL or file path
- Field: date checked

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes assistant business visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the source table, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The source table should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for business kit.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business kit into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the SOP needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The SOP is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Inputs, Tools, and Setup: research'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the eval checklist.
- Fill: test input.
- Fill: expected output.
- Fill: failure mode.
- Fill: score.
- Fill: reviewer.

TOOL STACK
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search TikTok for real people using research to build a eval checklist. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working eval checklist that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts research from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank eval checklist is a design promise; a filled eval checklist is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the eval checklist: test input, expected output, failure mode, score. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the handoff note include trigger?
- Does the handoff note include inputs?
- Does the handoff note include steps?
- Does the handoff note include tool used?
- Does the handoff note include human review?
- Does the handoff note include handoff?

DECISION RULE

If assistant is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the handoff note until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about assistant, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the handoff note is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the handoff note finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of business, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about business as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the error log.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with business.' After: 'Use this error log to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Inputs, Tools, and Setup: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is ai research assistant, and what is it not?
- How does inputs, tools, and setup change the work?
- What does the prompt spec contain?
- Which field is weakest: task goal, source context, input example?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn ai research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain ai research assistant, build the prompt spec, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET

Use step-by-step operating method to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand research assistant, connect it to market research, and produce a usable prompt spec.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS

The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT

Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled prompt spec for the chapter 'Step-by-Step Operating Method'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: research assistant. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Use CrewAI (https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI) when useful because it helps to test role-based agent teams. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

BUILD OUTPUT

Build the prompt spec as a production record: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE

- task goal
- source context
- input example
- output format
- constraints
- review checklist

SOURCE BOUNDARY

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Step-by-Step Operating Method works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating assistant business as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain assistant business through the fields of the source table: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the source table as a production record: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the source table. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for business kit. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: business kit
- Companion concept: retainer
- Output: SOP
- Field: trigger
- Field: inputs
- Field: steps

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business kit into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes business kit visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the SOP, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The SOP should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for research.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the eval checklist needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The eval checklist is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Step-by-Step Operating Method: assistant'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the handoff note.
- Fill: trigger.
- Fill: inputs.
- Fill: steps.
- Fill: tool used.
- Fill: human review.

TOOL STACK
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Google for real people using assistant to build a handoff note. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working handoff note that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts assistant from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank handoff note is a design promise; a filled handoff note is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the handoff note: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the error log include error observed?
- Does the error log include likely cause?
- Does the error log include repair?
- Does the error log include retest case?
- Does the error log include owner?
- Does the error log include date?

DECISION RULE

If business is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the error log until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about business, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the error log is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the error log finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of ai research assistant, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about ai research assistant as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the prompt spec.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with ai research assistant.' After: 'Use this prompt spec to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Step-by-Step Operating Method: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is market research, and what is it not?
- How does step-by-step operating method change the work?
- What does the source table contain?
- Which field is weakest: source title, URL or file path, date checked?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn market research into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain market research, build the source table, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use worked example and non-example to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand assistant business, connect it to retainer, and produce a usable source table.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled source table for the chapter 'Worked Example and Non-Example'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: assistant business. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Use Pydantic AI (https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai) when useful because it helps to validate model outputs with typed schemas. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the source table as a production record: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- source title
- URL or file path
- date checked
- claim supported
- confidence
- action affected

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Worked Example and Non-Example works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating business kit as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain business kit through the fields of the SOP: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business kit into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the SOP. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for research. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: research
- Companion concept: assistant business kit
- Output: eval checklist
- Field: test input
- Field: expected output
- Field: failure mode

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes research visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the eval checklist, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The eval checklist should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for assistant.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the handoff note needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The handoff note is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Worked Example and Non-Example: business'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the error log.
- Fill: error observed.
- Fill: likely cause.
- Fill: repair.
- Fill: retest case.
- Fill: owner.

