

SAMPLE SIGNAL BRIEF

Why a visible brand is not becoming the recommended choice.

Illustrative category analysis showing the progression from observed AI behaviour to evidence-backed corrective action.

CATEGORY	MARKET	STATUS
Premium skincare	United Kingdom	Illustrative dataset

The brand appears. It is not consistently advanced.

Within this illustrative test perimeter, the brand is visible in category responses but loses ground between consideration and positive recommendation. The commercial task is to remove decision friction, not simply create more mentions.

12.4% SHARE OF AGENT	-19.4 pts GAP TO CATEGORY LEADER	3 PRIORITY CAUSES
--	--	---

Selection progression

VISIBLE	74%	The brand is present in a broad majority of observed responses.
CONSIDERED	46%	It enters the plausible set for fewer than half of the defined questions.
SHORTLISTED	29%	Specific suitability and evidence conditions begin to favour competitors.
RECOMMENDED	18%	The brand is positively advanced in fewer than one in five cases.

Decision: correct high-priority claim and attribute conflicts before investing in broader AI visibility activity. The evidence suggests a selection problem caused by incomplete and inconsistent decision facts, not a simple awareness deficit.

What is weakening recommendation confidence?

The Audit separates the observed result from the information conditions likely to be contributing to it. Each condition is traceable to a source, field or claim and can be corrected without pretending to expose hidden model logic.

PRIORITY	CONDITION	OBSERVED EVIDENCE	LIKELY DECISION EFFECT
P1	Suitability evidence is fragmented	Protection and skin-suitability claims differ across the brand page, one priority retailer and the merchant feed.	AI systems have less consistent evidence for confidently matching the product to a specific need.
P1	Comparison language is generic	Competitors expose product use cases and qualification criteria more explicitly in product and comparison content.	The brand can be included but is less easily differentiated at the point of recommendation.
P2	Structured decision fields are incomplete	Formulation, suitability and evidence context are absent from priority machine-readable attributes.	Important decision facts depend on weaker inference or inconsistent third-party sources.

Illustrative claim trace

SOURCE	OBSERVED PRODUCT INFORMATION	STATUS
Brand PDP	Broad-spectrum SPF 50; fragrance free	CLEAR
Retailer A	SPF 30; suitable for all skin types	CONFLICT
Marketplace	Sun protection; formulation unspecified	INCOMPLETE
Merchant feed	Key protection and suitability fields missing	MISSING

Interpretation is deliberately bounded: this trace identifies a correctable information condition that may contribute to lower recommendation confidence. It does not claim a direct view of proprietary model weighting.

A backlog the organisation can implement and verify.

Actions are ordered by decision relevance, dependency and effort. Each has a named owner and acceptance test so the Audit remains useful whether implementation is handled internally, by an existing partner or with bounded Azra support.

WHEN	PRIORITY INTERVENTION	OWNER	ACCEPTANCE TEST
Days 1-30	Reconcile protection and suitability claims across priority product pages, retailers and feeds.	Product data + ecommerce	Zero material claim conflicts across audited sources.
Days 15-45	Add evidence-qualified use-case language to priority product and comparison content.	Brand + legal	Approved claims present in human and structured content.
Days 30-60	Extend merchant attributes for formulation, skin type and evidence context.	Product data	Required fields complete across the scoped catalogue.
Days 75-90	Repeat the fixed question set and compare selection progression to baseline.	Azra / insight	Comparable systems, market, prompts and test window.

Evidence controls for the re-test

FIXED PERIMETER Market, products, questions, competitors, systems and dates are agreed before the baseline and reused where comparison requires it.	OBSERVED VS INFERRED Direct response observations are separated from hypotheses about contributing information conditions.
SOURCE TRACEABILITY Material findings retain the source, capture date, field or claim and conflict status.	VERIFICATION, NOT GUARANTEE Changes are re-tested against the baseline. Recommendations, rankings and revenue outcomes are never guaranteed.

Typical Audit scope: a defined priority market, 50-100 buying questions, 4-6 major AI systems, 5-8 comparator brands, priority product evidence and a comparable re-test window. Final scope is set by category complexity and the decisions the client needs to make.