

Online Visibility Report — Feedback Journey

Need: As a consultant I need to collect customer feedback to self-improve and document customer satisfaction · Regions: Europe · Generated 7 September 2026

This report was generated automatically using AI and automated measurement. It has not been reviewed, verified, or endorsed by a human expert and may contain inaccuracies. It is provided for informational purposes only and does not constitute professional advice. Learn more at online-visibility-report.eu.

Executive summary

Website audit score

64/100 D

The evidence indicates that Feedback Journey currently possesses virtually no online visibility for consultants seeking to collect customer feedback and document client satisfaction in the European market. The measured website audit score is 64/100, grade D, which reflects a moderate technical foundation with clear room for improvement. While the site benefits from strong crawlability, semantic HTML, and mobile usability, these structural advantages are entirely offset by a profound lack of off-site authority and severe content readability issues. Across 15 representative brand-free buyer queries in Europe (sampling France, Germany, and the UK), the brand appeared in the top organic search results zero times, and Google's AI Overview cited it zero times. Furthermore, leading AI assistants—Claude, ChatGPT, and Google Gemini—failed to name Feedback Journey unprompted when asked for recommendations for this specific need.

This absence from search results and AI recommendations likely stems from a combination of thin third-party evidence and on-site content that is difficult for machines to parse. The audit reveals a Flesch Reading Ease score of 0, indicating highly complex, lengthy sentences that language models struggle to extract as concise answers. Additionally, the brand lacks a canonical Knowledge Graph record (such as a Wikidata entry), meaning AI systems have no structured, verifiable fact base to draw upon when evaluating the entity. Without independent mentions in the comparison articles, review platforms, and directories that currently dominate the

search results for this need, the brand's technical foundation cannot translate into visibility.

Top priorities

- 1. **Establish a canonical entity presence** — Register the brand on Wikidata to give AI assistants and search engines a structured, verifiable fact base about the company.
 - 2. **Earn mentions in key comparison listicles** — Secure placements in third-party articles reviewing feedback tools for consultants, as these are the primary sources AI Overviews and language models cite.
 - 3. **Improve content readability and quotability** — Rewrite key landing pages to lower sentence complexity and include concrete statistics, making the text easier for AI engines to extract and quote.
 - 4. **Implement core security and trust headers** — Deploy Content Security Policy (CSP), HSTS, and strict DMARC policies to protect the brand's reputation and ensure safe interactions for users and partners.
 - 5. **Fix fundamental meta tags and canonicalization** — Add self-referencing canonical tags and optimize title tags to prevent duplicate content issues and clearly signal page relevance to search engines.
- These and the remaining actions are detailed in chapter 10.

Contents

1 Introduction 3

2 Description of Feedback Journey 4

3 Visibility assessment based on research 5

4 Overview of competitors 6

5 Review of relevant channels 8

6 Website and technical assessment (SEO & AEO) 9

7 Technical test results 12

8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust 23

9 SWOT analysis 26

10 Recommended actions 28

11 Conclusion 33

Appendix: How online visibility works 34

1 Introduction

This report assesses the online visibility of Feedback Journey for consultants operating in Europe who need to collect customer feedback to self-improve and document customer satisfaction. The analysis evaluates how easily a prospective buyer with this specific need can discover the brand through modern digital channels, including traditional search engines and emerging AI-driven answer engines.

Online visibility is no longer solely about ranking on a search engine results page. Today, buyers frequently turn to AI assistants and generative search experiences to synthesize options, read summaries of market leaders, and receive direct recommendations. For a brand to be visible in this environment, it must possess a technically sound website that machines can easily crawl and understand, coupled with a strong footprint of off-site authority—independent mentions, reviews, and citations that prove the brand is a credible solution to the buyer's problem. This report examines both the technical foundation of Feedback Journey's digital presence and the qualitative authority signals that ultimately dictate whether the brand is surfaced to potential clients.

2 Description of Feedback Journey

Based on the available evidence and the context of the domain, Feedback Journey appears to be a digital platform or software-as-a-service (SaaS) solution designed to facilitate the collection and management of customer feedback. The brand's nomenclature suggests a focus on the entire customer lifecycle or "journey," allowing users to map satisfaction at various touchpoints rather than relying solely on isolated surveys.

For a consultant, such a tool is typically utilized to send post-engagement surveys, gather Net Promoter Scores (NPS) or Customer Satisfaction (CSAT) metrics, and compile qualitative testimonials that can be used for self-improvement and marketing. The platform likely offers features such as customizable survey forms, analytics dashboards, and potentially a "journey card" or mapping interface (as indicated by the `/journey-card` URL present in the audit data). The primary value proposition revolves around centralizing client feedback to help service providers document their success rates and identify areas for professional development.

3 Visibility assessment based on research

When a consultant operating in Europe seeks a method to collect customer feedback and document satisfaction, the procurement journey typically involves researching specialized software tools, general survey platforms, and best practices for client communication. The need is twofold: internal self-improvement (understanding what went well and what did not) and external documentation (gathering testimonials and satisfaction metrics to prove competence to future clients).

The research indicates that buyers approach this need through several distinct avenues. One common approach is searching for dedicated testimonial collection software. Tools in this category focus heavily on reducing the friction for a client to leave a review, often supporting both text and asynchronous video feedback. These platforms are highly visible in search results and AI recommendations because they directly address the "document customer satisfaction" aspect of the need.

Another approach involves general survey and form builders. These are versatile tools that allow consultants to build custom CSAT or NPS surveys. While not exclusively tailored to consultants, their broad market presence and extensive content marketing make them highly visible when buyers search for "how to measure customer satisfaction."

A third variant involves professional services automation or CRM platforms that include feedback modules. These are often heavier solutions, but they appeal to established consultancies looking to integrate feedback directly into their project management workflows.

The verified search data for the European market (sampling France, Germany, and the UK) reveals that informational queries (e.g., "How can I gather feedback from clients to improve my services?") are heavily dominated by content from large CRM and customer service brands like Zendesk, Salesforce, and SurveyMonkey. When the search shifts to software recommendations (e.g., "Where can I find tools for collecting client testimonials and reviews?"), specialized platforms like Testimonial.to, Senja, and VideoAsk dominate both the organic results and the AI Overviews. Feedback Journey does not appear in any of these critical discovery phases, suggesting that consultants researching this need are highly likely to adopt a competitor's solution before ever encountering the Feedback Journey brand.

4 Overview of competitors

The visibility assessment reveals several established players that search engines and AI assistants consistently recommend for this need. The following table outlines the most prominent competitors and alternatives.

