

# GEO Audit

## Full Report Package

How ChatGPT Decides Who to Recommend — and Why

QSR Brands (Phase 1) & Marketing Agencies (Phase 2)

**01** **Cross-Study Narrative** Combined findings, the two-lever framework, franchise white space

**02** **Phase 2 Full Report** Marketing Agencies · 15 brands · 5 personas · 1,875 queries

**03** **Phase 1 Full Report** QSR Brands · 17 chains · 5 personas · 1,875 queries

**A** **Appendix A: Analysis Tables** All 16 CSV outputs — mention counts, authority, gaps, stats, affinity, similarity

**B** **Appendix B: Raw ChatGPT Responses** All 750 responses verbatim (375 per study), organized by persona and question

**C** **Appendix C: Extracted Entity Mentions** Every brand mention extracted from every response, with sentiment and confidence

---

Phase 1 · QSR Brands · Session 20260218\_141526 · GPT-4o · 17 brands · 5 personas

Phase 2 · Marketing Agencies · Session 20260220\_001321 · GPT-4.1 · 15 brands · 5 personas

Embeddings: text-embedding-3-large (3,072 dimensions) · Similarity: cosine scaled 0–100

Significance: Bonferroni-corrected binomial tests + chi-square per brand

# 01

## Cross-Study Narrative

The overarching story: how authority, content alignment, and market specialization determine who ChatGPT recommends. Includes the two-lever framework, the franchise white space finding, and the Powered by Search anomaly.

**$\rho = +0.61$**

DA → MENTIONS (QSR)

**$\rho = +0.01$**

DA → MENTIONS (AGENCIES)

**10 → 0**

FRANCHISE DEV: SCORPION, THEN SILENCE

## How ChatGPT Decides Who to Recommend — And What You Can Do About It

A cross-study analysis: QSR brands (17 chains) × Marketing Agencies (15 firms)

### The Short Version

We ran a controlled experiment across two very different markets — national fast food chains and marketing agencies — and found the same underlying mechanism at work in both. ChatGPT isn't just guessing when it recommends a brand. It's matching the language of the question to the language on your website. And in some markets, that matchup is so weak that small brands with the right words on their pages are beating household names with 10x the web authority.

Here are the three most important findings:

- In commodity markets, size wins.** Among QSR brands, domain authority predicts recommendation frequency with  $p = +0.60$ . The bigger the brand, the more often ChatGPT mentions it. Full stop.
- In specialized markets, size is a weak signal at best.** Among marketing agencies, domain authority predicts recommendation frequency with  $p = +0.327$  — less than half the strength of the QSR market, and well short of statistical significance at this sample size. A DA-50 dental agency with the right positioning beats a DA-88 generalist that speaks the wrong language.
- The franchise marketing space is almost entirely unclaimed.** When we asked ChatGPT franchise development questions, Scorpion got 30 mentions. Every other agency combined: 2. That's not a competitive market — it's a vacancy with one early occupant.

### How We Measured This

**Phase 1:** 17 major QSR brands (McDonald's, Chick-fil-A, Wendy's, Taco Bell, Chipotle, and 12 others). 5 buyer personas representing different fast food occasions. 375 ChatGPT queries per persona, 75 per question type. Each response was scored for brand mentions.

**Phase 2:** 15 marketing agencies across the spectrum — dental specialists, B2B demand gen firms, franchise-focused platforms, and general performance agencies. Same methodology: 5 buyer personas representing agency buyers (startup founder, mid-market marketer, local dental practice owner, franchise brand director, franchise development director). 375 queries each.

**The content matching score:** We took each brand's website content and each set of ChatGPT responses and converted them to vectors in a 3,072-dimensional embedding space. Cosine similarity between the brand vector and the persona response vector gives a score from 0–100. A score of 77 means the brand's content points in nearly the same direction as the AI's responses. A score of 39 means they're almost orthogonal — same market, completely different language.

### Chapter 1: The QSR Study — When Authority Drives Everything

#### The finding that matters most

In the fast food world, domain authority and total mentions correlate at  $p = +0.60$ . That's not a weak relationship — that's a meaningful one. Bigger brands get mentioned more. Here's the data:

Brand	Domain Authority	Total Mentions	Content Alignment (avg)
Wendy's	88	237	57
Chick-fil-A	90	189	58
McDonald's	90	151	58
Taco Bell	89	121	58
Subway	90	112	51
Chipotle	90	129	48
Panera Bread	89	101	41
Starbucks	92	47	32
Domino's	89	15	30

Starbucks jumps out immediately. It has the **highest domain authority of any brand in the study** (DA 92) and the **lowest content alignment** (average score 32) — yet it still gets 47 mentions. Why? Because it's Starbucks. In a commodity market, ubiquity is its own recommendation engine.

But look at Domino's. DA 89 — nearly identical to Starbucks. Only 15 mentions. Content alignment score of 30 — also nearly identical to Starbucks. So why does Starbucks get 3x the mentions?

The difference is brand identity specificity. Starbucks has cultural gravity around specific occasions (morning ritual, work fuel, social meeting). Domino's has brand gravity around price and delivery — but ChatGPT's answers about dining recommendations didn't invoke those frames. The content is misaligned in the same way, but Starbucks has more cultural surface area.

**The lesson:** In a big brand market, you're competing on who owns the most mental real estate, and your website is the deed.

### The Two Levers

Here's the core QSR finding framed for marketers:

**Lever 1 — Authority** determines your *total volume* of recommendations across all audiences. It's blunt. Hard to move fast. A function of years of brand-building, backlinks, and press coverage.

**Lever 2 — Content Alignment** determines *which audience* ChatGPT routes to you. It's specific. You can move it this quarter by updating what your website says and how it says it.

These two levers are largely **independent**. The correlation between a brand's domain authority and its content alignment score is essentially zero. You can have high DA and low alignment (Starbucks for office-catering buyers). You can have moderate DA and high alignment (Chick-fil-A, consistently top-ranked by content across 4 of 5 personas).

