



Mindgle AI Prompt Library – Unit 3

AI Prompt Orchestration (Knowledge Validation & Stress Testing)

For Mindgle, validation prompts should never be random. They should follow the Mindgle Cognitive Architecture of Epistemic Validation, where each prompt deliberately tests, challenges, and strengthens the learner's Initial Knowledge Claim. Rather than seeking confirmation, learners use AI to identify weaknesses, uncover hidden assumptions, examine competing evidence, evaluate reasoning, and refine their explanations. Each prompt is designed to move the learner from an Initial Knowledge Claim → validated understanding → justified confidence → Robust Knowledge Claim, while developing epistemic resilience—the ability of a knowledge claim to remain strong after systematic questioning, critical evaluation, and thoughtful refinement.

Epistemic resilience lies at the heart of robust knowledge. *It is not the ability to defend an explanation at all costs, but the willingness to question it, revise it, and strengthen it whenever better evidence, stronger reasoning, or broader perspectives emerge. A resilient learner does not fear criticism because every challenge becomes an opportunity to improve understanding. In Mindgle, the goal is not to protect one's first explanation, but to construct knowledge that can withstand intellectual challenge while remaining open to future refinement. The Mindgle AI Prompt Library for Unit 3 therefore transforms AI from an information provider into a validation partner, helping learners develop explanations that are evidence-informed, logically coherent, ethically responsible, and intellectually resilient before they become Robust Knowledge Claims (RKC).*

3.1 The Journey from an Initial Knowledge Claim to a Robust Knowledge Claim

Goal

Understand how an Initial Knowledge Claim becomes a Robust Knowledge Claim.

Prompts

- What is my current Initial Knowledge Claim?



- Why should this knowledge claim be validated before I accept it?
- What are the strengths of my current explanation?
- What possible weaknesses might still exist?
- What assumptions could be influencing my conclusion?
- What evidence would strengthen or weaken my claim?
- What would make this explanation truly robust?

3.2 Activating AI for Critical Evaluation

Goal

Use AI as a critical thinking partner rather than an investigation partner.

Prompts

- Challenge my current knowledge claim.
- What important weaknesses do you notice?
- What questions should I ask to test my explanation?
- What evidence might I be overlooking?
- What assumptions might I not have recognised?
- How can AI help me improve my thinking rather than simply confirm it?
- What validation prompts should I ask next?

3.3 Evaluating Evidence Reliability

Goal

Determine whether the evidence supporting the knowledge claim is sufficiently reliable.

Prompts

- Is my evidence reliable?
- Would similar investigations produce similar conclusions?
- How consistent is the available evidence?



- Do multiple independent studies support this explanation?
- Is my evidence sufficient to justify my claim?
- Which pieces of evidence are strongest?
- Which evidence appears weakest?

3.4 Examining Source Credibility

Goal

Evaluate whether the sources supporting the knowledge claim deserve trust.

Prompts

- Which of my sources are most credible?
- Which sources should I trust the most?
- Are any of my sources outdated?
- Which sources have potential conflicts of interest?
- Are these findings peer-reviewed?
- Which sources provide the strongest authority?
- What additional credible sources should I consult?

3.5 Detecting Bias

Goal

Identify biases that may influence the investigation or explanation.

Prompts

- What personal biases might influence my thinking?
- Am I showing confirmation bias?
- What cultural assumptions may affect my interpretation?
- Could AI itself introduce bias?
- What perspectives am I unintentionally ignoring?



- Which assumptions require further examination?
- How can I reduce bias in my explanation?

3.6 Challenging Through Alternative Perspectives

Goal

Strengthen the explanation by considering competing viewpoints.

Prompts

- How would another expert explain this?
- What alternative perspectives exist?
- Which stakeholders might disagree with me?
- How would another culture interpret this issue?
- What competing explanations deserve consideration?
- Which perspective have I overlooked?
- Does another discipline explain this differently?

3.7 Evaluating Confidence, Certainty and Limitations

Goal

Judge how much confidence the evidence actually deserves.

Prompts

- How confident should I be in this explanation?
- Am I confusing confidence with certainty?
- What limitations exist in my knowledge claim?
- Under what conditions might this explanation fail?
- How generalisable are these findings?
- What questions remain unanswered?
- What uncertainty should I acknowledge?



3.8 Applying Falsification

Goal

Deliberately attempt to challenge the knowledge claim.

Prompts

- What evidence could disprove my explanation?
- What observations would falsify this claim?
- Which findings contradict my conclusion?
- What exceptions exist?
- How would Karl Popper test this explanation?
- If my explanation were wrong, what would I expect to observe?
- Does my claim survive serious attempts to refute it?

3.9 Examining Ethical Implications

Goal

Evaluate the ethical responsibility of the knowledge claim.

Prompts

- Who benefits from this explanation?
- Who could be harmed?
- What ethical concerns should I consider?
- Are any important voices missing?
- Is my explanation fair to all stakeholders?
- What responsibilities arise if this knowledge is applied?
- Could this knowledge produce unintended consequences?



3.10 Evaluating Logical Coherence

Goal

Ensure that reasoning logically supports the conclusion.

Prompts

- Does my conclusion logically follow from my evidence?
- Have I made unsupported assumptions?
- Are there logical fallacies in my reasoning?
- Are my ideas internally consistent?
- Which part of my argument appears weakest?
- How can I improve the logic of my explanation?
- Does every piece of evidence support my conclusion?

3.11 Revising and Refining the Knowledge Claim

Goal

Strengthen the knowledge claim through improvement and reflection.

Prompts

- How should I revise my explanation?
- Which evidence should I include?
- Which parts require refinement?
- What improvements strengthen my claim?
- Have my conclusions changed?
- How has my thinking evolved?
- Is my explanation now stronger than before?

3.12 Constructing the Robust Knowledge Claim (RKC)

Goal

Copyright © 2026, All Right Reserved Mindgle, an educational product of ThinkBeanz



Develop a critically validated and well-justified explanation.

Prompts

- Based on everything I have evaluated, what is my strongest explanation?
- How should I write my Robust Knowledge Claim?
- What evidence best justifies this claim?
- What limitations should I acknowledge?
- Why is this claim more robust than my Initial Knowledge Claim?
- What confidence should I place in this explanation?
- What future evidence might further strengthen or modify this claim?