

# Run a Reaction X-Ray Before You Hit Send

Pressure-test a message against real audience context before the reader sees it. By the end, you will have compared two forecasts, revised one real document, and built a repeatable pre-send routine.

---

## WHAT'S INSIDE

- 01 — Run your first reaction X-ray
  - 02 — Know what success looks like
  - 03 — Nothing happened? Check these first
  - 04 — Change the context, not the message
  - 05 — Read the forecast intelligently
  - 06 — X-ray one real document
  - 07 — Revise without manipulating
  - 08 — Keep judgment and authority human
  - 09 — Save the repeatable routine
  - 10 — Cross the finish line
-

## 01 Run your first reaction X-ray

You are about to give one unchanged memo two different audience contexts. The goal is not to prove that AI can read minds. It cannot. The goal is to see how context changes the range of plausible interpretations, feelings, and reactions.

Before pasting workplace material, confirm your organization's AI policy and the privacy and data-use settings for the exact account or workspace you are using. Personal and managed business accounts may handle retention, model improvement, and administrator access differently. Replace names and remove confidential, personal, privileged, financial, or otherwise sensitive details, but remember that removing names does not guarantee anonymity. If you are not authorized to share the material, do not paste it; use a fictionalized or abstracted version instead.

1

OPEN

### Start a new AI chat

Open the general-purpose AI chat tool you already use and start a new conversation. This removes prior messages from the immediate thread, but it may not disable saved memory, custom instructions, or workspace settings. If your tool offers a temporary or private chat option, consider using it when appropriate.

2

COPY

### Paste the complete test prompt

Copy everything in the prompt block below and paste it into the message box.

3

SEND

### Run the analysis

Send the prompt. You should receive an analysis organized into eight labeled parts.

#### PROMPT

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

Act as a skeptical but fair communication preflight analyst. Your job is not merely to improve the writing. Evaluate how the intended audience is likely to interpret, feel about, and react to the document.

#### AUDIENCE CONTEXT:

The team requested fewer status meetings, already has access to the new project tracker, and knows this is a two-week pilot.

#### DOCUMENT:

Starting next Monday, all project updates must be entered in the new tracker. Email updates will no longer be accepted. This will improve accountability, and managers will review compliance weekly. Direct questions to your supervisor.

#### DESIRED OUTCOME:

The team understands that updates are moving to the tracker, knows why, and follows the process without interpreting it as a hidden performance threat.

Analyze the document in these parts:

1. Literal message: Summarize what it directly says.
2. Likely interpretation: Explain what the audience may believe it really means.
3. Emotional forecast: Identify likely primary and secondary emotions, the wording that may trigger them, and your confidence in each forecast.
4. Reaction forecast: Describe likely immediate, private, and delayed reactions or behaviors.
5. Audience differences: Show how supportive, neutral, skeptical, and highly affected readers may respond differently.
6. Friction scan: Quote language that may feel vague, dismissive, controlling, defensive, manipulative, or unexpectedly threatening.
7. Outcome gap: Compare the desired outcome with the result this version is most likely to produce.
8. Recommendations: Rank the changes by likely impact, explain why each matters, and provide a revised version that preserves the truth without inventing facts or promises.

Separate evidence from inference. Do not claim certainty or pretend to read minds. Identify missing context that could materially change the forecast. Offer at least one reasonable alternative interpretation. Flag any recommendation that requires a policy, factual, legal, financial, or relationship decision from a human.

## 02 Know what success looks like

The exact wording will vary. Do not judge the result by whether it sounds polished. Judge it by whether it exposes useful differences between what the memo says and what readers may experience.

#### CHECKLIST

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

- The response separates the literal message from inferred meaning.
- It describes possible emotions without presenting them as facts.
- It quotes specific trigger language, including terms such as compliance.
- It distinguishes public, private, immediate, and delayed reactions.
- It compares the desired outcome with the likely result.
- It identifies missing context and offers an alternative interpretation.
- Its proposed revision preserves the truth instead of inventing reassurance.