TOOL STACK
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search LinkedIn for real people using business to build a error log. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working error log that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts business from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank error log is a design promise; a filled error log is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the error log: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the prompt spec include task goal?
- Does the prompt spec include source context?
- Does the prompt spec include input example?
- Does the prompt spec include output format?
- Does the prompt spec include constraints?
- Does the prompt spec include review checklist?

DECISION RULE

If ai research assistant is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the prompt spec until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about ai research assistant, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the prompt spec is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the prompt spec finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of market research, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about market research as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the source table.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with market research.' After: 'Use this source table to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Worked Example and Non-Example: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is report templates, and what is it not?
- How does worked example and non-example change the work?
- What does the SOP contain?
- Which field is weakest: trigger, inputs, steps?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn report templates into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain report templates, build the SOP, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use templates, checklists, and records to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand business kit, connect it to assistant business kit, and produce a usable SOP.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled SOP for the chapter 'Templates, Checklists, and Records'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: business kit. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Use LangGraph (https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph) when useful because it helps to build agent workflows as visible graphs. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- trigger
- inputs
- steps
- tool used
- human review
- handoff

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Templates, Checklists, and Records works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating research as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain research through the fields of the eval checklist: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn research into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the eval checklist as a production record: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the eval checklist. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Worked Example

SCENARIO
A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for assistant. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD
- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: assistant
- Companion concept: assistant business
- Output: handoff note
- Field: trigger
- Field: inputs
- Field: steps

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn assistant into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING
The example works because it makes assistant visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE
If the worked record does not change the handoff note, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION
Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The handoff note should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for business.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the error log needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The error log is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Templates, Checklists, and Records: ai research assistant'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the prompt spec.
- Fill: task goal.
- Fill: source context.
- Fill: input example.
- Fill: output format.
- Fill: constraints.

TOOL STACK
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search YouTube for real people using ai research assistant to build a prompt spec. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working prompt spec that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts ai research assistant from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank prompt spec is a design promise; a filled prompt spec is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the prompt spec: task goal, source context, input example, output format. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the source table include source title?
- Does the source table include URL or file path?
- Does the source table include date checked?
- Does the source table include claim supported?
- Does the source table include confidence?
- Does the source table include action affected?

DECISION RULE

If market research is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the source table until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about market research, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the source table is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the source table finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of report templates, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about report templates as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the SOP.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with report templates.' After: 'Use this SOP to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Templates, Checklists, and Records: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is retainer, and what is it not?
- How does templates, checklists, and records change the work?
- What does the eval checklist contain?
- Which field is weakest: test input, expected output, failure mode?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain retainer, build the eval checklist, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use measurement and feedback loops to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand research, connect it to assistant business, and produce a usable eval checklist.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled eval checklist for the chapter 'Measurement and Feedback Loops'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: research. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Use LlamaIndex (https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index) when useful because it helps to turn source folders into retrieval systems. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the eval checklist as a production record: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- test input
- expected output
- failure mode
- score
- reviewer
- revision

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Measurement and Feedback Loops works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating assistant as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain assistant through the fields of the handoff note: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the handoff note as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the handoff note. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Worked Example

SCENARIO
A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for business. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD
- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: business
- Companion concept: research
- Output: error log
- Field: error observed
- Field: likely cause
- Field: repair

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn business into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING
The example works because it makes business visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE
If the worked record does not change the error log, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION
Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The error log should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for ai research assistant.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn ai research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the prompt spec needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The prompt spec is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Measurement and Feedback Loops: market research'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the source table.
- Fill: source title.
- Fill: URL or file path.
- Fill: date checked.
- Fill: claim supported.
- Fill: confidence.

TOOL STACK
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Reddit for real people using market research to build a source table. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working source table that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts market research from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank source table is a design promise; a filled source table is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the source table: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the SOP include trigger?
- Does the SOP include inputs?
- Does the SOP include steps?
- Does the SOP include tool used?
- Does the SOP include human review?
- Does the SOP include handoff?

