



Why one prompt gives you a **generic** week

You ask a chatbot for a weightlifting program and get a tidy 5×5 with “listen to your body” at the end. The tool is not the problem. One question into one chat is not a method, and a real athlete moving through a real cycle needs a method. A single prompt breaks in five places:

1. **No athlete context.** It does not know the maxes, the weak point or the history, so it writes for an average lifter who does not exist.
2. **No phase awareness.** Heavy triples land in a volume phase. Every week looks like the same week.
3. **No memory of progression.** Ask for week 5 and week 4 is gone. Loads reset and exercises churn.
4. **Wrong for the sport.** Fixed kilos for a max that will change. An overhead squat written to train pressing.
5. **Nobody audits it.** It looks plausible, and that is the trap.

Apply it.

1. Pick an athlete you know well. Ask your outside tool, in one prompt, for a four-week block.

2. Read the draft with the five failures next to it. Tick each one you find.
3. Keep the ticks. Each of Parts 2 to 7 closes one of the five.

Example athlete, illustrative, not a client. A weightlifter with a snatch of 80 kg, a clean and jerk of 100 kg and a back squat of 125 kg, meet in 16 weeks. The one-prompt draft gives week 1 and week 4 the same back squat, 5×5 at 100 kg. Failures 2, 3 and 4 are ticked: no phase, no progression, a fixed kilo load. The athlete's squat will have moved by week 4.

In the workbook: Exercise 7, "Check the AI", is the checklist you run on every draft from here on.

NEXT IN THIS PACK

Part 2. Five specialists, five separate chats