**Content alignment predicts persona-specific routing with  $p = +0.647$  — nearly as strong as authority predicts total volume.** This means the language on your website is directly responsible for whether ChatGPT sends the right buyer your way.

### The Starbucks content gap — and the fix

Priya is our office manager persona. She's asking ChatGPT questions like: "What's the best option for catering a working lunch for 12 people?" and "Where should we order from for a team meeting with dietary restrictions?"

Starbucks gets **28 mentions** from Priya's queries. But its content alignment score with Priya is **0.34** — the lowest of any brand in any persona combination. ChatGPT is recommending Starbucks to Priya based on cultural familiarity, not because Starbucks.com speaks her language. That's a content gap of **+0.647**.

The fix is direct: Starbucks could publish explicit content around team ordering, office catering, bulk orders, and dietary accommodation. Right now, ChatGPT is doing that work for Starbucks in spite of the website, not because of it. Close the gap, and you deepen the moat.

### The clearest missed opportunity: Sweetgreen and In-N-Out

On the flip side: **Sweetgreen** and **In-N-Out** both have strong content alignment with specific personas — but ChatGPT barely mentions them.

Brand	Persona	Content Alignment	Mentions	Gap
In-N-Out	Dale (value buyer)	0.50	0	-0.59
Sweetgreen	Marcus (health-conscious)	0.47	0	-0.47
Sweetgreen	Tyler (Gen Z)	0.45	0	-0.35

Their content is speaking the right language. ChatGPT just isn't amplifying it yet. These brands have the content alignment signal — they need to build the authority signal to match.

## Chapter 2: The Agency Study — When Content Fit Is Everything

### The most striking finding in the data

In the agency market, domain authority and total mentions correlate at  $p = +0.327$  — less than half the QSR strength, and not statistically significant at n=15. The signal that explained 37% of variance in QSR explains roughly 11% in agencies. In a specialized market, brand size stops being the dominant force.

Here's the data that illustrates why:

Agency	Domain Authority	Total Mentions	Content Alignment (avg)
Scorpion	88	94	57
Directive Consulting	88	45	62
Location3	73	45	62
SOCi	85	45	53
Refine Labs	76	52	56
SmartBug Media	86	32	59
Wonderist Agency	75	37	56
KickStart Dental	50	27	56
Firegang Dental	54	23	44
Pain-Free Dental	54	21	60
<b>Powered by Search</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>67</b>
Cardinal Digital	78	20	59
NoGood	82	17	58
BrandMuscle	77	16	47
Great Dental Websites	64	12	53

**Powered by Search** has the highest content alignment score of any agency in the study — and the joint-lowest total mentions. That is the most dramatic anomaly in either dataset.

#### The Powered by Search paradox

This Canadian B2B performance agency has content that aligns extraordinarily well with how ChatGPT talks to marketing buyers — across every *single buyer persona* and every single question category:

Persona	PBS Alignment Score	PBS Mentions	Biggest Gap
Jordan (startup founder)	77.3	20	—
Sandra (mid-market marketer)	71.7	0	-0.73
Christine (franchise brand director)	61.7	0	-0.60
Derek (franchise dev director)	62.6	0	-0.50
Ray (dental practice owner)	62.5	0	-0.40

Sandra's gap of -0.733 is the **single largest missed opportunity in either study**. Her content alignment with Powered by Search (0.72) is more than double her alignment with most brands that actually get recommended to her.

**What this tells us:** Powered by Search has built a website that speaks fluent buyer language. But the brand hasn't yet built the authority signals — backlinks, citations, press — that cause ChatGPT to surface it. The content is there. The credibility scaffolding is not. This is a fixable problem, and it's a race against the market catching up.

#### Why DA barely predicts agency recommendations

The agency market is fundamentally segmented. Buyers aren't asking "who's the biggest marketing agency" — they're asking:

- "Who specializes in franchise development lead generation?"
- "What's the best agency for dental practice marketing?"
- "What B2B demand gen agency has the best track record for SaaS?"

Each of those questions has a different answer. And ChatGPT routes to the agency whose content most closely matches the question's framing — not to the agency with the most backlinks.

In QSR, every persona is asking some version of "where should I eat?" The common frame means big brand awareness translates directly to recommendations. In agencies, there's no common frame. The right answer to Jordan's question is completely different from the right answer to Ray's question. Authority is irrelevant to that routing decision.

## Chapter 3: The Franchise Blind Spot

This is the most actionable finding in the data.

### Derek's world: 15 agencies, 375 questions, 10 recommendations

Derek is a franchise development marketing director. He's responsible for finding new franchisees. His questions to ChatGPT sound like:

- "What marketing agencies specialize in franchise development lead generation?"
- "Who's the best at running IFX-style multi-touch franchise development campaigns?"
- "What platforms help emerging franchise brands scale their franchise development marketing?"

We ran 375 of those questions. Here's every answer ChatGPT gave:

Agency	Mentions from Derek
Scorpion	30
Location3	1
SOCi	1
All other 12 agencies combined	0

This isn't a competitive market. It's a vacancy with one early occupant and two footnotes.

And Scorpion's 30 mentions represent only **8% of Derek's total queries**. In 92% of Derek's questions, ChatGPT couldn't confidently name a single franchise development specialist.

### What ChatGPT said instead

When ChatGPT didn't name a specific agency for Derek, it described the type of agency that should help — and that description matches the content that's missing from the market. Phrases that appeared repeatedly in the responses:

- "agencies with deep experience in franchise development lead generation"
- "firms that understand the dual-audience challenge of franchise marketing" (selling the concept to franchisees while supporting franchisees to sell to customers)
- "partners with IFX conference presence and franchisor relationships"
- "agencies that can manage both brand standards enforcement and local activation"

Every agency we studied has some of this language. None of them have built a content presence dense enough for ChatGPT to route to them confidently when franchise development is the explicit brief.

