

# CASE STUDY: Building A Prompt Library For Improved Content Quality

---

## Executive Summary

**The Problem:** Inconsistent writing styles, failure to follow client style guides, and avoidable technical errors led to heavy overhead during the peer review and quality checks prior to publication.

**The Solution:** I led a team to develop a library of prompts targeted at the most frequent errors in our content, enabling us to leverage AI to reduce the time spent reviewing and revising content at two checkpoints in our workflow.

**The Outcome:** With the team using the prompt library to self-review content prior to sending for peer-review, we reduced the review and revision time from as much as four hours per article to well under one hour while also improving consistency in voice and style guide adherence across 30+ help centers.

## The Challenge: Consistency Gaps

With a distributed team of seven writers from different professional disciplines maintaining a massive documentation library, quality control became a major bottleneck. Our workflow called for a peer-review after the initial draft and a second peer-review prior to publication.

**Style Guide Deviations:** Our content reviews most commonly uncovered style guide deviations

**Grammar And Syntax Errors:** Reviewers also frequently flagged simple grammar and syntax mistakes.

**Review Fatigue:** We allotted four hours for each peer-review. The workflow required them to check every article manually against a dense checklist.

## The Solution: Dedicated Prompt Library

I led a team to identify how we could leverage Google Gemini to address these problems. We chose Gemini as our tool since the client had approved that specific tool.

When conducting manual reviews, each reviewer filled out a checklist noting where the writer introduced grammar or syntax errors.

In deciding what problems to address first, we analyzed the database of past reviews to identify patterns. From that analysis, we selected the most common error types. We developed AI prompts to specifically look for those mistakes, and return a structured output including the error and the reason the AI flagged it, and a suggested correction. This not only helped the writer know how to fix the identified issues, it also served as a training aid. It was then up to the writer to assess the review and make any changes to the draft.

### Building The Prompt Library

Each member of the team took on a specific category of common errors, such as passive voice or reading level, and developed prompts to surface those errors and return actionable results. We tested and iterated on each other's prompts until the team reached a consensus on each prompt's performance. Once the team approved a prompt, I added it to the library accessible to the whole team.

### Incorporating Prompts Into The Workflow

We updated our SOP documents to include AI-supported review at two checkpoints. The first occurred after the writer completed the draft but before handing it off for human peer-review. The writer would use the Gemini sidebar to give the AI context, and run the draft against a series of prompts from the library. Based on the responses, the writer would make revisions until satisfied the draft was ready for peer-review.

We integrated a final AI-supported check immediately before publication. This step caught any errors introduced during the SME and writer revision cycles. After the writer validated the draft against our quality prompts, a human reviewer provided the final sign-off for staging.

### Cleaner Hand-offs

After implementing these changes, we significantly reduced the errors reaching human reviewers, and they spent less time checking drafts for mechanical issues.

## The Results: By The Numbers

Metric	Manual Review (Before)	Prompt-Assisted (After)	Improvement
Peer Review Effort	4 Hours (Half Day)	Under 1 Hour	<b>75% Reduction</b>
Revision Time	4 Hours (Half Day)	Under 1 Hour	<b>75% Reduction</b>
QA Review	2 Hours	Under 1 Hour	<b>50% Reduction</b>

## Key Takeaways

**Prompts As Governance:** Good prompt design gave us a digital editor, enforcing quality standards while requiring less human intervention.

**Reducing Friction:** By automating routine compliance work, the team could focus their energy on the usability and technical accuracy of content.

**Model-Agnostic Design:** Because the logic lives in the prompt library rather than a specific software feature, the process remains valuable even as underlying AI models evolve.