

MISHA MANKO.

FILE № 047 · INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

AI VISIBILITY *AUDIT.*

A ground-truth analysis of how ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Google AI Overviews actually see your website. Delivered as an 18-page technical document based on real server logs, real citations, and real competitive benchmarks.

PREPARED FOR

[Client Name]

PREPARED BY

Misha Manko.

DELIVERED

[Month DD, 2026]

01.

§ SECTION 01

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

[Client]'s website currently ranks **[X] out of 10** on the AI Visibility Score — developed across my ongoing research network of 47 live sites. The site has **[strength #1]** and **[strength #2]** working in its favor, but is losing AI citations to competitors because of **[primary weakness]**. Across **[N]** tracked queries in ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Google AI, the brand appeared in **[X]%** of responses, compared to the top competitor at **[X]%**.

AI VISIBILITY SCORE

4 / 10

Scored across 10 dimensions covering technical AI-readiness, live bot behavior, and citation presence in the four major AI surfaces. Top competitor in category: **[X] / 10**.

SCORE BREAKDOWN BY DIMENSION

| DIMENSION | SCORE | NOTES |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Schema markup coverage | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| RSS feed quality | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| HTML structure & semantic clarity | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| Bot accessibility | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| Content freshness signals | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| Internal linking & topic clustering | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| ChatGPT citation presence | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |

| DIMENSION | SCORE | NOTES |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| Claude citation presence | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| Perplexity citation presence | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |
| Google AI Overview presence | [X/10] | <i>[one-line summary]</i> |

THE THREE FIXES THAT MATTER MOST

- 1** *[Fix headline — e.g. Rebuild enriched RSS feed with full content & schema]*
 IMPACT: HIGH · 30-DAY FIX
- 2** *[Fix headline — e.g. Deploy LegalService JSON-LD sitewide]*
 IMPACT: HIGH · 14-DAY FIX
- 3** *[Fix headline — e.g. Fix missing x-default hreflang on bilingual CPTs]*
 IMPACT: MEDIUM · 7-DAY FIX

02.

BUSINESS CONTEXT

Before the technical findings, here is what I understand about *[Client]*'s business, target queries, and competitive landscape. This context informs every recommendation in the report. If anything below is wrong or incomplete, flag it and I will revise the analysis at no charge.

BUSINESS SNAPSHOT

- What *[Client]* does: *[one or two sentences]*
- Primary service areas: *[geography and segment]*
- Target customer: *[who is searching in AI for this]*
- Primary conversion goal: *[phone call, form fill, booking, purchase]*

TARGET QUERY CATEGORIES

- Informational: *[e.g. "what to do after X", "how much does Y cost"]*
- Commercial research: *[e.g. "best X in [city]", "X near me", "X reviews"]*
- Transactional / brand: *[e.g. "[Client] reviews", "[Client] pricing"]*

PRIMARY COMPETITORS

| COMPETITOR | DOMAIN | WHY IN SCOPE |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>[Name]</i> | <i>[domain]</i> | <i>[reason]</i> |
| <i>[Name]</i> | <i>[domain]</i> | <i>[reason]</i> |
| <i>[Name]</i> | <i>[domain]</i> | <i>[reason]</i> |

03.

§ SECTION 03

METHODOLOGY

How I produced this report, so you can evaluate the rigor and replicate parts of it in-house if you want.

TECHNICAL AUDIT

I reviewed every page type on *[client-domain.com]* for schema markup, HTML structure, heading hierarchy, internal linking, and AI-readable content signals. Tools: Schema.org validators, Google's Rich Results Test, and manual inspection of rendered HTML. I cross-referenced plugin and theme configuration where relevant (RankMath, Yoast, or equivalent).

BOT LOG ANALYSIS

I pulled *[N days]* of server logs from *[source — CDN / WPEngine / Cloudflare / hosting panel]* and analyzed bot user-agents. Search spiders (Googlebot, Bingbot, Ahrefs, Semrush) separated from AI fetchers (ChatGPT / OAI-SearchBot / GPTBot, Claude / ClaudeBot / Claude-User, PerplexityBot, Google-Extended). I measured request volume, URL patterns, crawl depth, and return-visit frequency.

AI CITATION TESTING

I ran *[N]* target queries through ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Google AI Overviews manually, capturing whether *[Client]* appeared, how the brand was described, whether competitors were cited instead, and which source URLs were linked. Tests were conducted *[date range]* from a clean, non-personalized browser session in the client's target geography.

COMPETITOR BENCHMARKING

The same technical audit run on the top three competitors. Scored on the same 10-point scale. This tells us what's achievable in the category — not just what's good in isolation.