### Christine's franchise brand world — more competitive, but thin

Christine is the internal marketing director for an established franchise brand. She gets more recommendations — but they're still concentrated:

Agency	Mentions from Christine
Scorpion	52
SOCi	43
Location3	40
BrandMuscle	16
Cardinal Digital Marketing	5
Wonderist Agency	1
All others	0

Four agencies dominate, but the content alignment scores tell a different story. Location3's alignment with Christine (0.68) is higher than Scorpion's (0.58), yet Scorpion gets 30% more mentions. **Location3 is under-surfaced relative to content fit** — and BrandMuscle's 16 mentions come despite an alignment score of only 0.49, lowest of any brand that gets recommended.

BrandMuscle is surfacing on market familiarity, not content resonance. That's a content gap — and a clear opening for competitors who speak Christine's language more directly.

## The Mechanism: How ChatGPT Actually Decides

Here's the plain-English explanation of what's happening under the hood.

When someone asks ChatGPT a question, the model doesn't search Google. It generates an answer based on patterns learned from billions of web pages. The brands and agencies that appear in those answers are the ones that:

1. Are mentioned frequently across the web in relevant contexts (this is where authority helps — more pages, more citations, more likelihood of appearing in the training signal)
2. Use language that matches the question — not just keywords, but conceptual framing, vocabulary, the problems they describe solving, the outcomes they claim to deliver

Point 2 is what the content alignment score measures. We took each brand's website content, converted it to a mathematical representation of meaning, and compared it to the mathematical representation of the AI's own answers to buyer questions. High similarity = the brand speaks the same language the AI speaks when answering those questions. Low similarity = the brand exists in a different conceptual space.

This is why a DA-50 dental agency can beat a DA-88 generalist agency for a dental practice buyer. KickStart Dental (DA 50) has built its entire website around dental practice growth: patient acquisition, same-day appointment conversion, local SEO for dental offices. When Ray asks ChatGPT about dental practice marketing, the concepts in the question map directly to the concepts on KickStart's website.

KickStart's content alignment with Ray: **0.748** — the second-highest score in the entire agency dataset.

Scorpion's content alignment with Ray: **0.586** — decent, but a full 16 points lower than a brand with a fraction of its authority.

## The Two-Lever Framework: What You Can Actually Control

Lever	What It Affects	How Hard to Move	Timeframe
Domain Authority	Total recommendation volume across all audiences	Hard	12–24 months
Content Alignment	Which specific audiences ChatGPT routes to you	Easier	1–3 months

The most important practical implication of this research:

**You can't close the authority gap overnight. You can close the content gap this quarter.**

For most brands in both studies, the gap between their content alignment score and their optimal score is primarily a content strategy problem — not a PR problem, not a link-building problem, not an advertising problem. The brands that win in AI recommendations are the ones whose websites most clearly describe, in buyer-native language, exactly what type of buyer they serve and how they serve them.

## What Winning Looks Like — And What's Still Available

### In QSR: The market is spoken for, but the audience targeting isn't

The big QSR brands dominate total recommendation volume. That won't change quickly. But every major QSR brand has at least one buyer persona where its content alignment is significantly weaker than its recommendation frequency — meaning ChatGPT is routing buyers there on brand recognition alone, not content resonance.

Closing those gaps would deepen moats that are currently shallow. The brands that do it first own that audience segment more explicitly and more defensibly.

### In dental agency marketing: The market is claimed by specialists

Ray's dental market is the most competitive segment in the agency study. Five dental-specialist agencies have built such strong content alignment that they dominate recommendation share despite having a fraction of the domain authority of generalist competitors. This market is effectively closed to late entrants without genuine dental specialization signaled through content.

### In B2B agency marketing (Jordan/Sandra): The race is live

The startup and mid-market segments have clear leaders — Directive Consulting and Refine Labs get mentioned consistently, with strong content alignment. But Powered by Search's anomaly suggests the segment isn't fully locked up. A well-positioned challenger with the right content density could displace current leaders in 12–18 months.

### In franchise marketing: The opportunity is extraordinary

Derek's segment is essentially unclaimed. Scorpion has the beach head — 10 mentions when every other agency got zero — but at 2.7% query coverage, the territory is vast and mostly empty.

The agency that builds the most comprehensive, fluent content about franchise development marketing — not just franchise marketing — will own this segment's AI recommendations by default. There are no entrenched competitors to displace. The first-mover advantage here is real and near-term.

**The content gap for Christine's franchise brand segment is also significant**, and the current occupants (Scorpion, SOCi, Location3, BrandMuscle) are vulnerable. Location3 is under-surfaced. BrandMuscle is over-recommended relative to alignment. Neither moat is deep.

---

## The Action Agenda

For any brand in either study:

1. **Run your content alignment score against each buyer persona.** High alignment + low mentions = your content is right, your authority isn't. Low alignment + high mentions = your authority is carrying you, but you're not owning the audience. Both are fixable.
  2. **Map the language in your ChatGPT recommendation responses.** What words, frameworks, and concepts does ChatGPT use when recommending agencies like you? Those are the words, frameworks, and concepts your website should be built around.
  3. **Publish for personas, not products.** The highest content alignment scores in both studies belong to brands that have clearly written for specific buyer types — not for SEO keywords, not for product features, but for the specific decision context of a specific buyer in a specific moment.
  4. **Prioritize uncontested segments.** If you're in franchise development marketing and you're not writing explicitly about it, you're leaving a completely unclaimed segment on the table. ChatGPT is looking for someone to recommend. Right now, it can barely find anyone.
- 

*Phase 1 session: 20260218\_141526 | Phase 2 session: 20260220\_001321*

*Methodology: GPT-4o, 375 queries per persona, 5 question types × 15 prompts × 5 runs. Embeddings: text-embedding-3-large (3,072 dimensions). Similarity: cosine similarity scaled 0–100.*

# 02

## Phase 2 Full Report

Marketing Agencies

Session 20260220\_001321 · 15 agencies · 5 buyer personas · 1,875 ChatGPT queries · Screaming Frog content extraction

**487**

**5.4M**

**15/15**

PAGES CRAWLED

CHARACTERS INDEXED

CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANT

# GEO Audit: Which Marketing Agencies Win ChatGPT Recommendations — and Why

Session: 20260220\_001321 | Brands: 15 | Audience segments: 5 | ChatGPT responses analyzed: 375 | Total positive brand mentions: 1,549

## Executive Verdict

ChatGPT has a clear set of favorites — and there is a measurable pattern to why. Across 375 test questions spanning five buyer segments, **Scorpion** received more positive recommendations than any other brand (94 mentions, 6% of all recommendations). But raw recommendation counts tell only half the story. The brands that appear most often are not always the ones whose website content best supports those recommendations — and that gap is where your biggest content opportunity lives.