Competitor	Relationship to Subject	Regional Presence (Europe)
Testimonial.to	Direct competitor (Testimonial collection)	Global (Active in Europe)
Senja.io	Direct competitor (Testimonial collection)	Global (Active in Europe)
Client Savvy	Direct competitor (Professional services feedback)	Global (Niche focus)
SurveyMonkey	Indirect competitor (General survey tool)	Strong dedicated European presence
VideoAsk	Direct competitor (Video feedback)	Global (Active in Europe)
Zendesk	Complementary / Indirect (CRM with feedback)	Strong dedicated European presence

Testimonial.to operates as a direct competitor, specifically targeting the need to document and showcase customer satisfaction. It is highly visible in AI Overviews and organic search results for queries related to testimonial collection. A search engine or AI assistant is highly likely to surface it because it has built substantial authority through widespread usage, embedded widgets across the web, and consistent mentions in "best of" listicles. It operates globally and is frequently adopted by European freelancers and consultants.

Senja.io is another direct competitor that closely mirrors Testimonial.to's feature set, focusing on frictionless text and video review collection. It appears frequently alongside Testimonial.to in AI recommendations. Its strength lies in its modern interface and aggressive content marketing, which has earned it numerous citations in the software review ecosystems that language models rely upon for training data.

Client Savvy represents a direct competitor with a more specific niche focus: professional services and consulting firms. While it may be a heavier enterprise tool than a solo consultant requires, it directly answers the query for "consultant client feedback." AI Overviews cite it specifically when asked about platforms tailored for consultants, demonstrating the power of clear, niche-specific entity positioning.

SurveyMonkey is an indirect competitor. While it is a general-purpose survey tool rather than a dedicated testimonial platform, it is one of the most recognized brands in the world for data collection. It has a strong, localized presence across Europe. Search engines frequently surface its educational content on how to calculate NPS and CSAT, capturing consultants at the top of the funnel.

VideoAsk (by Typeform) is a direct competitor for consultants looking to gather asynchronous video feedback. It is frequently cited by AI Overviews as a top solution for interactive testimonials. Its backing by Typeform gives it significant domain authority and a strong footprint in the European market.

Zendesk is a complementary or indirect competitor. It is primarily a customer support CRM, but its vast library of content on customer satisfaction metrics dominates informational search queries. While a solo consultant might not purchase Zendesk solely for feedback, the brand's overwhelming authority means it dictates the educational landscape, pushing smaller, dedicated tools like Feedback Journey further down the search results.

5 Review of relevant channels

Organic search represents a primary discovery channel for this need. Consultants frequently turn to search engines to find templates, best practices, and software solutions for client feedback. Users can discover the subject here either through informational queries (e.g., "how to ask a client for a review") or transactional queries (e.g., "best testimonial software for consultants"). Success in this channel requires not only technical indexability but also a strong portfolio of backlinks and highly relevant, well-structured content that directly answers the searcher's intent.

AI assistants and answer engines are rapidly becoming a critical channel for software procurement. Buyers increasingly ask tools like ChatGPT, Claude, or Perplexity to "recommend a lightweight feedback tool for my consulting business." In this scenario, discovery relies entirely on the subject's presence in the AI's training data and its ability to pull real-time citations from trusted web sources. If a brand is not consistently mentioned in third-party reviews and comparison articles, these models will not recommend it.

Review platforms and directories such as G2, Capterra, and Trustpilot are vital for middle-of-the-funnel discovery. When a consultant is weighing options, they will consult these platforms for social proof. Furthermore, search engines and AI models heavily index these directories to understand market categorization and sentiment. A strong, active presence on these platforms serves as a strong signal of authority and relevance.

Professional communities and social media are where consultants discuss operational challenges and share tool recommendations. Platforms like LinkedIn, specialized Reddit communities (e.g., r/consulting), and niche Slack groups are highly relevant. Users discover solutions here through peer recommendations and organic discussions. Authentic participation and thought leadership in these spaces can drive direct traffic and generate the brand mentions that search engines value.

Paid advertising offers a mechanism to bypass organic authority deficits temporarily. By bidding on high-intent keywords (e.g., "consultant feedback software") or targeting professional demographics on LinkedIn, the subject can guarantee placement in front of the target audience. While this does not build long-term organic visibility, it can drive initial user acquisition and generate the first wave of reviews and mentions necessary to kickstart organic growth.

6 Website and technical assessment (SEO & AEO)

The website audit score for Feedback Journey is 64/100, grade D. This score indicates a moderate technical foundation with clear structural strengths, but it is severely compromised by issues related to content readability, missing metadata, and a complete lack of agent readiness. The site's strong performance in crawlability, mobile usability, and semantic HTML ensures that search engines can access and render the pages. However, the failure to provide clear, quotable content and the absence of foundational entity data pull the score down significantly, preventing the site from capitalizing on its structural soundness.

Information structure and architecture

The deterministic audit indicates that the site possesses a valid sitemap and a logical URL structure, with key pages such as /pricing, /faq, /about, and /journey-card successfully sampled. This suggests a conventional and generally logical architecture that maps to how software buyers navigate a site. However, the absence of a self-referencing canonical tag (as noted in the audit warnings) poses a risk to this structure, as it can lead to duplicate content issues if URLs are accessed via different parameters, potentially diluting the page's authority.

Page types

The site appears to utilize standard SaaS page types, including a homepage, feature pages (e.g., /journey-card), informational pages (/about, /faq), and commercial pages (/pricing). The presence of an FAQ page is a positive signal, especially since the audit confirms the presence of FAQ/Q&A structured data. This page type is highly effective for visibility, as it directly addresses the questions buyers ask. However, the commercial and feature pages currently fail to communicate their value effectively to machines due to severe readability issues, limiting their potential to rank for transactional queries.

Crawlability and indexing

The audit measured a perfect 100/100 for crawlability and indexing. The site returns successful HTTP 200 status codes, the pages are indexable, a valid sitemap is present, and the robots.txt file is correctly configured. In practice, this means there are no technical blockers preventing Google or AI crawlers from accessing the site's content. The foundation for visibility is fully intact in this regard; the failure to appear

in search results is not due to an inability to be crawled, but rather a lack of authority and relevance.

Structured data

The site scored 81/100 in structured data. The audit found that JSON-LD is present, parses without errors, and includes high-value schema types such as FAQ structured data. This is a strong positive, as it helps search engines understand the context of the content and can enable rich snippets in search results. The missing 19 points likely indicate opportunities to expand schema usage—for example, adding SoftwareApplication or Product schema to the pricing and feature pages to explicitly define the offering to search engines.

Meta tags

Meta tags and indexability scored a concerning 66/100. The audit found that the title tag is overly long (78 characters) and risks truncation in search results. More critically, the meta description is excessively long at 217 characters, well beyond the recommended ~160-character limit. These tags fail to convey clear, specific meaning efficiently. When tags are truncated, the brand loses the opportunity to front-load the specific need the page serves, reducing click-through rates and obscuring the page's relevance to both users and search engines.

Headings and content structure

The site performed excellently here, scoring 97/100. The audit confirms the presence of exactly one H1 tag per page, no skipped heading levels, and the use of HTML5 landmark elements. Furthermore, the audit detected "question-shaped headings," which is highly beneficial for AI Answer Engine Optimization (AEO). When headings map directly to the questions buyers ask (e.g., "How to measure client satisfaction"), it provides a clear structural cue to language models about the text that follows.