DECISION RULE

If report templates is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the SOP until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about report templates, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the SOP is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the SOP finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of retainer, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about retainer as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the eval checklist.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with retainer.' After: 'Use this eval checklist to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Measurement and Feedback Loops: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is research assistant business, and what is it not?
- How does measurement and feedback loops change the work?
- What does the handoff note contain?
- Which field is weakest: trigger, inputs, steps?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain research assistant business, build the handoff note, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET

Use risk, ethics, and safe use to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand assistant, connect it to research, and produce a usable handoff note.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS

The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT

Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled handoff note for the chapter 'Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: assistant. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Use CrewAI (https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI) when useful because it helps to test role-based agent teams. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

BUILD OUTPUT

Build the handoff note as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE

- trigger
- inputs
- steps
- tool used
- human review
- handoff

SOURCE BOUNDARY

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating business as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain business through the fields of the error log: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the error log as a production record: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the error log. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for ai research assistant. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: ai research assistant
- Companion concept: business
- Output: prompt spec
- Field: task goal
- Field: source context
- Field: input example

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn ai research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes ai research assistant visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the prompt spec, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The prompt spec should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for market research.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn market research into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the source table needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The source table is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: report templates'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the SOP.
- Fill: trigger.
- Fill: inputs.
- Fill: steps.
- Fill: tool used.
- Fill: human review.

TOOL STACK
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search GitHub for real people using report templates to build a SOP. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working SOP that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts report templates from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank SOP is a design promise; a filled SOP is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the SOP: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the eval checklist include test input?
- Does the eval checklist include expected output?
- Does the eval checklist include failure mode?
- Does the eval checklist include score?
- Does the eval checklist include reviewer?
- Does the eval checklist include revision?

DECISION RULE

If retainer is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the eval checklist until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about retainer, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Prompting. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/prompting

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the eval checklist is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the eval checklist finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of research assistant business, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about research assistant business as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the handoff note.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with research assistant business.' After: 'Use this handoff note to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Risk, Ethics, and Safe Use: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is assistant business kit, and what is it not?
- How does risk, ethics, and safe use change the work?
- What does the error log contain?
- Which field is weakest: error observed, likely cause, repair?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business kit into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain assistant business kit, build the error log, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use troubleshooting and repair to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand business, connect it to business, and produce a usable error log.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled error log for the chapter 'Troubleshooting and Repair'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: business. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Use Pydantic AI (https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai) when useful because it helps to validate model outputs with typed schemas. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the error log as a production record: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case, owner. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- error observed
- likely cause
- repair
- retest case
- owner
- date

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM

Troubleshooting and Repair works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating ai research assistant as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Explain ai research assistant through the fields of the prompt spec: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn ai research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION

Build the prompt spec as a production record: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR

A strong explanation changes the prompt spec. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for market research. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: market research
- Companion concept: market research
- Output: source table
- Field: source title
- Field: URL or file path
- Field: date checked

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn market research into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes market research visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the source table, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The source table should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for report templates.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn report templates into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the SOP needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The SOP is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Troubleshooting and Repair: retainer'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the eval checklist.
- Fill: test input.
- Fill: expected output.
- Fill: failure mode.
- Fill: score.
- Fill: reviewer.

TOOL STACK
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Etsy for real people using retainer to build a eval checklist. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working eval checklist that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts retainer from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank eval checklist is a design promise; a filled eval checklist is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the eval checklist: test input, expected output, failure mode, score. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the handoff note include trigger?
- Does the handoff note include inputs?
- Does the handoff note include steps?
- Does the handoff note include tool used?
- Does the handoff note include human review?
- Does the handoff note include handoff?