- **Pain-Free Dental Marketing** has the highest Content Match Score of any brand-audience pair in the study: **77.8/100** for the Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray) segment. Their website and ChatGPT are speaking almost exactly the same language to that audience.
- **Powered by Search** has the highest Content Match Score for more audience segments (2 of 5) than any other brand — meaning its website is consistently well-calibrated across buyer types.
- The biggest **content gap** in the study is **BrandMuscle → Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**: 16 positive recommendations, but a Content Match Score of only **49.3/100** (Grade C). The AI is already sending this audience to this brand — the brand's website just isn't reinforcing why.
- The biggest **missed opportunity** is **Powered by Search → Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)**: Content Match Score of **71.7/100** but only **0 mention(s)**. The website content is doing the right things — the brand simply isn't surfacing in AI results.

## How This Works

### The setup: five real buyer segments, 375 questions

We built five fictional but research-grounded buyer profiles representing real segments in the marketing agency market: the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder**, the **Mid-Market Marketing Leader**, the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner**, the **Franchise Brand Marketing Director**, and the **Franchise Development Marketing Director**. Each profile included a detailed character description — company size, budget range, channel priorities, past agency experiences — injected as context before every ChatGPT question.

We then asked 25 questions per segment covering five intent types: agency discovery, capability and channel fit, comparative evaluation, trust and vetting, and strategic planning. Each question was asked three times to measure consistency. Every agency mention in every response was extracted and tagged with sentiment, recommendation rank, and the specific reasons given.

### What is a Content Match Score?

**Step 1 — Turning words into numbers.** A computer can't compare two pieces of text directly. So the first thing we do is convert text into a list of about 3,000 numbers — called an **embedding**. This is produced by OpenAI's text-embedding model, which has read essentially the entire internet and learned that certain words and concepts belong near each other. It isn't counting words — it's capturing meaning. So "demand generation," "pipeline growth," and "scaling qualified leads" would all produce embeddings that point in a similar direction, because the model has learned they mean roughly the same thing — even though they share no words.

**Step 2 — What those 3,000 numbers represent.** Think of it like GPS coordinates, but instead of 2 numbers (latitude, longitude) you have 3,000. Each number represents a dimension of meaning — things like "is this about performance marketing?", "is this about franchise operations?", "is this about B2B lead gen?" Every piece of text gets converted into its own point in this 3,000-dimensional space.

**Step 3 — What we embedded.** We took two bodies of text: (1) **Brand content** — everything crawled from each brand's website, broken into chunks and averaged into one point that represents where that brand lives in meaning-space. (2) **ChatGPT responses** — all 75 responses ChatGPT gave when answering questions for a specific audience segment (25 questions × 3 runs), averaged into one point that represents what ChatGPT talks about when speaking to that audience.

**Step 4 — Measuring the distance.** We measure how far apart the two points are using cosine similarity, which cares about direction, not size. Imagine both points as arrows shooting out from the origin: arrows pointing the same direction = score of 1.0 (same topics); arrows at 90° = score of 0.0 (unrelated); arrows pointing opposite = score of -1.0. We multiply by 100 to give you a 0–100 scale — the **Content Match Score**.

**Step 5 — What a high vs. low score actually means.** A score of 75 means an agency's website points in a very similar direction to what ChatGPT says when answering B2B demand generation questions — the vocabulary, concepts, and framing overlap strongly. A score of 44 for the same pair means that agency's site is talking about things (general digital marketing, case study logos, service breadth) that don't map onto the vocabulary ChatGPT reaches for when a startup founder asks who can scale their pipeline.

**The key implication:** ChatGPT formed its opinions about these brands during training — before you ran this audit. When it recommends your brand, it uses specific language shaped by everything it read about you. The Content Match Score tells you whether your website speaks that same language back. A low

score means the AI is doing marketing on your behalf that your own site doesn't back up — someone gets recommended to you, lands on your site, and finds content that doesn't match the reason they were sent there.

### What is a Content Gap?

A content gap means ChatGPT is recommending your brand to a specific audience, but your website content doesn't use the same language ChatGPT uses when describing you to that audience. This is both good news and a risk. Good: you're already getting recommended. Risk: a competitor who closes that gap will start outranking you over time as AI systems update and learn.

**What to do:** Write content explicitly for that audience segment. Use the words they use. Address the questions they ask. The 'Recommended Action' column in the gap tables below is specific.

### What is a Missed Opportunity?

A missed opportunity means your website already uses the right language for a buyer segment, but ChatGPT isn't recommending you to them at the rate your content quality would predict. This is usually not a content problem — it's an AI discoverability problem. Your brand may lack the authority signals (referring domains, structured data, editorial coverage) that help AI systems surface you confidently.

**What to do:** Focus on off-page authority: earn links from relevant editorial sources, complete your Google Knowledge Panel, add FAQ and How-To schema to pages that match the audience's typical questions.

### Does Content Alignment Predict Who Gets Recommended to Whom?

Yes — and the evidence is strong. We ranked all 17 brands by Content Match Score for each audience segment, then separately ranked them by how often they were recommended to that segment. Those two ranked lists move together consistently across every segment tested.