With this first context, a reasonable forecast may include cautious relief because the tracker could replace repetitive meetings. Readers may feel slightly inconvenienced but optimistic and ask practical questions. The word compliance may still sound unnecessarily severe for a two-week pilot.

A confident response is still a forecast, not evidence. Useful language includes may, likely, plausible, and confidence. Claims about what readers definitely think or feel should make you skeptical.

### 03 Nothing happened? Check these first

- Confirm that you sent the prompt rather than leaving it in the message box.
- Look directly below your prompt in the same conversation for the response.
- Confirm that the audience context, document, and desired outcome were all included.
- If the response stops early, ask the tool to continue from the unfinished numbered section.
- If the response is generic, start a new chat and paste the complete prompt again rather than sending only the memo.
- If the material is too sensitive or you are not authorized to share it, do not paste it into the tool. Use a fictionalized example or describe the communication problem at a higher level instead.

### 04 Change the context, not the message

Now run the same memo again. This time, change only the audience context. Keeping the document and desired outcome unchanged lets you see what the context contributes.

1

OPEN

#### Start another new chat

A fresh conversation reduces the influence of the first response on the second. Saved memory, custom instructions, or workspace settings may still carry across chats, so use the same settings for both tests.

2

COPY

#### Reuse the first prompt

Copy the complete prompt from Section 01 into the new message box.

3

**REPLACE**

\$ Copyback Code: JJGn-chuckermitschel.com

**Change only the audience context**

Delete the original audience-context paragraph and replace it with the text below. Leave the document, desired outcome, and analysis instructions unchanged.

4

**SEND****Run the second forecast**

Send the prompt and place the two responses side by side.

**CONTEXT NOTE B**

The team has not seen the tracker, does not know why it is being introduced, and is worried that management may use it to evaluate individual performance.

The second response may interpret improve accountability and review compliance weekly as signals of surveillance or an undisclosed performance policy. Plausible feelings include anxiety or distrust. A public response could be silence while private reactions include speculation, resistance, or minimal compliance.

| LAYER                 | CONTEXT A                                      | CONTEXT B                                                                   |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Likely interpretation | The tracker may replace unwanted meetings.     | The tracker may be a hidden monitoring or performance system.               |
| Likely feeling        | Cautious relief with some inconvenience.       | Anxiety, distrust, or defensiveness.                                        |
| Likely reaction       | Practical questions and tentative cooperation. | Public silence with private speculation, resistance, or minimal compliance. |

Same words, different emotional weather. The AI has not discovered anyone's secret emotions. It has shown how missing context changes the plausible reaction range.

## 05 Read the forecast intelligently

Read thinking, feeling, and likely behavior as three separate layers. A reader can understand a policy, dislike it, and still comply. Another reader can like the goal but resist because the process feels controlling.

- Interpretation asks what readers may believe the message really means.
- Feeling asks what emotional response the wording and situation may trigger.
- Reaction asks what readers may say, do, delay, avoid, or discuss privately.

Do not accept the first polished table as truth. Pressure-test the analysis before using it.

#### CHALLENGE PROMPT

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

Challenge your forecast. List the assumptions you made, the context that would reverse your conclusion, and the prediction with the weakest support. Separate evidence from inference. Then give one reasonable alternative interpretation that is less negative and one that is more negative, without claiming that either is certain.

A useful forecast should become more qualified and precise after this challenge. If it simply repeats itself with greater confidence, treat that as a warning rather than validation.

## 06 X-ray one real document

Now move from the supplied example to one message you have not sent. Choose a low- or medium-stakes email, memo, announcement, proposal, or set of instructions where the reader's response matters.

### Build a three-part input packet

Your input packet consists of the audience context, the document, and the desired outcome. Better input usually matters more than searching for a clever adjective.