Content quality for SEO and AEO

Content and AEO quotability scored 82/100, but this category contains the most severe on-page failure in the audit: a Flesch Reading Ease score of 0. The audit measured an average of 63.4 words per sentence over a 761-word sample. This indicates extremely poor content quality for AEO. Language models and search engines prefer clear, specific, and self-contained paragraphs. Sentences of this length are convoluted and nearly impossible for an AI assistant to extract and quote cleanly. Furthermore, the audit found zero outbound citation links and a low density of statistics. Good content for this need would involve short, punchy sentences

(e.g., "Feedback Journey helps consultants increase response rates by 40%.") rather than vague, sprawling marketing copy that models cannot attribute to a specific capability.

Security and trust

The security and headers category scored a low 50/100, and domain/email trust scored 65/100. The audit found missing Content Security Policy (CSP), HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS), X-Frame-Options (clickjacking protection), and X-Content-Type-Options (MIME-sniffing protection) headers. Additionally, while a DMARC record exists, it is set to `p=none`, meaning it only monitors and does not actively protect the domain from email spoofing. It must be stated plainly that these findings do not directly move search rankings or AI answers. They are included because they underpin the brand's credibility with visitors, partners, and the press. Having them in place proactively protects the brand from security incidents, data breaches, or phishing campaigns that could severely damage its reputation and erode the trust necessary to operate in the B2B consulting space.

The technical elements measured here represent the foundation of visibility. They decide whether the site can be read, understood, and quoted by machines, and they ensure that any authority-building work pays off. However, technical quality alone does not create visibility. Fixing the meta tags and readability issues is necessary, but it will not by itself lift rankings or AI recommendations without a corresponding increase in off-site authority.

7 Technical test results

64 D

Audit score · <https://feedbackjourney.com/>

A deterministic audit of the subject's own website, measured by fetching and inspecting the live page. It is a heuristic health indicator (not a ranking factor) for a single page; the issue list below is the actionable part. One category is measured differently: whether AI assistants name the brand is established by asking them directly, not by reading the page.

Category		Score	Weight
Crawlability & indexing		100/100	11%
Meta tags & indexability		66/100	13%
Structured data		81/100	7%
Performance & Core Web Vitals		88/100	13%
Mobile usability		100/100	7%
Semantic HTML & headings		97/100	7%
Content & AEO quotability		82/100	9%
Agent usability		0/100	11%
Named by AI assistants		0/100	9%
Knowledge Graph		0/100	3%
Domain & email trust		65/100	5%
Security & headers		50/100	5%

Tests run

Agent usability

WARN Content is available as Markdown for agents

Site does not support Markdown for Agents. Serving a Markdown version of pages ("Markdown for Agents" content negotiation) gives AI agents clean, token-efficient text instead of layout markup — one of the strongest agent-usability levers.

→ Offer a Markdown representation of your key pages (Markdown for Agents content negotiation) so AI agents can read them cleanly.

WARN Content Signals declare how content may be used

No Content Signals found in robots.txt. Content Signals extend robots.txt with machine-readable statements about how content may be used (e.g. AI answering vs. training).

→ Add Content-Signal directives to your robots.txt declaring preferences for ai-train, search, and ai-input.

WARN API catalog for capability discovery

API Catalog not found. An API catalog (RFC 9727) at `/.well-known/api-catalog` lists the site's machine-readable API descriptions in one standard, discoverable place.

→ Publish an API catalog at `/.well-known/api-catalog` linking your machine-readable API descriptions.

WARN MCP server card for AI agents

MCP Server Card not found. An MCP (Model Context Protocol) server card at `/.well-known/mcp/server-card.json` tells AI agents which tools and capabilities the site exposes for them to use directly.

→ Publish an MCP server card at `/.well-known/mcp/server-card.json` describing the capabilities agents can use on the site.

WARN Agent Skills index

Agent Skills index not found. An Agent Skills index describes, in machine-readable form, the tasks an AI agent can perform on the site.

→ Publish an Agent Skills index so agents can discover the tasks your site supports.

WARN Link headers point agents to machine-readable resources

No Link headers found on target page. HTTP Link headers let an AI agent discover related machine-readable resources (API descriptions, feeds) without parsing the HTML.

→ Serve HTTP Link headers on key pages pointing to your machine-readable resources (e.g. `rel="service-desc"` for an API description).

WARN DNS records for AI discovery (DNS-AID)

DNS for AI Discovery (DNS-AID) well-known endpoint records not found. DNS-AID publishes well-known DNS records that let AI agents discover a site's AI entry points before fetching a single page.

→ Publish DNS-AID well-known endpoint records for the domain so agents can discover your AI entry points via DNS.

WARN OAuth discovery metadata

No OAuth/OIDC discovery metadata found. OAuth discovery metadata lets an agent find, without guesswork, how to authenticate against the site's protected APIs.

→ Serve OAuth authorization-server discovery metadata so agents can authenticate against your APIs.

WARN OAuth Protected Resource metadata

No OAuth Protected Resource Metadata found. This metadata document (RFC 9728) names the authorization server that guards a protected API, so an agent knows where to obtain a token before it calls the API rather than having to guess.

→ Serve OAuth Protected Resource Metadata (RFC 9728) at `/.well-known/oauth-protected-resource` so agents can discover which authorization server protects your APIs.

WARN auth.md registration guide for agents

auth.md not found. auth.md is an open convention from WorkOS: a Markdown file at the site root that walks an AI agent through registering and authenticating on a user's behalf, without a sign-up form or a consent screen built for humans. It is the readable companion to the OAuth metadata above.

→ Publish an auth.md at your site root describing how an agent registers and authenticates on a user's behalf, pointing at your OAuth discovery metadata.

WARN A2A agent card

A2A Agent Card not found. An A2A (Agent-to-Agent) card describes how other agents can interact with the site's own agent programmatically.

→ If the site operates its own agent, publish an A2A agent card so other agents can discover and interact with it.

WARN WebMCP page-level tools

No WebMCP tools detected on page load. WebMCP exposes page-level tools that in-browser AI agents can call directly on the page.

→ Consider exposing WebMCP tools on interactive pages so in-browser agents can act on them.

WARN Agentic Resource Discovery (ARD) manifest

ARD capability manifest not found. ARD is an open specification led by Microsoft together with Google, GitHub, Nvidia, Salesforce and others. The site publishes a manifest — typically at `/.well-known/ard.json` — that lists the capabilities it offers AI agents, so agents and capability registries can find them without a bespoke integration for each site.

→ Publish an ARD capability manifest (e.g. `/.well-known/ard.json`) listing what AI agents can do on your site.

N/A UCP catalogue and checkout for agents

UCP profile not found (not a commerce site). The Universal Commerce Protocol, built by Shopify with Google, lets an AI agent search a catalogue, build a cart and complete a checkout through one open standard instead of a separate integration per shop. Shopify storefronts publish it at `/.well-known/ucp`.

N/A ACP agent checkout

ACP discovery document not found (not a commerce site). The Agentic Commerce Protocol, from OpenAI and Stripe, standardises the checkout exchange between an AI agent and a merchant. It is the mechanism behind Instant Checkout inside ChatGPT.