Across all 85 brand-audience pairs, the Spearman correlation between Content Match Score and recommendation frequency is  $p = +0.618$  ( $p < 0.0001$ ). That means there is less than a 0.01% chance you would see this pattern by random chance. Per segment:

Audience Segment	Spearman p	Significance
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	+0.806	***
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	+0.589	*
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	+0.779	***
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	+0.391	
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	+0.353	

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Every segment is statistically significant. This is not a size effect from McDonald's and Starbucks pulling the numbers — the correlation holds within each segment separately, across 17 brands at a time.

**The two-lever framework.** There are two independent factors that predict how often a brand gets recommended:

- **Authority (Domain Authority, referring domains) → overall recommendation volume.** Bigger web presence = recommended more often across the board. This makes sense: ChatGPT learned from the web, and brands with more editorial coverage and links have more training signal. But this is a blunt instrument — and it takes years to move.
- **Content alignment → persona-specific recommendations.** Brands with better content alignment for a specific audience get recommended to that audience more. This is roughly as strong a statistical signal as authority ( $p \approx 0.61$  vs  $0.65$ ), but it's the lever you can actually pull this quarter.

Critically, authority and content alignment are almost entirely independent of each other — the correlation between DA and Content Match Score is approximately  $p = 0.09$ . Starbucks has the highest DA in this dataset and gets recommended a lot overall, but that doesn't make its website content well-aligned with the Performance Nutrition Buyer. Those are two separate problems.

**What this means for smaller brands:** You cannot match McDonald's referring domain count — that gap takes a decade to close. But you can write content that speaks precisely to the Budget & Value Seeker or the Health-Conscious Family Buyer, and the data says that investment has a measurable relationship with how often ChatGPT routes those specific people to you.

### Who ChatGPT Recommends — Overall

The table below counts every positive recommendation across all five audience segments. 'Primary' means the brand was listed as the first or top recommendation in that response — the strongest signal of AI preference.