DECISION RULE

If research assistant business is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the handoff note until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about research assistant business, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OpenAI API Docs - Agents. Link: https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/agents

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the handoff note is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the handoff note finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of assistant business kit, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about assistant business kit as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the error log.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with assistant business kit.' After: 'Use this error log to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Troubleshooting and Repair: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is research assistant, and what is it not?
- How does troubleshooting and repair change the work?
- What does the prompt spec contain?
- Which field is weakest: task goal, source context, input example?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant into one visible thing inside the prompt spec: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain research assistant, build the prompt spec, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use advanced variations and personalization to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand ai research assistant, connect it to market research, and produce a usable prompt spec.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled prompt spec for the chapter 'Advanced Variations and Personalization'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: ai research assistant. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Use LangGraph (https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph) when useful because it helps to build agent workflows as visible graphs. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the prompt spec as a production record: task goal, source context, input example, output format, constraints. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- task goal
- source context
- input example
- output format
- constraints
- review checklist

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Advanced Variations and Personalization works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating market research as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain market research through the fields of the source table: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn market research into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the source table as a production record: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the source table. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Worked Example

SCENARIO
A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for report templates. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD
- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: report templates
- Companion concept: retainer
- Output: SOP
- Field: trigger
- Field: inputs
- Field: steps

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn report templates into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING
The example works because it makes report templates visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE
If the worked record does not change the SOP, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION
Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The SOP should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for retainer.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the eval checklist needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The eval checklist is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Advanced Variations and Personalization: research assistant business'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the handoff note.
- Fill: trigger.
- Fill: inputs.
- Fill: steps.
- Fill: tool used.
- Fill: human review.

TOOL STACK
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Pinterest for real people using research assistant business to build a handoff note. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working handoff note that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts research assistant business from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank handoff note is a design promise; a filled handoff note is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the handoff note: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the error log include error observed?
- Does the error log include likely cause?
- Does the error log include repair?
- Does the error log include retest case?
- Does the error log include owner?
- Does the error log include date?

DECISION RULE

If assistant business kit is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the error log until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about assistant business kit, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: NIST AI Risk Management Framework. Link: https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the error log is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the error log finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of research assistant, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about research assistant as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the prompt spec.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with research assistant.' After: 'Use this prompt spec to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Advanced Variations and Personalization: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is assistant business, and what is it not?
- How does advanced variations and personalization change the work?
- What does the source table contain?
- Which field is weakest: source title, URL or file path, date checked?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business into one visible thing inside the source table: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain assistant business, build the source table, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use implementation sprint to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand market research, connect it to retainer, and produce a usable source table.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled source table for the chapter 'Implementation Sprint'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: market research. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Use LlamaIndex (https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index) when useful because it helps to turn source folders into retrieval systems. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the source table as a production record: source title, URL or file path, date checked, claim supported, confidence. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- source title
- URL or file path
- date checked
- claim supported
- confidence
- action affected

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Implementation Sprint works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating report templates as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain report templates through the fields of the SOP: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn report templates into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the SOP. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for retainer. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: retainer
- Companion concept: assistant business kit
- Output: eval checklist
- Field: test input
- Field: expected output
- Field: failure mode

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes retainer visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the eval checklist, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The eval checklist should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for research assistant business.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the handoff note needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The handoff note is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Implementation Sprint: assistant business kit'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the error log.
- Fill: error observed.
- Fill: likely cause.
- Fill: repair.
- Fill: retest case.
- Fill: owner.

TOOL STACK
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search TikTok for real people using assistant business kit to build a error log. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working error log that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts assistant business kit from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank error log is a design promise; a filled error log is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the error log: error observed, likely cause, repair, retest case. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the prompt spec include task goal?
- Does the prompt spec include source context?
- Does the prompt spec include input example?
- Does the prompt spec include output format?
- Does the prompt spec include constraints?
- Does the prompt spec include review checklist?