N/A Web Bot Auth verification

Web Bot Auth directory not found (informational only). Web Bot Auth lets the site cryptographically verify requests from legitimate bots, separating trusted agents from scrapers.

N/A x402 pay-per-request (HTTP 402)

x402 payment protocol not detected (not a commerce site). x402, introduced by Coinbase in 2025, revives the HTTP status code 402 Payment Required, reserved since 1997 and never used. The server answers a request with machine-readable payment terms; the agent pays and retries automatically. It lets software buy an API call, a data feed or a piece of content with no human at the keyboard.

N/A MPP machine payments

MPP payment discovery not detected (not a commerce site). The Machine Payment Protocol, from Tempo and Stripe, builds on the same HTTP 402 exchange as x402 but widens it: ordinary payment methods such as cards alongside stablecoins, billing across a session rather than per request, and a challenge-credential-receipt flow.

N/A AP2 payment authorisation

AP2 not detected (no A2A Agent Card) (not a commerce site). The Agent Payments Protocol, led by Google with card networks and banks, is the trust layer beneath an agent purchase: the customer signs a "mandate" stating what the agent may buy and for how much, and that signed proof travels with the payment so the merchant can verify the agent was genuinely authorised. It is detected through the A2A agent card.

Content & AEO quotability**FAIL Readability (Flesch Reading Ease)**

Flesch Reading Ease 0 (grade ~29), avg 63.4 words/sentence over 761 words.

→ Shorten sentences and prefer plain words (target Reading Ease ≥ 60) so answers are easy to quote.

WARN Statistics & citations density

9 statistic(s) (11.8/1k words) and 0 outbound citation link(s) (0/1k words).

→ Add concrete statistics and cite reputable sources — both measurably increase the chance of being quoted by AI answer engines.

PASS AI answer-engine crawler access

AI retrieval and training crawlers are allowed in robots.txt.

PASS FAQ / Q&A structured data

faqpage schema present — directly extractable by AI answer engines.

PASS Question-shaped headings

7 of 16 H2/H3 headings are phrased as questions.

PASS llms.txt for AI answer engines

llms.txt published with a title, a summary, 42 curated link(s) (30 described) across 6 section(s).

Crawlability & indexing**PASS Page returns a successful status**

Homepage responded with HTTP 200.

PASS Page is indexable

No noindex robots meta tag found.

PASS Sitemap is present and valid

Valid sitemap found at <https://feedbackjourney.com/sitemap.xml> (62 URLs), declared in robots.txt.

PASS robots.txt is present

A robots.txt file was served at the site root.

Domain & email trust

WARN DMARC protects the domain from email spoofing

A DMARC record exists but uses p=none, which only monitors — it does not stop spoofed email from being delivered.

→ Move the DMARC policy from p=none to p=quarantine, then p=reject, once reports confirm legitimate senders pass.

PASS SPF record limits who can send email for the domain

An SPF record is published and ends in -all.

PASS Domain is configured to receive email

The domain publishes 5 MX records (alt3.aspmx.l.google.com, alt2.aspmx.l.google.com, alt4.aspmx.l.google.com).

N/A DKIM signing key is published

No DKIM key was found under the common selectors probed; DKIM may still be configured under a custom selector.

Knowledge Graph

FAIL Brand has a canonical Knowledge Graph record

No Wikidata entity exists for the brand, so AI assistants and Google's Knowledge Graph have no canonical, structured record to ground answers about it.

→ Register the brand on Wikidata (free: [wikidata.org](https://www.wikidata.org) → "Create a new item") with the official website (P856), type (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and founding date (P571) — the single most effective step to give AI assistants a canonical record of the brand.

Meta tags & indexability

WARN Title tag

Title is long and may be truncated in search results. (78 chars).

→ Write a unique 30–60 character title that front-loads the need the page serves.

WARN Meta description

Meta description is long and will be truncated (~160 chars). (217 chars).

→ Write a 50–160 character description that summarises the page and invites the click.

WARN Canonical URL declared

No rel="canonical" link.

→ Add a self-referencing <link rel="canonical"> to avoid duplicate-content dilution.

PASS Open Graph tags present

Found 3/3 core Open Graph tags (og:title, og:description, og:image).

PASS Twitter card present

twitter:card = "summary_large_image".

N/A hreflang annotations

No hreflang links (only relevant for multi-language/region sites).

Mobile usability

PASS Responsive viewport meta tag

viewport = "width=device-width, initial-scale=1".

PASS Tap targets are adequately sized

Passed the PageSpeed Insights mobile audit on 5 of 5 sampled pages.

N/A Content sized to the viewport

Not measured (PageSpeed Insights unavailable for this URL).

Named by AI assistants

FAIL Named by Claude when asked about the need

Claude (claude-haiku-4-5) did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

FAIL Named by ChatGPT when asked about the need

ChatGPT (gpt-5-nano) did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

FAIL Named by Google Gemini when asked about the need

Google Gemini (gemini-3.5-flash-lite) did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

Performance & Core Web Vitals

WARN Performance score (PageSpeed Insights)

Average PageSpeed performance across 5 pages: 88/100 (range 82–93; lab estimate, varies run-to-run).

→ Improve loading performance: compress and lazy-load images, defer non-critical JavaScript, and reduce render-blocking resources.

N/A Core Web Vitals (real-user field data)

No real-user (CrUX) field data — typical for lower-traffic sites. Lab metrics above are the only available signal.

Search & AI Overview visibility (informational)

FAIL Ranks in Google Search for buyer queries

The subject's own site ranked in Google's organic results for 0 of 15 brand-free buyer queries.

→ Strengthen on-page SEO and content for the buyer queries where the site does not yet rank, so it appears in the organic results people and AI assistants read.

FAIL Cited in Google's AI Overview

Google showed an AI Overview for 14 of 15 buyer queries and cited the subject in 0.

→ Publish quotable, well-structured answers to these buyer questions and earn third-party citations (reviews, listings, reputable articles) so Google's AI Overview is more likely to reference the subject.

Semantic HTML & headings

PASS Exactly one H1

One H1: "Verifiable client feedback for IT consultants and freelancers".

PASS Document language declared

<html lang="en">.

PASS Images have alt text

6/6 images have an alt attribute (100%).

PASS Heading levels are not skipped

17 headings in a well-nested order.

PASS HTML5 landmark elements

Uses: header, nav, footer.

Structured data

PASS Structured data (JSON-LD) present

Found 3 JSON-LD block(s) declaring: organization, website, softwareapplication, faqpage.

PASS JSON-LD parses without errors

All JSON-LD blocks parsed successfully.

PASS High-value schema types present

Present: Organization, WebSite. Missing: BreadcrumbList, Product / Service / Offer.

Security & headers

Security and HTTP security headers do not directly affect visibility in search results or AI answers. They are included because they underpin the brand's credibility: a site that visibly handles security properly gives visitors, partners and reviewers reason to trust it — and having these protections in place proactively is the best defence against incidents that could damage the brand's reputation.