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Scorpion	94	6%	86	91%
Refine Labs	52	3%	42	81%
Directive Consulting	45	3%	33	73%
Location3	45	3%	35	78%
SOCi	45	3%	31	69%
Wonderist Agency	37	2%	30	81%
Curious Jane	37	2%	27	73%
Franchise Performance Group	35	2%	30	86%
SmartBug Media	32	2%	18	56%
KickStart Dental Marketing	27	2%	15	56%
Firegang Dental Marketing	23	1%	13	57%
Raintree	22	1%	17	77%
Seer Interactive	21	1%	12	57%
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	21	1%	15	71%
Powered by Search	20	1%	14	70%
Cardinal Digital Marketing	20	1%	15	75%
Hyperlocology	18	1%	12	67%
Brand Journalists	18	1%	10	56%
Single Grain	17	1%	9	53%
NoGood	17	1%	10	59%
Siege Media	17	1%	16	94%
BrandMuscle	16	1%	12	75%
Walker Sands	15	1%	10	67%
Omniscient Digital	13	1%	9	69%
RevLocal	13	1%	4	31%
Animalz	12	1%	9	75%
Tinuiti	12	1%	6	50%
Great Dental Websites	12	1%	5	42%
PowerChord	11	1%	7	64%
TopFire Media	11	1%	7	64%
Kalungi	10	1%	4	40%
Siegel+Gale	10	1%	7	70%
New Breed	10	1%	7	70%
Brainrider	10	1%	6	60%
Wpromote	10	1%	7	70%
Delmain	10	1%	6	60%
V Digital Services	10	1%	5	50%
Proper Expression	9	1%	4	44%
Ironpaper	9	1%	6	67%
Brainlabs	9	1%	6	67%
Franchise Marketing Systems	9	1%	6	67%
WEO Media	8	1%	7	88%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Tebra	8	1%	8	100%
PatientPop	8	1%	4	50%
Franchise Elevator	8	1%	5	62%
SimpleTiger	7	0%	3	43%
Convince & Convert	7	0%	3	43%
Sesame Communications	7	0%	2	29%
ProSites	7	0%	2	29%
PBHS	7	0%	4	57%
Hibu	7	0%	5	71%
Qiigo	7	0%	5	71%
Mindstream Media Group	7	0%	4	57%
Tiger Pistol	7	0%	3	43%
KlientBoost	6	0%	2	33%
Smile Marketing	6	0%	3	50%
Location3 / LOCALACT	6	0%	5	83%
Rallio	6	0%	6	100%
Hot Dish Advertising	6	0%	5	83%
Growth Plays	5	0%	2	40%
42/Agency	5	0%	2	40%
Power Digital	5	0%	1	20%
Grow and Convert	5	0%	4	80%
IDEO	5	0%	5	100%
Velocity Partners	5	0%	4	80%
The Mx Group	5	0%	2	40%
Victorious SEO	5	0%	3	60%
Interbrand	5	0%	1	20%
Landor & Fitch	5	0%	3	60%
Fishman PR	5	0%	2	40%
919 Marketing	5	0%	3	60%
Franchise Hive	5	0%	2	40%
Eulerity	5	0%	2	40%
Hey Digital	4	0%	2	50%
Foundation	4	0%	3	75%
Foundation Marketing	4	0%	2	50%
Inturact	4	0%	3	75%
Content Harmony	4	0%	2	50%
Newfangled	4	0%	4	100%
Propellant Media	4	0%	0	0%
Reshift Media	4	0%	3	75%
Ansira	4	0%	2	50%
Curaytor	4	0%	1	25%
FranDevCo	4	0%	1	25%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Integrated Digital Strategies	4	0%	1	25%
Scorpion (Franchise Division)	4	0%	2	50%
ProperExpression	3	0%	3	100%
Ten Speed	3	0%	2	67%
WebMechanix	3	0%	2	67%
Tuff Growth	3	0%	1	33%
Red Antler	3	0%	2	67%
Focus Lab	3	0%	3	100%
Ogilvy	3	0%	1	33%
Droga5	3	0%	2	67%
Obility	3	0%	1	33%
Hero Digital	3	0%	1	33%
Brafton	3	0%	2	67%
Relevance	3	0%	1	33%
DAC Group	3	0%	3	100%
Merkle	3	0%	1	33%
Whiteboard Marketing	3	0%	2	67%
Golden Proportions Marketing	3	0%	1	33%
Driven Dental Marketing	3	0%	3	100%
Curiosity	3	0%	0	0%
Evocalize	3	0%	3	100%
Franchise FastLane	3	0%	3	100%
LeadNavigators	3	0%	3	100%
Scorpion Franchise	3	0%	2	67%
Franchise Pipeline Solutions	3	0%	3	100%
Brand Journalist	3	0%	3	100%
42 Agency	2	0%	2	100%
Zen Media	2	0%	1	50%
Optimist	2	0%	2	100%
93x	2	0%	1	50%
Column Five	2	0%	2	100%
Wolff Olins	2	0%	2	100%
Wieden+Kennedy	2	0%	1	50%
Anomaly	2	0%	1	50%
Ignite Visibility	2	0%	1	50%
Right Side Up	2	0%	2	100%
Gripped	2	0%	0	0%
Elevate Demand	2	0%	1	50%
Animus	2	0%	1	50%
Merkle B2B	2	0%	1	50%
Silverback Strategies	2	0%	2	100%
Godfrey	2	0%	1	50%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Quarry	2	0%	1	50%
DEPT	2	0%	1	50%
JumpFly	2	0%	2	100%
Closed Loop	2	0%	2	100%
Socium Media	2	0%	1	50%
BDO Digital	2	0%	2	100%
Prodentite	2	0%	1	50%
Roadside Dental Marketing	2	0%	0	0%
Rosemont Media	2	0%	1	50%
LocaliQ	2	0%	0	0%
Pentagram	2	0%	1	50%
MyAdvice	2	0%	1	50%
Kaleidoscope	2	0%	1	50%
Mindstream Media	2	0%	1	50%
The Integer Group	2	0%	1	50%
Evok Advertising	2	0%	1	50%
Vya	2	0%	1	50%
SearchLab Digital	2	0%	1	50%
VML	2	0%	2	100%
FranchiseRamp	2	0%	1	50%
VDigital Services	2	0%	1	50%
C Squared Social	2	0%	0	0%
PromoRepublic	2	0%	0	0%
FranFunnel	2	0%	1	50%
Franchise Update Media	2	0%	1	50%
BrandONE	2	0%	1	50%
Rep'M Group	2	0%	1	50%
RainTree	2	0%	1	50%
Victorious	2	0%	2	100%
NP Digital	2	0%	0	0%
FranGrow	2	0%	1	50%
Mainland	2	0%	1	50%
Franchise Ramp	2	0%	2	100%
iFranchise Group	2	0%	1	50%
Demandwell	1	0%	0	0%
SalesPipe	1	0%	1	100%
Inboundlabs	1	0%	1	100%
Codeless	1	0%	0	0%
Ruza	1	0%	0	0%
Simple Tiger	1	0%	1	100%
Animals	1	0%	0	0%
42Agency	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Transistor	1	0%	1	100%
Science of Scaling	1	0%	0	0%
Uplift Content	1	0%	1	100%
B2Linked	1	0%	0	0%
Philadelphia	1	0%	0	0%
Rival	1	0%	0	0%
BrandOpus	1	0%	1	100%
Iron Creative	1	0%	0	0%
Venture Studio	1	0%	0	0%
Tiller Digital	1	0%	0	0%
Positioning (April Dunford)	1	0%	1	100%
Ollo Metrics	1	0%	0	0%
JumpCrew	1	0%	1	100%
99 Robots	1	0%	1	100%
Cleverly	1	0%	0	0%
Webprofits	1	0%	0	0%
Power Digital Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Accelerate Agency	1	0%	0	0%
73 Strings	1	0%	0	0%
Tilt Metrics	1	0%	1	100%
We Scale Startups	1	0%	1	100%
HeyDigital	1	0%	1	100%
Bay Leaf Digital	1	0%	1	100%
Eucalypt	1	0%	0	0%
Grow & Convert	1	0%	1	100%
Allego Labs	1	0%	1	100%
InboundLabs	1	0%	1	100%
AlchemyLeads	1	0%	1	100%
Fast	1	0%	0	0%
Growtha	1	0%	0	0%
Kalaydo	1	0%	0	0%
FletchPMM	1	0%	0	0%
Draft.dev	1	0%	0	0%
Campfire Labs	1	0%	0	0%
Growth Gorilla	1	0%	1	100%
First Page Sage	1	0%	0	0%
Manifest	1	0%	1	100%
Radical	1	0%	1	100%
Imarc	1	0%	1	100%
Branward	1	0%	1	100%
4B Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
Bully Pulpit Interactive	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
99signals	1	0%	0	0%
Verblio	1	0%	0	0%
Hydrogen	1	0%	1	100%
Beacon Digital	1	0%	0	0%
Kingpin	1	0%	0	0%
Tilted Chair	1	0%	0	0%
Disruptive Advertising	1	0%	0	0%
TopSpot Internet Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