DECISION RULE

If research assistant is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the prompt spec until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about research assistant, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Source guardrail: OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025. Link: https://genai.owasp.org/resource/owasp-top-10-for-llm-applications-2025/

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the prompt spec is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the prompt spec finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of assistant business, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about assistant business as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the source table.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with assistant business.' After: 'Use this source table to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Implementation Sprint: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is business kit, and what is it not?
- How does implementation sprint change the work?
- What does the SOP contain?
- Which field is weakest: trigger, inputs, steps?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn business kit into one visible thing inside the SOP: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain business kit, build the SOP, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Lesson Lens

LEARNING TARGET
Use transfer, maintenance, and next edition to make AI Research Assistant Business Kit concrete. The reader should understand report templates, connect it to assistant business kit, and produce a usable SOP.

WHY THIS PAGE EXISTS
The page removes ambiguity by naming the decision, the mechanism, the output, and the quality bar. For this domain, the decision is practical: what will the reader build, publish, cook, record, check, or revise?

CHAPTER MEGAPROMPT
Act as a plain-English AI Implementation Course editor for 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit'. Build a filled SOP for the chapter 'Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition'. Audience: operators, founders, creators, consultants, and non-technical builders. Focus: report templates. Explain the idea simply first, then name the expert term. Include these fields: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Use CrewAI (https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI) when useful because it helps to test role-based agent teams. Add one worked example, one non-example, one risk boundary, one source check, one beginner version, one advanced version, and a final pass/fail checklist a normal reader can use today.

TOP TOOLKIT AND SOURCES
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

BUILD OUTPUT
Build the SOP as a production record: trigger, inputs, steps, tool used, human review. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

FIELDS TO INCLUDE
- trigger
- inputs
- steps
- tool used
- human review
- handoff

SOURCE BOUNDARY
AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Deep Explanation

MECHANISM
Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition works when the reader can see how inputs become decisions, decisions become actions, actions become outputs, and outputs create evidence. For AI Research Assistant Business Kit, the hidden risk is treating retainer as a label instead of a working part.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION
Explain retainer through the fields of the eval checklist: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. This forces the idea to become observable instead of decorative.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE
Turn retainer into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

CONCRETE IMPLICATION
Build the eval checklist as a production record: test input, expected output, failure mode, score, reviewer. Do not let the model invent missing facts; route uncertain claims to source review.

QUALITY BAR
A strong explanation changes the eval checklist. It gives a definition, example, boundary, failure mode, and check. A weak explanation sounds smart but leaves the reader with no next move.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Worked Example

SCENARIO

A non-technical builder wants an AI workflow for research assistant business. The safe first version uses one source folder, one prompt spec, one human review gate, and one measurable output.

WORKED RECORD

- Topic: AI Research Assistant Business Kit
- Focus: research assistant business
- Companion concept: assistant business
- Output: handoff note
- Field: trigger
- Field: inputs
- Field: steps

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research assistant business into one visible thing inside the handoff note: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

REASONING

The example works because it makes research assistant business visible. The reader can inspect the output, test one assumption, and decide what should change in the next version.

DECISION CONSEQUENCE

If the worked record does not change the handoff note, the example is decorative. Rewrite it until one field, one instruction, or one risk boundary becomes sharper.

VARIATION

Create one beginner version, one premium version, and one cautious-review version. The handoff note should stay clear in all three.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Procedure

PROCEDURE

- Define the task for assistant business kit.
- Add source context and banned assumptions.
- Write the prompt spec with output format.
- Run one test case.
- Score the answer against the eval checklist.
- Revise the instruction and log the failure.

SEQUENCE LOGIC

The sequence prevents the common failure of researching forever while building nothing. AI Research Assistant Business Kit becomes useful when each page produces a record that another person can inspect.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn assistant business kit into one visible thing inside the error log: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

PROCEDURE REASONING

The order matters because the error log needs context before action, action before testing, and testing before revision. Skipping that order creates confident but fragile output.

COMPLETION STANDARD

The error log is done when it contains a decision, an action, a check, and a limit.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Practice Lab

LAB SETUP
Create a workspace page named 'Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: research assistant'. Set a 45-minute timer. The goal is a usable draft, not a perfect theory.

LAB TASKS
- Draft the prompt spec.
- Fill: task goal.
- Fill: source context.
- Fill: input example.
- Fill: output format.
- Fill: constraints.