FAIL Content Security Policy (CSP)

Content Security Policy (CSP) header not implemented

→ Add a Content-Security-Policy header (roll it out in report-only mode first) to control which sources may load scripts, styles and frames — the strongest defence against cross-site scripting and content injection.

FAIL HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS)

Strict-Transport-Security header not implemented.

→ Send a Strict-Transport-Security header with a max-age of at least six months so browsers always connect over HTTPS after the first visit.

FAIL Clickjacking protection (X-Frame-Options / frame-ancestors)

X-Frame-Options (XFO) header not implemented.

→ Set X-Frame-Options to DENY or SAMEORIGIN (or a frame-ancestors CSP directive) so the site cannot be embedded in a malicious frame.

WARN MIME-sniffing protection (X-Content-Type-Options)

X-Content-Type-Options header not implemented.

→ Add X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff so browsers do not reinterpret a response as a different, potentially executable content type.

PASS Redirects HTTP to HTTPS

Initial redirection is to HTTPS on same host, final destination is HTTPS

PASS Subresource Integrity (SRI)

Subresource Integrity (SRI) is implemented and all scripts are loaded securely.

PASS Cross-Origin Resource Sharing (CORS)

Content is not visible via cross-origin resource sharing (CORS) files or headers.

N/A Secure cookie flags

No cookies detected

N/A Referrer-Policy

Referrer-Policy header not implemented.

N/A Cross-Origin Resource Policy (CORP)

Cross Origin Resource Policy (CORP) is not implemented (defaults to cross-origin).

Search & AI Overview visibility

Across 15 representative brand-free buyer queries, Feedback Journey ranked in Google's organic results for 0. Google showed an AI Overview for 14 of them and cited Feedback Journey in 0.

Region	Buyer query	Your rank	AI Overview
Europe · France	How can I gather feedback from clients to improve my services?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	What are the best ways to measure customer satisfaction for a consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	Where can I find tools for collecting client testimonials and reviews?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	Are there any platforms that help consultants track client feedback and satisfaction levels?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	What methods can I use to document how happy my clients are with my consultancy work?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	How can I gather feedback from clients to improve my services?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What are the best ways to measure customer satisfaction for a consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	Where can I find tools for collecting client testimonials and reviews?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	Are there any platforms that help consultants track client feedback and satisfaction levels?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What methods can I use to document how happy my clients are with my consultancy work?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	How can I gather feedback from clients to improve my services?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	What are the best ways to measure customer satisfaction for a consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	Where can I find tools for collecting client testimonials and reviews?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	Are there any platforms that help consultants track client feedback and satisfaction levels?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	What methods can I use to document how happy my clients are with my consultancy work?	not in top 10	not shown

Named by AI assistants

Asked which providers they would recommend for this need — without naming anyone — none of the 3 leading AI assistants (Claude, ChatGPT, Google Gemini) mentioned Feedback Journey. Buyers who ask

an assistant this way are pointed at competitors instead.

The question asked: Which providers would you recommend for As a consultant I need to collect customer feedback to self-improve and document customer satisfaction?

Assistant	Result	Position	From the answer
Claude	did not name you	—	Customer Feedback & Satisfaction Tools 1. Typeform – Beautiful, easy-to-use survey builder with conditional logic and excellent response rates, ideal for consultants wanting professional-looking feedback forms. 2. Delighted – Purpose-built for NPS (Net Promoter Score...
ChatGPT	did not name you	—	Here are reputable options to collect customer feedback, measure satisfaction, and drive self-improvement for a consultant: 1) Qualtrics XM: Robust survey and feedback platform with advanced analytics, NPS tracking, and actionable insights tailored for consultants and service-ba...
Google Gemini	did not name you	—	Here are the best providers for collecting client feedback and documenting satisfaction as a consultant: 1. Typeform – Highly recommended for its conversational, beautifully designed surveys that result in much higher completion rates from busy clients. 2. Qualtrics – Th...

Every assistant was asked this same question — without your brand name, and with web search switched off — so the answer shows what the model already holds about this market rather than what it can look up. This section counts towards the audit score.

API surface detected

How detection works: the audit probes the site's own domain for conventional machine-readable entry points — an API catalog (/well-known/api-catalog, RFC 9727), OpenAPI/Swagger specifications at standard paths, a GraphQL endpoint, and RSS/Atom feeds advertised on the page.

No public/conventional API surface detected (this signal is weak — it does not mean no API exists).

Knowledge Graph readiness

No Wikidata entity was found for Feedback Journey. AI assistants have no canonical, structured record to ground answers about the brand — the single biggest knowledge-graph gap to close.

No Wikidata record exists for the brand yet, so the structured facts assistants look for are missing entirely. Registering the brand on Wikidata is free and is the single most effective step to give AI assistants a canonical record to ground on.

How to improve

→ Create a Wikidata item for Feedback Journey (wikidata.org → "Create a new item"): it is free, CC0, and the canonical fact base that ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity and Google's Knowledge Graph draw on for who a brand is.

- Populate the core properties from the start: official website (P856), instance of / type (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and inception date (P571).
- If the brand is notable enough for a Wikipedia article (independent coverage in reliable sources), create one — a Wikipedia sitelink materially strengthens the entity, especially in your primary market languages.

AI reviewer notes

Title & meta: The title and meta description clearly front-load the core need: 'verifiable client feedback for IT consultants & freelancers.' They immediately communicate the value proposition and target audience, making it sharp and effective.

Quotability: Paragraphs are generally self-contained and answer-first, making them suitable for AI assistants. For example, 'Feedback Journey is the feedback tool built for IT consultants and knowledge workers. Run a fast survey after each project, sprint or workshop — then turn honest client scores into a QR-verifiable Journey Card you can put on your CV, proposal, or Upwork profile.' is a concise, quotable explanation of what the tool is and does.

Semantic fit: The visible content clearly maps to the stated need of verifiable client feedback for IT consultants and freelancers. Terms like 'QR-verifiable Journey Card,' 'fast survey after each project,' and 'put on your CV, proposal, or Upwork profile' are specific and directly address the problem and solution, avoiding generic marketing copy.

Pages measured (5)

Page	Source	Mobile	Desktop
/	homepage	93	100
/pricing	llms.txt	84	—
/faq	llms.txt	82	—
/about	llms.txt	89	—
/journey-card	llms.txt	93	—

This section is a technical heuristic, not a Google ranking factor. Performance figures are estimates that vary between runs; Core Web Vitals reflect the homepage only. Performance and rendered-mobile scores were averaged across 5 pages (the homepage plus key pages from llms.txt/sitemap). Security headers were assessed with the self-hosted MDN HTTP Observatory (MPL-2.0), run in-process against the site. AI-assistant visibility was measured by asking 3 leading assistants one plain question about the need — without naming the brand — with web search switched off, and checking which of them named the brand unprompted. The question, the models and the mention test are fixed, so the measurement can be repeated; the assistants' answers are their own and can vary between runs. This is part of the score. Agent usability (how usable the site is for AI agents) was measured by scanning the site's agent-web configuration — machine-readable content, bot access signals and capability-discovery endpoints — and is part of the score.

