

Anonymized Sample ? Page 1 ? Assessment Snapshot

Deterministic score position

The supplied overall scores are: Example Local Services 76; Selected Competitor B 16; Selected Competitor A 6; Selected Competitor C 1. These are assessment outputs rather than proof of market performance or future results. The underlying provider scores varied, including a marked outlier for Gemini on Selected Competitor B and for OpenAI on the prospect score. [evd_f148077cf97ea973344f2bac] [evd_49b7e0d177aab8f61fd2cc04]

What the evidence supports

Multiple supplied results describe Example Local Services as a Florida coastal-market roofing contractor offering repair, replacement, maintenance, and storm-damage services. The evidence also reports generally positive third-party review signals and a Florida contractor license number, although current status and the independence of some claims are not uniform across sources. [evd_2bd148ce9686749082d70f33] [evd_0047d47868e60b7b493da83e] [evd_b52c1ab0a3683129dabb761a]

Interpretation boundary

The score indicates stronger representation in this assessment set, not guaranteed customer choice, business quality, search position, or future AI recommendations. Provider disagreement and incomplete competitor verification limit direct comparative conclusions. [evd_806d71fa2a1e24ab14914f26] [evd_8f5216094253830959df57bb]

Page 2 ? Buyer-Facing Evidence

Identity and services

The supplied evidence consistently associates Example Local Services with a Florida coastal-market address and South Florida service coverage. Reported core services include residential and commercial roof repair, replacement, inspection or maintenance, and storm-damage work. Address, phone, corporate-name, and service-area variants appear across sources, so the canonical business identity is not fully settled.

[evd_1088a1dcca41b12b1c068059] [evd_0bbca9b76bafc5f5dddb0c32]

Trust signals

Evidence reports BBB accreditation or an A+ rating, strong ratings on review platforms, substantial review volume, and a no-upfront-deposit message. These are signals a buyer may consider, not independent proof of workmanship, contract compliance, insurance, or warranty fulfillment. One supplied result also notes at least one negative complaint.

[evd_0047d47868e60b7b493da83e] [evd_8f5216094253830959df57bb]

[evd_2bd148ce9686749082d70f33]

Buyer uncertainty

Pricing, crew availability, project timelines, insurance certificates, current license standing, permitting performance, and contract-specific warranty terms were not reliably verified. A buyer should request current documentation and a formal project proposal before selection.

[evd_8f5216094253830959df57bb] [evd_2bd148ce9686749082d70f33]

[evd_49b7e0d177aab8f61fd2cc04]

Page 3 ? Competitive Context

Selected Competitor A

The evidence describes Selected Competitor A as a longstanding South Florida contractor with residential and commercial coverage and a reported lifetime guarantee for eligible work. Another result notes mixed feedback concerning warranty follow-up. The supplied deterministic score is 6. [evd_49b7e0d177aab8f61fd2cc04] [evd_6a99c6405dcb70d7b953e9fa]

Selected Competitor B

The evidence variably describes Selected Competitor B as a commercial or large-scale roofing option, but detailed verification was limited in other provider results. Its supplied deterministic score is 16, with Gemini's higher provider score explicitly marked as an outlier. The comparison should therefore be treated cautiously. [evd_49b7e0d177aab8f61fd2cc04] [evd_806d71fa2a1e24ab14914f26]

Selected Competitor C

Selected Competitor C is described in some results as serving residential and commercial roofing, while other results could not verify sufficient business data. Its supplied deterministic score is 1. No stronger conclusion is supported by the bundle. [evd_9f28ed85465374fc9aabeddb] [evd_806d71fa2a1e24ab14914f26]

Competitive takeaway

Example Local Services has the highest supplied deterministic score, but the competitor evidence is incomplete and provider-dependent. The score difference may indicate stronger representation in this test set; it does not establish comparative service quality or a causal advantage. [evd_f148077cf97ea973344f2bac] [evd_806d71fa2a1e24ab14914f26]

Page 4 ? Bounded Actions and Measurement

Priority test 1: canonical identity block

Add one consistent, copyable block containing the legal business name, primary address, phone, license number, owner or principal where confirmed, and service region. This is a reasonable action to test because the evidence reports entity, address, and service-area ambiguity. [evd_f148077cf97ea973344f2bac] [evd_0bbca9b76bafc5f5dddb0c32]

Priority test 2: standardized service and area pages

Create or revise service pages with explicit labels for repair, replacement, maintenance, storm damage, materials, residential or commercial eligibility, and municipalities served. This may improve machine readability, but the bundle does not establish a resulting ranking or recommendation change. [evd_a89ece7d6ff3609ec2d8a512] [evd_2034af80f20c2eeac3735236]

Priority test 3: credential and case-study documentation

Where accurate and current, link to primary-source license or approval records and publish fact-labeled case studies containing location, property type, material, service performed, and project date. This is a reasonable action to test because general marketing claims and project galleries were not consistently independently verifiable. [evd_f148077cf97ea973344f2bac]

Bounded measurement plan

Before and after the changes, rerun the same approved query set using the same scoring rules, record provider-level recommendations and uncertainty, and separately audit address, entity, license, service, and warranty consistency. Do not interpret a score change as proof that any single edit caused it; the supplied evidence does not support that causal conclusion. [evd_f148077cf97ea973344f2bac] [evd_a89ece7d6ff3609ec2d8a512]