TOOL STACK
- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- LangGraph: build agent workflows as visible graphs. Link: https://github.com/langchain-ai/langgraph
- LlamaIndex: turn source folders into retrieval systems. Link: https://github.com/run-llama/llama_index
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

USE-CASE PROBE
Research probe: search Google for real people using research assistant to build a prompt spec. Log the situation, tool stack, visible result, mistake, repair, and what the book should teach differently.

DELIVERABLE
A working prompt spec that a reader can use without asking what the words mean.

WHY THIS LAB MATTERS
The lab converts research assistant from language into evidence. If the reader cannot fill the fields, the chapter needs a better example before it needs more explanation.

FIELD STANDARD
Each field should contain a real value, not a heading. A blank prompt spec is a design promise; a filled prompt spec is a teaching page.

REFLECTION
Mark what stayed unclear in the prompt spec: task goal, source context, input example, output format. Repair that before reading more.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Decision Checklist

CHECKLIST

- Does the source table include source title?
- Does the source table include URL or file path?
- Does the source table include date checked?
- Does the source table include claim supported?
- Does the source table include confidence?
- Does the source table include action affected?

DECISION RULE

If assistant business is still vague, replace one broad claim with a filled example, screenshot description, worksheet field, recipe step, script, or metric.

NOVELTY GATE

Improve the source table until it contains one unexpected but useful insight about assistant business, one source-backed caution, and one action a generic book would not include.

SOURCE CHECK

- CrewAI: test role-based agent teams. Link: https://github.com/crewAIInc/crewAI
- Pydantic AI: validate model outputs with typed schemas. Link: https://github.com/pydantic/pydantic-ai
- Source guardrail: Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content. Link: https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

HOW TO INTERPRET IT

A missing field means the source table is not yet safe to publish, sell, teach, use, or automate. Fix the weakest field before adding another section.

NEXT REPAIR

Choose the weakest field and rewrite it with a concrete input, an example value, and a pass/fail check.

USE

Run this checklist before calling the source table finished.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Mistake Repair

COMMON MISTAKES

- Letting the model invent facts
- No source boundary
- No eval case
- No human review gate
- Prompt too broad
- Automation before manual proof

REPAIR METHOD

Repair the page by adding a definition of business kit, one worked example, one non-example, one action step, one quality gate, and one source or limitation note.

REPAIR PROMPT

Rewrite the weakest paragraph about business kit as a concrete recipe: input, action, output, check, risk, and next revision for the SOP.

READER TRANSLATION

Plain English: the reader should know what to do, why it works, how to check it, and when to stop or ask for help.

REPAIR LENS

Do not rewrite the whole chapter first. Decide whether the weakness is in the fields, the example, the risk boundary, the evidence, or the next action, then fix that layer.

BEFORE/AFTER

Before: 'AI Research Assistant Business Kit helps with business kit.' After: 'Use this SOP to decide X, produce Y, check Z, and stop when risk A appears.'

GUARDRAIL

AI outputs are drafts until verified. Keep human review for legal, medical, financial, safety, privacy, and customer-impacting decisions.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Transfer, Maintenance, and Next Edition: Mastery Transfer

RETRIEVAL QUESTIONS

- What is research, and what is it not?
- How does transfer, maintenance, and next edition change the work?
- What does the eval checklist contain?
- Which field is weakest: test input, expected output, failure mode?
- What evidence would change the instruction?
- What is the most likely failure mode?

TRANSFER TASK

Apply the same method to another audience, platform, routine, recipe, channel, or product. Keep the structure but change the constraint.

PLAIN-ENGLISH MOVE

Turn research into one visible thing inside the eval checklist: a filled field, a checklist item, a recipe step, a source note, a tool link, or a before/after example.

MASTERY EVIDENCE

The reader can explain research, build the eval checklist, name the risk, test the output, and improve the next version without copying the page.