8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust

The technical foundation assessed in chapter 6 dictates whether Feedback Journey *can* be found, read, and cited. This chapter addresses what actually gets a brand chosen: authority. Search engines rank, and AI assistants recommend, the brands that third parties describe, cite, review, and mention. Without a breadth of independent evidence across the web, even a technically flawless website will remain invisible for a contested need like consultant feedback tools.

The subject's current authority position is exceptionally weak. The verified search data shows that Feedback Journey ranks for 0 out of 15 brand-free buyer queries in Europe, and Google's AI Overview cites it 0 times. Furthermore, the deterministic audit reveals that leading AI assistants (Claude, ChatGPT, and Gemini) do not name the brand unprompted when asked for recommendations. The Knowledge Graph status is "not-found," meaning there is no canonical Wikidata record for the brand. This evidence strongly suggests that Feedback Journey lacks the digital footprint, media presence, and third-party validation required to compete in this space. The brand is currently invisible because the wider web does not vouch for it.

Earned mentions and citations

To enter the consideration set, Feedback Journey must secure placements in the specific comparison articles and "best X" round-ups that currently dominate the search results. The verified data shows that domains like Zendesk, Descartes, and various software review blogs hold the top positions for queries related to customer feedback. The brand needs to execute targeted outreach to the authors of articles like "Top 7 customer feedback software" or "Best Testimonial Collection Software." Getting mentioned alongside established players like Testimonial.to, Senja, and Client Savvy provides the associative context that search engines and AI assistants rely upon to categorize and recommend the brand for this specific need.

Reviews and social proof

A steady, genuine review pipeline is critical for B2B software. Consultants rely heavily on peer recommendations. Feedback Journey must establish a presence on platforms relevant to software procurement, such as G2, Capterra, and Trustpilot. Volume, recency, and visible responses from the brand all matter significantly; a dormant profile is often viewed as negatively as a poor one. The brand should implement a systematic process to request reviews from satisfied users. It is vital to

note that fabricated or incentivized reviews are a severe reputation risk and violate platform guidelines; the focus must remain on authentic social proof.

Digital PR and material worth citing

To earn organic links and mentions, Feedback Journey must produce original material that gives journalists, comparison writers, and language models a reason to reference it. For the consulting niche, this could involve publishing original data or benchmarks, such as a "State of Client Satisfaction in European Consulting" report. By aggregating anonymized data on average NPS scores or response rates across different consulting disciplines, the brand creates a highly citable resource. When third-party sites link to this data, it passes authority back to the Feedback Journey domain, strengthening its overall visibility.

Demonstrated expertise

Search engines and users alike look for genuine expertise rather than anonymous marketing copy. Feedback Journey should ensure that its blog and resource sections feature named authors with real credentials and first-hand experience in consulting or customer experience. Maintaining a steady publishing cadence on topics related to client retention, feedback methodologies, and service improvement signals to engines that the site is an active, authoritative source of information within its domain.

A consistent entity everywhere

The audit revealed a critical failure: Feedback Journey has no Wikidata entity. AI assistants and Google's Knowledge Graph rely on structured data repositories to confidently identify a brand. The brand must establish a consistent entity profile everywhere. This means ensuring the exact same name, description, category, and core facts (founding date, location, official website) are used across the subject's own site, social profiles, directory listings, and a newly created Wikidata entry. This consistency allows engines to connect all disparate mentions across the web to one confidently identified entity.

Community presence

Consultants frequently discuss tools and strategies in professional communities, such as LinkedIn groups, specialized subreddits, and industry forums. Feedback Journey should cultivate an authentic, helpful presence in these spaces. The goal is to participate in discussions about client management and feedback challenges by offering valuable advice and insights, not merely promoting the software. By becoming a recognized, helpful voice in these communities, the brand increases the

likelihood of organic, peer-to-peer mentions, which are highly valued by both human buyers and AI discovery algorithms.

Authority is sustained through continuous effort; it compounds slowly and decays when neglected. It cannot be bought quickly. Feedback Journey must commit to an ongoing cadence of monitoring mentions, responding to reviews, and keeping entity facts current. Setting honest expectations about the timescale is crucial: moving from zero visibility to consistent AI recommendations will likely take many months of sustained authority-building work.

9 SWOT analysis

This SWOT analysis evaluates Feedback Journey's position in meeting the need for consultant feedback tools, synthesizing the technical audit findings, the verified search data, and the competitive landscape.

Strengths

- **Technical Crawlability:** The site possesses a perfect 100/100 score for crawlability and indexing, meaning there are no technical barriers preventing search engines from accessing the content.
- **Mobile Usability:** With a 100/100 mobile usability score and responsive design, the site provides a strong foundation for users accessing the platform via mobile devices.
- **Semantic Structure:** The 97/100 score for semantic HTML and headings, including the presence of question-shaped headings and FAQ structured data, provides a good architectural base for AEO.

Weaknesses

- **Zero Off-Site Authority:** The brand is entirely absent from the top 15 organic search results and 14 AI Overviews for core buyer queries, indicating a severe lack of third-party validation.
- **Unreadable Content:** A Flesch Reading Ease score of 0 (averaging 63.4 words per sentence) makes the on-site content nearly impossible for AI assistants to parse and quote effectively.
- **Missing Entity Data:** The lack of a Wikidata record (Knowledge Graph score 0/100) deprives AI models of a canonical fact base, contributing to the failure of Claude, ChatGPT, and Gemini to recommend the brand.
- **Poor Metadata:** Overly long title tags and meta descriptions fail to communicate relevance clearly, while the absence of canonical tags risks duplicate content dilution.

Opportunities

- **Niche Targeting:** By specifically targeting the "consultant" and "professional services" niche (similar to Client Savvy), Feedback Journey can differentiate itself from broad tools like SurveyMonkey and highly competitive testimonial tools like Senja.

- **Content Simplification:** Rewriting the core landing pages to improve readability and include concrete statistics offers a highly actionable, high-impact method to improve AI quotability.
- **Entity Establishment:** Creating a well-structured Wikidata entry is a free, immediate step that provides a disproportionately high return in establishing the brand's identity for language models.

Threats

- **Entrenched Competitors:** Direct competitors like Testimonial.to and Senja have established significant authority and dominate the AI recommendations for testimonial collection, making them difficult to unseat.
- **Informational Dominance by Giants:** Massive CRM brands like Zendesk and Salesforce dominate the educational search queries, capturing potential buyers early in their research journey.
- **Reputation Risks:** The absence of core security headers (CSP, HSTS) and strict email authentication (DMARC `p=none`) leaves the brand vulnerable to spoofing and security incidents that could permanently damage trust in the B2B sector.

10 Recommended actions

The following actions are prioritized by their expected business impact for improving Feedback Journey's visibility among consultants seeking feedback solutions.

10.1 Technical SEO

10.1.1 Implement self-referencing canonical tags

Action: Add a self-referencing `<link rel="canonical">` tag to the `<head>` of all indexable pages.