§ WHAT THIS AUDIT IS NOT

Not a keyword SEO audit. Not a paid search analysis. Not a conversion rate review. It is specifically focused on how AI surfaces discover, consume, and cite your site. Other scopes are separate engagements.

04.

§ SECTION 04

TECHNICAL AI-READINESS

Seven subsections covering what your site tells AI bots when they arrive. Each scored on the 10-point scale in Section 1.

4.1 • SCHEMA MARKUP COVERAGE

CURRENT STATE

- *[Schema.org type] on [page types] — [validation status]*
- *[Schema.org type] — [coverage and status]*
- *[Schema.org type] — [coverage and status]*

GAPS

- *[Missing type and why it matters for this business]*
- *[Missing type and why it matters]*

PLATFORM-SPECIFIC NOTES

The site runs on *[CMS and plugin stack]*. Fastest path to closing the gaps: *[specific recommendation — RankMath Advanced Schema Editor / custom JSON-LD / theme-level injection]*.

4.2 • HTML STRUCTURE AND SEMANTIC CLARITY

- **Heading hierarchy:** *[H1/H2/H3 usage — consistent, chaotic, missing H1s]*
- **Semantic HTML:** *[article, section, nav, main — present, missing, misused]*
- **Paragraph length:** *[short enough for AI extraction, or wall-of-text]*
- **Answer formatting:** *[first 1-2 sentences answer the question, or bury it]*

4.3 • RSS FEED QUALITY

Current feed: *[client-domain.com/feed or equivalent]*

- **Full content vs excerpts:** *[which]*
- **Author attribution:** *[present / missing]*
- **Publish / modified dates:** *[present / missing]*

- Category and tag entities: *[present / missing]*
- Inline schema in feed items: *[present / missing]*
- AI bots currently fetching the feed: *[ChatGPT: X, Claude: X, Perplexity: X]*

§ WHY THIS MATTERS

From my research across 47 sites, **enriched RSS feeds pulled more AI bot traffic than any other content format** — outpacing standalone JSON-LD endpoints by roughly 10 to 1. If your feed is stripped to titles and excerpts, you are invisible in the single most-consumed format.

4.4 • BOT ACCESSIBILITY

- robots.txt review: *[are AI bots allowed, blocked, rate-limited?]*
- CDN / WAF configuration: *[is Cloudflare blocking legitimate AI crawlers?]*
- AI-specific user-agents handled: *[GPTBot, ChatGPT-User, ClaudeBot, Claude-User, PerplexityBot, Google-Extended]*
- My recommendation: *[allow all / allow select / block training bots but allow real-time fetchers]*

4.5 • CONTENT FRESHNESS SIGNALS

- Publish / modified dates visible on pages: *[yes / no / inconsistent]*
- Last-updated timestamps in schema: *[yes / no]*
- Publishing cadence: *[weekly, monthly, stale]*
- Evergreen content maintenance: *[updated or abandoned]*

4.6 • INTERNAL LINKING AND TOPIC CLUSTERING

- Topic clusters: *[pillar pages + cluster pages, or a flat blog]*
- Anchor text variety: *[descriptive or generic]*
- Orphan pages: *[count]*
- Internal link depth to key pages: *[1-2 clicks, or buried 4+ deep]*

4.7 • MULTI-LANGUAGE AND HREFLANG

Applies only if the site serves multiple languages.

- hreflang implementation: *[correct, incomplete, missing]*
- x-default tag: *[present / missing]*
- Language-specific schema: *[present / missing]*

05.

§ SECTION 05

BOT TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

What bots actually did on *[Client]*'s site during the audit period. Most agencies do not pull log data at all — this section is the single biggest gap I see in competing audits.

```
● ACCESS_LOG · TAIL -F          SAMPLE · AUDIT PERIOD · PAST 7 DAYS          LIVE
```

→ Representative sample from this client's actual log data. Full extract delivered as companion CSV.

| | | | | |
|------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------|
| [03:14:02] | GPTBot | [/feed.xml] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:07] | ClaudeBot | [/blog/post-url] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:11] | PerplexityBot | [/feed.xml] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:19] | ChatGPT-User | [/services/page] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:24] | Googlebot | [/sitemap-index.xml] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:31] | ClaudeBot | [/feed.xml] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |
| [03:14:38] | GPTBot | /llms.txt | - never requested - | 0 hits |
| [03:14:46] | CCBot | [/feed.xml] | [your-domain.com] | 200 |