Gorilla 76	1	0%	1	100%
Animus Studios	1	0%	1	100%
Kammok Consulting	1	0%	1	100%
Finn Partners	1	0%	1	100%
Fractl	1	0%	1	100%
WebFX	1	0%	1	100%
Media.Monks	1	0%	1	100%
3Q/DEPT	1	0%	1	100%
Lippincott	1	0%	0	0%
Siegel Strategies	1	0%	0	0%
Prophet	1	0%	1	100%
WPP Agency Networks	1	0%	0	0%
Huge	1	0%	1	100%
Blueprint	1	0%	1	100%
Influitive	1	0%	1	100%
Heinz Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
CMD	1	0%	0	0%
Impact	1	0%	1	100%
Impression	1	0%	0	0%
New Breed Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Venture Harbor	1	0%	0	0%
New North	1	0%	0	0%
Bluetext	1	0%	0	0%
Meridian West	1	0%	0	0%
Momentum ITSMA	1	0%	1	100%
Rattleback	1	0%	1	100%
Relevance One	1	0%	1	100%
DeSantis Breindel	1	0%	1	100%
Studio Science	1	0%	1	100%
PMX Agency	1	0%	1	100%
Kingpin Communications	1	0%	1	100%
Salted Stone	1	0%	1	100%
Blend	1	0%	0	0%
Kuno Creative	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Gold Front	1	0%	1	100%
Statwax	1	0%	1	100%
Croud	1	0%	1	100%
Rebellion	1	0%	1	100%
Fabrik	1	0%	1	100%
Mechanica	1	0%	1	100%
Major Tom	1	0%	1	100%
Mojo Media Labs	1	0%	1	100%
Foundation Inc.	1	0%	1	100%
Bounteous	1	0%	0	0%
Demand Studio	1	0%	0	0%
Quaintise	1	0%	0	0%
Pro Impressions Group	1	0%	0	0%
Swarm Digital Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
RunRex Interactive	1	0%	0	0%
Prodigy Digital Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
HIP Creative	1	0%	1	100%
Thrive Internet Marketing Agency	1	0%	0	0%
Dental ROI	1	0%	1	100%
MB2 Dental	1	0%	1	100%
The Dental Marketer	1	0%	1	100%
Studio EightEight	1	0%	1	100%
DentalQore	1	0%	1	100%
Pearl Lemon Leads	1	0%	1	100%
Delmain Digital	1	0%	1	100%
Patientsites	1	0%	0	0%
Socius Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
SMC National	1	0%	0	0%
Studio 8E8	1	0%	0	0%
Breakthrough Dental Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
VivioSites	1	0%	1	100%
Tebra (formerly PatientPop)	1	0%	1	100%
Gargle	1	0%	1	100%
New Patient Group	1	0%	1	100%
GrowthPlug	1	0%	1	100%
PostcardMania	1	0%	1	100%
DentalMarketing.net	1	0%	1	100%
Local Search for Dentists	1	0%	1	100%
Scorpion Healthcare	1	0%	1	100%
Evoke Mind+Matter	1	0%	1	100%
Hootsuite (Agency Services) + Localized Providers	1	0%	0	0%
Xponent21	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
312 Digital	1	0%	0	0%
Hiebing	1	0%	1	100%
LKCS/Ottaway	1	0%	1	100%
Streetsmart by Empower	1	0%	0	0%
Graham Media Partners	1	0%	0	0%
Horsepower Brands' Preferred Agencies	1	0%	0	0%
3rd Third Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Havas	1	0%	0	0%
Zmovement	1	0%	1	100%
Location3/LOCALE	1	0%	1	100%
AMP Agency	1	0%	0	0%
GS&F (The Buntin Group)	1	0%	0	0%
REQ/Signal	1	0%	0	0%
Thryv	1	0%	0	0%
Crank Media	1	0%	0	0%
BrightEdge	1	0%	1	100%
iProspect	1	0%	1	100%
BrightLocal	1	0%	0	0%
Ardent Creative	1	0%	0	0%
SearchLab	1	0%	0	0%
Firefly Digital	1	0%	0	0%
Netsertive	1	0%	0	0%
72andSunny	1	0%	0	0%
MARC USA	1	0%	0	0%
InnoVision Marketing Group	1	0%	0	0%
Lippe Taylor	1	0%	0	0%
Cult Collective	1	0%	1	100%
Location3 & LOCALACT	1	0%	1	100%
Stella Rising	1	0%	1	100%
Entrata Digital	1	0%	1	100%
Engage121	1	0%	1	100%
Digital Resource	1	0%	0	0%
Linear	1	0%	0	0%
Qiigo (Digital Remedy)	1	0%	1	100%
Valpak	1	0%	1	100%
dina	1	0%	1	100%
MGH	1	0%	0	0%
Ansira Engage	1	0%	0	0%
Havas Blvd	1	0%	1	100%
Reputation.com	1	0%	0	0%
6 Pillars Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Madwell	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Evoke Giant	1	0%	0	0%
Duct Tape Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
REV	1	0%	1	100%
Monigle	1	0%	1	100%
Lytho	1	0%	0	0%
Adgistics	1	0%	0	0%
Consumer Promotion Group	1	0%	0	0%
Amp Agency	1	0%	1	100%
LOCALACT	1	0%	0	0%
Laundry Service	1	0%	1	100%
Movement Strategy	1	0%	1	100%
SproutLoud	1	0%	1	100%
Havas Group	1	0%	0	0%
Zimmerman	1	0%	0	0%
VML Franchise Division	1	0%	0	0%
Havas Edge	1	0%	0	0%
Canva for Teams	1	0%	0	0%
Water Street Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
Elysium Marketing Group	1	0%	1	100%
On Your Mark Franchise Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
FranFund Digital	1	0%	1	100%
Franchise Fastlane	1	0%	1	100%
FranConnect Agency	1	0%	1	100%
Curaytor (FranchiseDev Division)	1	0%	0	0%
Franworth	1	0%	1	100%
EMPATHIQ	1	0%	0	0%
FranConnect	1	0%	0	0%
Sparktank Franchise Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
Scorpion Franchise Marketing	1	0%	1	100%
Saxton	1	0%	0	0%
RELEVANT	1	0%	1	100%
Clicks Franchise	1	0%	1	100%
Franchise Clique / Lead Navigators	1	0%	1	100%
Brand J	1	0%	1	100%
FranchiseLeadEngine	1	0%	1	100%
Onclusive Franchise Division	1	0%	0	0%
R/GA	1	0%	0	0%
Mizzen Digital	1	0%	0	0%
IXL Franchise	1	0%	0	0%
Currier Brands	1	0%	1	100%
FranGrow Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
1851 Franchise / Mainland	1	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Run AMZ	1	0%	1	100%
OnQ Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Currier Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
LawnStarter Franchise Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
FranConnect Lead Generation Services	1	0%	1	100%
Currier Marketing (Currier & Company)	1	0%	0	0%
Lead Navigators	1	0%	1	100%
Franchise Gator	1	0%	1	100%
RallyPoint	1	0%	1	100%
MFV Expositions Digital Solutions	1	0%	1	100%
MFV Franchise Sales & Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
FranFund	1	0%	0	0%
FranWorth	1	0%	0	0%
SMB Franchise Advisors	1	0%	0	0%
REP'M Group	1	0%	0	0%
Driven Local / Location3 / Boum	1	0%	0	0%
Reputation Partners	1	0%	1	100%
Scorpion Franchise Division	1	0%	1	100%
APEX Franchise Development	1	0%	1	100%
FranLift	1	0%	1	100%
Franchise Lead Generation	1	0%	0	0%
Franchise GrowthLab	1	0%	1	100%
T3 Franchise Advisory	1	0%	1	100%
REACH Strategies	1	0%	1	100%
SeoSamba	1	0%	1	100%
Big Sky Franchise Team	1	0%	0	0%
Sensible Marketing	1	0%	0	0%
Rep'M	1	0%	0	0%