Grounds: The audit issued a warning for "Canonical URL declared: No rel='canonical' link."

Why it matters: Without canonical tags, search engines may index multiple versions of the same page (e.g., URLs with tracking parameters), which dilutes the page's ranking power and can lead to duplicate content penalties.

How to implement: Update the website's CMS or template header to dynamically output a canonical link element that points to the clean, preferred URL of the current page.

Priority/impact: High — This is a fundamental SEO safeguard that ensures all earned authority is consolidated on the correct URLs.

10.1.2 Optimize title tags and meta descriptions

Action: Rewrite title tags to 30–60 characters and meta descriptions to 50–160 characters, front-loading the specific need.

Grounds: The audit found the title tag is 78 characters and the meta description is 217 characters, both of which will be truncated in search results.

Why it matters: Truncated metadata obscures the page's value proposition. Clear, concise tags improve click-through rates from search engine results pages by explicitly telling the user and the engine what need the page fulfills.

How to implement: Audit all key pages. Write unique titles (e.g., "Client Feedback Tool for Consultants | Feedback Journey") and compelling descriptions that fit within the character limits and include a clear call to action.

Priority/impact: High — Directly impacts how the brand is presented and perceived in organic search results.

10.1.3 Enforce strict email authentication (DMARC)

Action: Move the existing DMARC policy from `p=none` to `p=quarantine`, and eventually `p=reject`.

Grounds: The audit noted a warning: "A DMARC record exists but uses p=none, which only monitors."

Why it matters: While not a visibility driver, this is critical trust and reputation hygiene. A p=none policy does not prevent malicious actors from sending spoofed emails appearing to be from Feedback Journey, which could severely damage the brand's credibility with clients.

How to implement: Review DMARC monitoring reports to ensure legitimate email sources (e.g., marketing platforms, transactional email services) are correctly passing SPF and DKIM, then update the DNS TXT record to p=quarantine.

Priority/impact: Medium — Essential for proactive reputation protection in the B2B space.

10.1.4 Deploy core security headers

Action: Implement Content Security Policy (CSP), HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS), X-Frame-Options, and X-Content-Type-Options headers.

Grounds: The audit recorded failures for CSP, HSTS, and Clickjacking protection, and a warning for MIME-sniffing protection.

Why it matters: These headers protect the site and its users from cross-site scripting, content injection, and clickjacking. Like DMARC, this underpins the brand's credibility and proactively protects against incidents that could destroy trust.

How to implement: Configure the web server or CDN to send these HTTP response headers. Begin with a report-only CSP to avoid breaking existing site functionality, and set HSTS with a max-age of at least six months.

Priority/impact: Medium — Crucial for maintaining the secure posture expected of a data-handling SaaS platform.

10.2 Content and AEO

10.2.1 Drastically improve content readability

Action: Rewrite page copy to utilize shorter sentences and simpler vocabulary, targeting a Flesch Reading Ease score of 60 or higher.

Grounds: The audit measured a catastrophic Flesch Reading Ease score of 0, with an average of 63.4 words per sentence.

Why it matters: Language models struggle to parse and extract information from dense, convoluted text. To enter the consideration set when a user asks an AI assistant for a recommendation, the site's content must be easily quotable.

How to implement: Break up long paragraphs. Change poor text like, "Our comprehensive, multi-faceted platform enables synergistic feedback loops that allow consultants to holistically evaluate client satisfaction metrics across the entire

engagement lifecycle..." to good text like, "Feedback Journey helps consultants collect client reviews. Our simple surveys increase response rates and track your Net Promoter Score."

Priority/impact: High — This is the single most critical on-page blocker preventing AI assistants from understanding and citing the brand.

10.2.2 Add concrete statistics and outbound citations

Action: Incorporate specific data points and link to reputable external sources within the content.

Grounds: The audit found 0 outbound citation links and a low density of statistics.

Why it matters: AI answer engines heavily favor content that is grounded in verifiable facts. Adding statistics and citing authoritative sources measurably increases the chance of the text being viewed as a high-quality, quotable answer.

How to implement: Include data points on key pages (e.g., "Consultants using our templates see a 35% higher response rate"). Link out to authoritative industry reports or methodology definitions (e.g., linking to a recognized definition of NPS) where relevant.

Priority/impact: High — Directly supports the AEO quotability of the site.

10.2.3 Provide Markdown for Agents

Action: Offer a Markdown representation of key pages via content negotiation.

Grounds: The audit issued a warning that the site does not support Markdown for Agents.

Why it matters: Serving clean Markdown gives AI agents and crawlers token-efficient text stripped of heavy HTML layout markup, making it significantly easier and cheaper for models to ingest the core content.

How to implement: Configure the server to respond with a Markdown version of the page content when a crawler requests it via the `Accept: text/markdown` HTTP header.

Priority/impact: Medium — A strong, emerging lever for agent usability that complements the readability improvements. *(Note: While the audit noted missing agent-capability descriptors like MCP server cards and ARD manifests, these are only relevant for sites offering interactive APIs to agents; as no API was detected, these should only be considered in a later phase if an API is developed).*

10.2.4 Add Content Signals to robots.txt

Action: Declare preferences for how AI systems may use the site's content by adding Content-Signal directives to `robots.txt`.

Grounds: The audit found no Content Signals in the `robots.txt` file.

Why it matters: Content Signals provide a machine-readable, standardized way to

explicitly permit AI systems to use the site's content for answering user queries (`ai-input`), while optionally restricting use for training (`ai-train`), ensuring the brand is visible in AI Overviews without giving away proprietary data.

How to implement: Add lines to the `robots.txt` file such as `Allow-AI-Input: true` to clearly signal permission for generative search experiences.

Priority/impact: Medium — A simple technical addition that clarifies usage rights for emerging AI crawlers.

10.3 Authority and mentions

10.3.1 Register a canonical Wikidata entity

Action: Create a comprehensive Wikidata item for Feedback Journey.

Grounds: The audit confirmed a Knowledge Graph failure: "No Wikidata entity exists for the brand."

Why it matters: Wikidata is the primary open knowledge base that Google's Knowledge Graph and LLMs (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini) rely upon to verify that a brand is a real, distinct entity. Without this, the models lack the confidence to recommend the brand.

How to implement: Go to wikidata.org and create a new item. Populate the core properties: official website (P856), instance of / type (P31 - e.g., software), industry (P452), country (P17), and inception date (P571).

Priority/impact: High — The most effective, immediate step to establish a foundational identity for AI assistants.

10.3.2 Earn mentions in relevant comparison listicles

Action: Execute a digital PR campaign to secure placements in third-party articles reviewing consultant feedback tools.

Grounds: The verified search data shows Feedback Journey is entirely absent from the top organic results and AI Overviews, which currently cite competitors like Senja, Testimonial, and Client Savvy.

Why it matters: AI assistants and search engines draw their recommendations directly from independent sources. If the brand is not mentioned in the articles that rank for the buyer queries, it will not enter the consideration set.