5.1 - OVERALL BOT VOLUME

Total bot requests during *[audit period]*: *[X]*

| CATEGORY | REQUESTS | % OF BOT TRAFFIC |
|---|------------|------------------|
| Search spiders (Google, Bing) | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> |
| SEO tools (Ahrefs, Semrush, others) | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> |
| AI fetchers (ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity) | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> |
| Unknown / suspicious | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> |

5.2 - AI FETCHER BREAKDOWN

| BOT | USER-AGENT | REQUESTS | RETURN VISITS |
|-----------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| ChatGPT | OAI-SearchBot / ChatGPT-User | [X] | <i>[yes/no, how often]</i> |
| Claude | ClaudeBot / Claude-User | [X] | <i>[yes/no, how often]</i> |
| Perplexity | PerplexityBot | [X] | <i>[yes/no, how often]</i> |
| Google-Extended | Google-Extended | [X] | <i>[yes/no, how often]</i> |

5.3 - WHAT THIS TELLS US

- *[AI fetchers are prioritizing / ignoring these content types on the site]*
- *[Bot X is returning to URL pattern Y repeatedly — suggests Z]*
- *[Bot Y has not visited — likely blocked by CDN / no inbound signal / format mismatch]*

06.

AI CITATION BASELINE

What AI assistants currently say about *[Client]*. I ran *[N]* queries across four AI surfaces and captured the responses — screenshots appear in Appendix C.

6.1 - CITATION PRESENCE BY AI SURFACE

| AI SURFACE | QUERIES | APEARED | % RATE | POSITION |
|---------------------|------------|------------|-------------|---|
| ChatGPT | <i>[N]</i> | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> | <i>[top / among others / not mentioned]</i> |
| Claude | <i>[N]</i> | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> | <i>[top / among others / not mentioned]</i> |
| Perplexity | <i>[N]</i> | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> | <i>[top / among others / not mentioned]</i> |
| Google AI Overviews | <i>[N]</i> | <i>[X]</i> | <i>[X%]</i> | <i>[top / among others / not mentioned]</i> |

6.2 - HOW AI DESCRIBES *[CLIENT]*

When the brand does appear, it is described as:

- *[Description 1 — verbatim or paraphrased from actual AI output]*
- *[Description 2]*
- *[Description 3]*

My assessment: *[Accurate? Flattering? Missing the brand's actual differentiators? Citing outdated info?]*

6.3 - WHERE *[CLIENT]* IS LOSING TO COMPETITORS

For *[N]* of the *[N]* queries tested, a competitor was cited instead. Most-cited competitor: *[Competitor Name]*, appearing in *[X]* of *[N]* responses.

WHY THEY'RE WINNING

- *[Specific technical or content advantage]*

→ *[Specific technical or content advantage]*

→ *[Specific technical or content advantage]*

A representative sample of query results, with screenshots, is included in Appendix C. Full query set available on request.

07.

§ SECTION 07

COMPETITIVE BENCHMARK

Side-by-side comparison on the same 10 dimensions from Section 1. This tells us what's achievable in the category — not just what's good in isolation.

| DIMENSION | [CLIENT] | [COMP 1] | [COMP 2] | [COMP 3] |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Schema markup coverage | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| RSS feed quality | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| HTML structure | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Bot accessibility | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Content freshness | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Internal linking | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| ChatGPT presence | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Claude presence | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Perplexity presence | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Google AI Overview | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] |
| Total | [X/100] | [X/100] | [X/100] | [X/100] |

BIGGEST GAPS TO CLOSE FIRST

1. [Dimension — brief explanation]

WHERE YOU ARE ALREADY AHEAD

→ [Dimension]

2. *[Dimension — brief explanation]*

→ *[Dimension]*

3. *[Dimension — brief explanation]*

08.

PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS

Every recommendation rated on three axes — Impact, Effort, Urgency. Tier 1 fixes ship first.

TIER 1 • FIX IMMEDIATELY (FIRST 30 DAYS)

[FIX #1 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: HIGH

EFFORT: MEDIUM

URGENCY: HIGH

WHAT TO DO: *[2-4 sentences of specific instruction]*

SUCCESS METRIC: *[specific metric that will move]*

[FIX #2 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: HIGH

EFFORT: LOW

URGENCY: MEDIUM

WHAT TO DO: *[specific instruction]*

SUCCESS METRIC: *[metric]*

[FIX #3 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: MEDIUM

EFFORT: MEDIUM

URGENCY: HIGH

WHAT TO DO: *[specific instruction]*

SUCCESS METRIC: *[metric]*

TIER 2 • FIX WITHIN 60 TO 90 DAYS

[FIX #4 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: MEDIUM

EFFORT: MEDIUM

URGENCY: MEDIUM

WHAT TO DO: *[specific instruction]*

[FIX #5 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: MEDIUM

EFFORT: LOW

URGENCY: LOW

WHAT TO DO: *[specific instruction]*

[FIX #6 HEADLINE]

IMPACT: LOW

EFFORT: MEDIUM

URGENCY: LOW

WHAT TO DO: *[specific instruction]*

TIER 3 - MONITOR AND MAINTAIN

- *[Ongoing recommendation and cadence]*
- *[Ongoing recommendation and cadence]*
- *[Ongoing recommendation and cadence]*

09.