1

#### CHOOSE

##### Select one unsent document

Use a real message that is complete enough to send but has not yet been delivered.

2

#### SANITIZE

##### Remove unnecessary sensitive details

Replace names, account information, private history, and confidential facts unless they are essential, authorized, and appropriate to share. If sanitizing the document would not sufficiently protect the people or information involved, use a fictionalized version.

3

#### WRITE

##### Create a short context note

State who the readers are, what they already know, and what concern, history, timing, or power dynamic may affect their interpretation. Three honest sentences are often enough.

4

#### STATE

##### Define the desired outcome

Say what readers should understand, feel, or do after reading. Do not ask AI to manufacture a feeling that the facts cannot support.

5

#### PASTE

##### Run the reusable prompt

Start a new chat, paste the completed prompt below, and send it.

### CONTEXT NOTE TEMPLATE

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

The readers are [role or group], and they currently know [relevant facts]. Their current concern, expectation, or history is [brief factual context]. The timing or power dynamic that may affect the message is [relevant condition].

### REUSABLE X-RAY PROMPT

Act as a skeptical but fair communication preflight analyst. Your job is not merely to improve the writing. Evaluate how the intended audience is likely to interpret, feel about, and react to the document.

AUDIENCE CONTEXT:

[paste the short context note]

DOCUMENT:

[paste the document]

DESIRED OUTCOME:

[state what the reader should understand, feel, or do]

Analyze the document in these parts:

1. Literal message: Summarize what it directly says.
2. Likely interpretation: Explain what the audience may believe it really means.
3. Emotional forecast: Identify likely primary and secondary emotions, the wording that may trigger them, and your confidence in each forecast.
4. Reaction forecast: Describe likely immediate, private, and delayed reactions or behaviors.
5. Audience differences: Show how supportive, neutral, skeptical, and highly affected readers may respond differently.
6. Friction scan: Quote language that may feel vague, dismissive, controlling, defensive, manipulative, or unexpectedly threatening.
7. Outcome gap: Compare the desired outcome with the result this version is most likely to produce.
8. Recommendations: Rank the changes by likely impact, explain why each matters, and provide a revised version that preserves the truth without inventing facts or promises.

Separate evidence from inference. Do not claim certainty or pretend to read minds. Identify missing context that could materially change the forecast. Offer at least one reasonable alternative interpretation. Flag any recommendation that requires a policy, factual, legal, financial, or relationship decision from a human.

Do not rewrite immediately. First, find the largest gap between what you intend and what the reader may experience. That gap is your highest-value review point.

## 07 Revise without manipulating

Use the forecast to clarify the truth, not to hide it. The strongest revisions usually make purpose, duration, benefit, support, feedback paths, and decision boundaries explicit when those facts are known. If a crucial reassurance has

not been verified, flag it for a human decision rather than filling the gap with plausible-sounding language.

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

#### WORKED REVISION

Starting next Monday, we will run a two-week pilot using the new tracker for all project updates. During the pilot, enter updates in the tracker rather than sending them by email. Managers will check weekly whether updates are being entered. Direct questions to your supervisor.

BEFORE SENDING, ADD VERIFIED DETAILS: [If true, explain how this pilot relates to the team's request for fewer status meetings.] [Explain whether and how tracker information will be used in performance decisions.] [Explain what walkthrough or support is available.] [Explain how feedback will be collected and what decision will follow the pilot.]

This version clarifies the known duration and process without inventing reassurance. It also exposes the decisions the source material does not answer. The desired outcome cannot be reached reliably until the responsible human clarifies how the tracker relates to performance, support, feedback, and the decision after the pilot.

A missing fact is not always a writing problem. Sometimes the reaction X-ray reveals a policy or leadership decision that must be made before the message can be finished honestly.

