

Claude Flow Summary – PDF Submission Ready

[Prompt Flow Summary \[Link\]](#)

[LaTeX Format Settings \[Link\]](#)

1. Initial Situation & Problem Recognition

User provided LaTeX file of VPT paper.

Three reviewer comments: SMD missing (Rigor), LLM details insufficient (Clarity), Quantitative impact unclear (Impact).

Experimental data and Love plot image provided.

2. First Revision (Reviewer Feedback Response)

Abstract updated: quantitative metrics added (AUC: 0.562→0.585, SMD: 0.101→0.018).

Table 2 updated: SMD After IPTW, Balance Assessment Summary included.

LLM details: ICD-10 concordance κ , 91.2% accuracy, error analysis.

Prompt example added: detailed LLM prompt structure.

3. Length Adjustment Request

User: 'Too short, can increase 10%'.

Added Clinical context, methodological rigor, causal inference explanation.

New sections: study design justification, detailed validation, clinical decision-making implications.

4. Further Expansion Request

User: 'Can increase another 10%'.

Expanded Introduction: AKI incidence, VPT usage quantified.

Exposure/outcome definitions with scientific rationale.

4-tier validation framework explained.

Clinical decision-making & cost-effectiveness analysis.

Future research directions detailed.

5. Paper Comparison Evaluation

New PDF paper (Agents4Science competition) provided.

Comparison: methodology-focused vs clinical application-focused.

Scores: PDF paper 82–85, LaTeX 75–78.

6. Competition-specific Evaluation

Agents4Science perspective: 88–92 score.

Competitiveness: AI agent usage, scientific contribution, reproducibility.

Improvement suggestions: demo/visualization, multi-domain validation.

Key Development Pattern

Problem diagnosis → specific solution → quantitative verification → expansion & deepening → tailored evaluation.

Reviewer feedback systematically reflected stepwise.

Balance of length & depth maintained.

Final evaluation adjusted for competition perspective.