RUBRIC

A strong answer is specific, bounded, evidence-aware, and usable. A weak answer sounds impressive but does not change action.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Capstone Project: Build the Full Course Artifact

PROJECT BRIEF

Build the complete an AI workflow playbook with prompt specs, source records, SOPs, eval checks, and handoff notes for AI Research Assistant Business Kit. It should contain source notes, examples, procedures, templates, risk boundaries, and a revision plan.

REQUIRED PIECES

- prompt spec
- source table
- SOP
- eval checklist
- source log
- error log

PASS STANDARD

A reader can use the artifact, explain why it works, name its limits, and improve it after one test.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Answer Key and Scoring Rubric

STRONG ANSWER

Defines the concept, gives a real example, names a boundary, uses a source or evidence note, produces an output, and states the next revision.

WEAK ANSWER

Repeats slogans, hides assumptions, skips examples, overpromises, or asks the reader to infer the real procedure.

SCORING

- Specificity
- Practical output
- Source discipline
- Risk clarity
- Reader usefulness
- Revision path

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Reusable Worksheet Bank

WORKSHEET SET

- prompt spec worksheet
- source table worksheet
- SOP worksheet
- eval checklist worksheet
- handoff note worksheet
- error log worksheet

USE

Each worksheet should reduce one ambiguity in AI Research Assistant Business Kit. Leave room for real answers, not decorative boxes.

DESIGN RULE

Show a filled-in example before asking the reader to complete a blank version.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: source table; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

30-Day Implementation Sprint

DAYS 1-7
Build the source log, vocabulary page, reader diagnostic, and first two examples.

DAYS 8-14
Create the first prompt spec, source table, and SOP; test each with one realistic scenario.

DAYS 15-21
Run the practice labs, write error logs, repair unclear instructions, and add safety or policy notes.

DAYS 22-30
Finish capstone, QA gates, source appendix, sales-safe metadata, and next-edition update plan.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: SOP; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Source Appendix and Recheck Log

SOURCE SPINE

- OpenAI API Docs - Prompting - Last checked 2026-06-07.
- OpenAI API Docs - Agents - Last checked 2026-06-07.
- NIST AI Risk Management Framework - Last checked 2026-06-07.
- OWASP Top 10 for LLM Applications 2025 - Last checked 2026-06-07.
- Google Search Central - helpful, reliable, people-first content - Last checked 2026-06-07.

RECHECK RULE

Recheck fast-changing claims before publication: platform fees, AI policies, health and supplement claims, food safety, legal/privacy rules, and payment rules.

READER NOTE

The course uses official sources as guardrails and implementation examples as testable inferences.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: eval checklist; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Anti-Slop Quality Gate

GATE QUESTIONS

- Does every page teach one decision?
- Does every page show or build something?
- Are repeated drills removed?
- Are random extracted terms removed?
- Are risks and sources visible?
- Is the page count exactly 128?

FAIL TRIGGERS

- Vague motivational copy
- Same paragraph repeated across pages
- Unsupported guarantees
- Health or income advice without boundaries
- Decorative worksheets without examples

OWNER

Human publisher or editor should review sensitive claims and sample pages before sale.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: handoff note; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Publishing Package

ASSETS

- Final PDF
- Cover image
- sample pages
- metadata
- sales description
- source and AI process note
- support FAQ

SALES-SAFE PROMISE

Position AI Research Assistant Business Kit as a practical course and workbook, not a guaranteed outcome machine.

BUYER PROOF

Show the table of contents, one lesson page, one worked example, and one worksheet so the buyer can judge substance before purchase.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: error log; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.

Next Edition Maintenance Log

MONTHLY REVIEW

Check sources, outdated tool names, platform policies, buyer questions, and pages with weak examples.

REVISION ACTIONS

- Verify facts
- Replace vague pages
- Add better examples
- Remove unsupported claims
- Improve worksheets
- Refresh metadata

FINAL NOTE

The book stays valuable when it is treated as a maintained course, not a static pile of pages.

PAGE CHECK Specific output: prompt spec; verify one example, one tool/source, one limit, and one next action.