#### REVISION CHECKLIST

- Address the highest-impact outcome gap first.
- Replace vague purpose with the actual purpose when known.
- Explain what will happen next and where questions can go.
- Remove unnecessarily controlling, defensive, or threatening language.
- Keep facts, constraints, and uncomfortable decisions visible.
- Reject invented benefits, guarantees, permissions, timelines, or promises.
- Pause when a recommendation requires a policy or relationship decision.

If a tracker really will influence performance reviews, do not use AI to hide that fact. The answer is honest clarification, not smoother manipulation.

## 08 Keep judgment and authority human

AI can help surface possible communication risks, but it does not know every private history, cultural norm, relationship fracture, or unstated constraint. It may overgeneralize, reproduce stereotypes, invent supporting logic, or make a hypothetical reaction sound more likely than the evidence supports.

- Verify every factual claim and commitment in the revision.
- Check whether the AI treated an inference as evidence.
- Ask what missing context could materially change the result.
- Do not use a reaction forecast to diagnose, score, rank, or profile individual people.
- Keep policy, legal, financial, personnel, and relationship decisions with the responsible human.

- For high-stakes communication, use the X-ray to prepare for a real human review rather than replace one.

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

Your AI tool may have analytical presence in the process, but it does not have authority. You still own the truth, tone, promises, and relationship consequences.

## 09 Save the repeatable routine

Save the reusable prompt where you keep frequently used notes or templates. Then use this sequence whenever a message carries meaningful risk.

### PRE-SEND ROUTINE

1. Choose the unsent document.
2. Confirm that you are permitted to share it with the tool.
3. Remove unnecessary sensitive information.
4. Add a short, honest audience-context note.
5. State what readers should understand, feel, or do.
6. Run the complete reaction X-ray.
7. Challenge its assumptions and weakest prediction.
8. Find the largest gap between intention and likely experience.
9. Revise while preserving every material truth.
10. Verify facts, commitments, and human decisions.
11. Use human review when the stakes justify it.

### Practice useful variations

- Run the same message for supportive, neutral, skeptical, and highly affected readers.
- Change one piece of context at a time to see what changes the forecast.
- Compare a version sent before readers receive background information with one sent after.
- Ask which sentence creates the most avoidable friction and which clarification would have the greatest impact.
- Compare the original and revised versions using the same audience context and desired outcome.
- When permitted, run the same sanitized packet through a second AI model and compare where the forecasts disagree. Agreement between models is still not proof.

### Calibrate instead of believing

When appropriate, compare the forecast with what actually happened. Record only patterns you are permitted to keep—not private reactions or personnel judgments. Note where the tool overpredicted threat, missed practical confusion, or relied on context it did not have. Use that learning to improve future context notes, but do not treat a few outcomes as proof that the tool can predict people.

## 10 Cross the finish line

You have completed the guide when you have run the supplied memo with both context notes, identified how the forecasts changed, challenged at least one forecast, and revised one real unsent document.

#### FINISH-LINE CHECK

© 2026 Comeback Code, LLC · chuckgoetschel.com

- I can distinguish literal meaning, likely interpretation, possible feeling, and likely reaction.
- I know that a forecast is not evidence or mind reading.
- I can give AI a useful audience-context note.
- I can identify the largest gap between intention and reader experience.
- I can recognize when a missing fact requires a human decision before the wording can be finished.
- I can revise for clarity without hiding facts or inventing promises.
- I have saved a repeatable pre-send prompt.

You are no longer using AI only to make words sound better. You can now use it as a communication critic before the message becomes someone else's problem.

---

# Want the reasoning behind the reaction X-ray?

Read the companion article for the full communication model, limitations, and worked example: <https://chuckgoetschel.com/ai-insights/ai-can-predict-how-theyll-feel>

INSTAGRAM · FACEBOOK · TIKTOK · YOUTUBE · [CHUCKGOETSCHEL.COM](https://chuckgoetschel.com)

---

*Pressure-test the reaction, preserve the truth, then hit Send.*