§ SECTION 09

WHAT I'D DO NEXT

Two paths forward.

PATH A - YOU IMPLEMENT

Your in-house team or current agency takes this report and implements the recommendations. I'll answer clarifying questions by email at no charge for 14 days after delivery. Beyond that I'm available hourly for specific questions or implementation review.

PATH B - I IMPLEMENT WITH YOU

I execute the Tier 1 recommendations as a one-time engagement (AI Ranking Foundation), then optionally move into an ongoing retainer where I handle Tier 2 and Tier 3 work, monitor bot activity on your site, and track AI citation trends for you monthly.

Based on what this audit uncovered, a sensible initial scope would be:

- *[Tailored scope line 1]*
- *[Tailored scope line 2]*
- *[Tailored scope line 3]*

Estimated timeline: *[X weeks]* · Estimated investment: *[\$X,XXX — \$XX,XXX]* depending on final scope.

§ ONE HONEST NOTE

I do not guarantee specific AI citation outcomes. AI model behavior is opaque and changes frequently. Anyone promising guaranteed rankings in ChatGPT or Claude is either lying or about to get sued. What I **do** guarantee is the quality of the infrastructure, the rigor of the measurement, and that you will be meaningfully closer to the top of your category after the work is done.

10.

§ SECTION 10

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

MISHA MANKO.

Independent AI visibility researcher and technical SEO specialist.

I run ongoing research across **47 live websites** to understand how ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Google AI Overviews actually discover, consume, and cite web content in 2026. Most of what's being sold as "AEO" right now is theory. My work is based on what bots actually do — measured in server logs, not whitepapers.

Before this research, I spent years doing the technical SEO work most agencies outsource or avoid: schema markup on bilingual legal sites, hreflang and custom post type architecture, RankMath Pro at expert level, and incident response on compromised WordPress installations. That background is why this audit goes deeper than what you'd get from a generalist agency running a single checklist.

I publish research on YouTube and in long-form write-ups on **mishamanko.com**. If you want to see more of the methodology before engaging further, start there.

EMAIL

[your@mishamanko.com]

WEB

mishamanko.com

YOUTUBE

[@channel]



SUPPORTING MATERIAL

A - FULL SCHEMA INVENTORY BY URL

Table of every page type on the site with schema types present and validation status. Delivered as companion spreadsheet.

B - BOT LOG EXTRACT

Representative 20 to 30 row sample of raw log analysis — bot user-agent, timestamp, URL, response code. Full CSV available on request.

C - AI QUERY TEST RESULTS

All *[N]* queries tested, grouped by AI surface, with screenshots of actual responses captured during testing.

D - COMPETITOR SCHEMA COMPARISON

Side-by-side table showing which schema types each competitor has implemented.

E - GLOSSARY

AEO (ANSWER ENGINE OPTIMIZATION). Optimizing content to appear in AI-generated answers rather than traditional search result pages.

AI FETCHER. A bot that retrieves content in real-time when a user asks a question in an AI assistant, as opposed to a training crawler that archives content for model training.

CLAUDEBOT VS CLAUDE-USER. ClaudeBot is Anthropic's training crawler. Claude-User is the real-time fetcher that retrieves content when a human asks Claude a question that needs current information.

GPTBOT / CHATGPT-USER / OAI-SEARCHBOT. GPTBot is OpenAI's training crawler. ChatGPT-User and OAI-SearchBot are real-time fetchers used during live ChatGPT conversations and ChatGPT Search.

SCHEMA MARKUP. Structured data added to a page in JSON-LD format that explicitly tells machines what the page is about — an article, a product, a service, a legal firm.

LLMS.TXT. Proposed standard markdown file at a site's root describing the site for AI crawlers. As of early 2026, adoption by major AI companies is minimal and bot traffic to these files in my research is near zero.

This audit was prepared by Misha Manko · mishamanko.com

§ I do not guarantee specific AI citation outcomes. AI model behavior changes frequently. What I guarantee is the rigor of the measurement and the quality of the recommendations.