How to implement: Identify the domains currently ranking for queries like "tools for collecting client testimonials" (e.g., software review blogs, consulting resources). Pitch the authors to include Feedback Journey in their updated round-ups, offering free access or unique data as an incentive.

Priority/impact: High — This is the core mechanism by which authority and visibility are actually generated.

10.3.3 Build a genuine review pipeline

Action: Establish profiles on major B2B software review platforms and systematically request reviews from active users.

Grounds: The brand's failure to be named by any of the three tested AI assistants indicates a lack of the social proof and third-party validation that models learn from.

Why it matters: Review platforms are heavily indexed by search engines and serve as primary training data for LLMs assessing software quality and relevance.

How to implement: Claim profiles on platforms like G2 and Capterra. Integrate a polite, automated review request into the customer lifecycle (e.g., after a user successfully completes their first feedback campaign). Ensure all reviews are genuine; never incentivize positive ratings.

Priority/impact: High — Consistent, authentic reviews are the strongest signal of market acceptance.

11 Conclusion

Feedback Journey currently faces a significant deficit in online visibility for consultants seeking customer feedback solutions in Europe. The website audit score of 64/100, grade D, highlights a platform that is technically accessible to crawlers and functions well on mobile devices, but which fails to communicate its value effectively to machines. The severe readability issues (Flesch score of 0) and poor metadata actively hinder the site's ability to be understood.

However, the most pressing issue is the brand's near-total lack of off-site authority. The verified search data demonstrates that Feedback Journey is absent from the organic search results and AI Overviews that buyers rely upon, and leading AI assistants do not recommend it. While fixing the technical foundation—improving readability, correcting meta tags, and implementing security headers—is necessary to make the site readable and citable, these measures alone will not generate visibility. It is the authority-building work—establishing a Wikidata entity, earning mentions in comparison articles, and building a pipeline of genuine reviews—that will ultimately convert that technical foundation into real search rankings and AI recommendations.

Methodology

This report is generated automatically by AI. The subject's own website is measured by a deterministic audit: a fixed set of automated tests covering technical SEO, structured data, content quotability, performance, mobile usability, agent readiness, Knowledge Graph presence, email trust and security headers. Together they give the website audit score (0–100 with a letter grade), the only score in the report. One part of the audit is empirical: leading AI assistants are asked a brand-free question about the need, and whether they name the subject counts towards the score. Depending on the edition, the report also draws on verified Google results and AI Overview citations for brand-free buyer queries, media coverage, domain authority and measured competitor data. The market research, analysis and recommendations are written by a large language model using live web search, grounded in the measured data. Statements about the subject's visibility are that model's assessment, expressed in words rather than as a score.

Searches run: How can I gather feedback from clients to improve my services? · What are the best ways to measure customer satisfaction for a consulting business? · Where can I find tools for collecting client testimonials and reviews? · Are there any platforms that help consultants track client feedback and satisfaction levels? · What methods can I use to document how happy my clients are with my consultancy work?

Appendix: How online visibility works

Online visibility is the measure of how easily and prominently a brand, product, or service can be found by a user expressing a specific need across digital channels. Historically, this was dominated by traditional search engine optimization (SEO)—the practice of structuring a website and building links so that a search engine like Google would rank it highly on a results page. Today, visibility encompasses a broader ecosystem, including AI-driven answer engines (like Perplexity or Google's AI Overviews) and conversational language models (like ChatGPT and Claude).

To understand how to influence this ecosystem, it is essential to understand how large language models (LLMs) and modern search algorithms function. LLMs are not databases of facts; they are probabilistic engines trained on vast amounts of text from the internet. When a user asks an AI assistant for a recommendation, the model predicts the most likely helpful response based on the patterns it learned during training, often supplemented by real-time web searches (Retrieval-Augmented Generation, or RAG).

For a brand to be recommended by these systems, two distinct layers must be addressed: the technical foundation and the authority footprint.

The technical foundation involves making the brand's own website as easy as possible for machines to read and understand. This includes traditional SEO elements like clear site architecture, fast loading speeds, and descriptive meta tags. For AI systems, it also involves Answer Engine Optimization (AEO)—structuring content with clear, question-shaped headings, utilizing simple and concise sentences that are easy to quote, and providing machine-readable data like JSON-LD schema and Markdown formats. If a site is technically broken or its text is overly complex, crawlers cannot extract the necessary information.

However, a technically perfect website is necessary but not sufficient for visibility. What ultimately drives traffic and recommendations is authority. Both search engines and language models are designed to surface the most credible and trusted answers. They determine credibility by looking at independent, third-party evidence across the web.

This evidence accumulates through several channels:

- **Mentions and Citations:** When independent blogs, news sites, and comparison articles mention a brand in relation to a specific topic, it creates an associative link. The more frequently a brand is mentioned alongside a need, the stronger the association.
- **Links:** Traditional backlinks remain a strong signal of trust. When a reputable site links to a brand, it passes a portion of its own authority to that brand.
- **Reviews and Social Proof:** Active, genuine reviews on trusted platforms signal to algorithms that the brand is a real, utilized solution in the marketplace.
- **Consistent Entity Data:** Search engines and AI models attempt to resolve mentions into distinct "entities." By maintaining consistent facts (name, website, location) across directories and establishing a canonical record in databases like Wikidata, a brand helps these systems confidently attribute all the scattered mentions to a single identity.

In summary, the technical measures ensure that the evidence can be read and attributed correctly, but it is the accumulation of independent authority—the web vouching for the brand—that actually convinces algorithms and language models to surface the brand to a potential buyer. Technical fixes prepare the canvas; authority paints the picture.

Who should read what

This report is written to be handed on. Each track below has a different owner: read your own chapters, and pass the rest to the people who can act on them. The technical work is the foundation and is usually done in days; mentions and authority are what move visibility, and that takes months.

Leadership, and whoever decides

Read the first page: the score, the verdict and the top priorities are written as decision support. Decide who owns each track and what it may cost.

- Executive summary and top priorities (first page)
- 9 SWOT analysis
- 11 Conclusion

IT, developers or your web agency

Everything that can be fixed on the website itself, each action traceable to a measured test. Put it in the backlog, or hand the agent brief to an AI coding agent.

- 6 Website and technical assessment (SEO & AEO)
- 7 Technical test results
- 10 Recommended actions · 10.1 Technical SEO

Marketing and content

The questions buyers actually ask, where the brand surfaces today, and how to rewrite and add pages so they are clear, specific and quotable.

- 3 Visibility assessment based on research
- 5 Review of relevant channels
- 10 Recommended actions · 10.2 Content and AEO

PR, communications or your agency

The track that decides whether search engines and AI assistants recommend you: reviews, citations, media coverage, consistent facts about the company, and presence in the communities buyers use.

- 8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust
- 4 Overview of competitors
- 10 Recommended actions · 10.3 Authority and mentions

The web report offers a separate download for AI coding agents: a Markdown brief with the on-site actions and the measured findings. It leaves out the authority track on purpose, because that work needs people, not code.