

Review of: "A Brief Summary of Prompting in Using GPT Models"

Chen Ningyang¹

¹ Suzhou University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This article presents an informative review of the emerging line of research on prompting in using GPT models and its extensive applications. The review also incorporates the authors' comments and interpretations of the current trends. The authors are knowledgeable about the topic and are passionate about sharing their findings and insights. The reviewer appreciates the authors' timely efforts to make a summary of the recent literature on the topic of intense discussion and suggests the following areas for further improvement.

The article is lengthy for a "brief" summary. It would be better if the authors could focus on the major themes and converging evidence in the reviewed studies and present a more concise picture for the growing body of literature.

The narration of the article is organized under the headings of "the rise of ChatGPT and the issue of prompts", "variety of prompts: as if in a conversation", "improvement of prompt tactics: manners of prompting", "uncover the box: mind-to-mind talking", "conclusion: the floor is soon GPT's". This design is clever and communicative, yet it gives little information as to how the review was conducted, e.g., the data source, the collection procedure, and the credibility of the reviewed studies. It could be appreciated if the authors could offer some information to explain the design of the literature survey and to what extent the reviewed studies can be taken as representative of the research undertakings in the field. Also, the author could add some transparent sub-section headings within the sections to guide readers through the various lines of enquiry and summarize their contributions to the field.

The article is written in clear, accessible, somewhat informal language, though the subjective tone (e.g., "such a remarkable intelligence") in some places may hinder an objective reading of the situation as is expected in a scholarly review.