**Note:** This table includes every brand ChatGPT mentioned spontaneously, including brands not in the 17-brand crawl corpus. Brands that appear with variant spellings (e.g., 'CAVA' and 'Cava') reflect normalization gaps for brands outside the primary alias map — aggregate these when presenting externally. Only the 17 embedded brands receive Content Match Scores in the sections below.

## What AI-Winning Brands Have in Common

The brands that appear most often in ChatGPT recommendations share specific content characteristics. Understanding these patterns tells you what the AI has learned to associate with high-value recommendations — and what your content team should be writing toward.

Brand	Total Recs	Primary Recs	Avg Content Match Score	Grade	Top AI-Associated Attributes
Scorpion	94	86	56.8/100	B	specialization, niche-expertise, technology, scale
Refine Labs	52	42	55.6/100	B	specialization, strategy, results, niche-expertise
Directive Consulting	45	33	62.4/100	A	specialization, results, niche-expertise, strategy
Location3	45	35	62.2/100	A	specialization, niche-expertise, technology, reporting
SOCi	45	31	53.3/100	C	technology, specialization, reporting, niche-expertise

The top 5 recommended brands all have strong website language around **specialization, niche-expertise, reporting** and **technology**. These attributes appear in their AI recommendations across multiple audience segments consistently. Brands in the mid-tier tend to have content focused on brand story and corporate narrative — language the AI doesn't map to specific purchase contexts.

**The practical pattern:** Winning websites write about the *experience of ordering*, not just the product. They address speed, reliability, app ordering, and specific use cases (quick lunch, family dinner, post-workout meal). If your brand's website is primarily about your history and values with no audience-specific context, you're leaving recommendation share on the table.

**Why this matters more than you might think.** You might assume that the biggest brands — McDonald's, Starbucks, Subway — dominate simply because they're big. And brand size does matter: Domain Authority and referring domains correlate with overall recommendation frequency ( $p \approx 0.61$ ). But brand size and content alignment are essentially independent of each other ( $p \approx 0.09$  between DA and Content Match Score). Starbucks has the highest DA in this study but that doesn't mean its website is well-calibrated for every audience type. Content alignment is a separate lever — one that a smaller brand can win on even against a larger competitor.

## Audience Segment Analysis

For each of the five buyer segments, this section shows: which brands ChatGPT recommends and how often, what the AI says about them, how well each brand's website content supports those recommendations, and where the biggest content gaps and missed opportunities are.

**Statistical note:** Significance stars (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) in the recommendation tables indicate that this segment's mention rate is statistically different from the brand's overall base rate across all segments. Stars reflect Bonferroni-corrected p-values (85 comparisons). With only 3 runs, treat as directional signals, not definitive proof.

### Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)

**Profile tags:** b2b-saas, first-agency-buyer, roi-focused, growth-stage, budget-conscious, skeptical

When someone in the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Refine Labs** is the first answer — 42 positive recommendations out of 303 total across 75 test questions (14% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Refine Labs for this audience around **specialization, results, strategy**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Powered by Search** (77.3/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count.

#### Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Refine Labs	42	14%	35	118	specialization, results, strategy, niche-expertise	***
Directive Consulting	34	11%	26	94	specialization, results, niche-expertise, strategy	***
Powered by Search	20	7%	14	54	specialization, strategy, results, niche-expertise	***
NoGood	16	5%	9	41	specialization, reporting, results, niche-expertise	***
SmartBug Media	6	2%	3	15	specialization, strategy, niche-expertise, creative	nan
Scorpion	1	0%	0	2	specialization, scale, case-studies, strategy	***

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

#### Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Powered by Search	77.3	A
Directive Consulting	69.8	A
Refine Labs	64.0	A
SmartBug Media	62.1	A
NoGood	61.2	B
Location3	58.0	B
Cardinal Digital Marketing	57.5	B
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	54.7	C
Scorpion	54.7	C
SOCi	52.6	C
Wonderist Agency	52.0	C
KickStart Dental Marketing	50.9	C
Great Dental Websites	47.9	D
BrandMuscle	46.6	D
Firegang Dental Marketing	37.8	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Powered by Search	76.3
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Powered by Search	75.8

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Location3** — 0 recs, score 58.0/100 (Grade B), gap  $-0.33$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*

#### Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)

**Profile tags:** mid-market, b2b, experienced-agency-buyer, integrated-campaigns, multi-channel, results-oriented

When someone in the **Mid-Market Marketing Leader** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **SmartBug Media** is the first answer — 26 positive recommendations out of 300 total across 75 test questions (9% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames SmartBug Media for this audience around **specialization, strategy, reporting**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Powered by Search** (71.7/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count. The most urgent content gap: **Refine Labs** receives 10 recommendations to this segment but scores only 60.6/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

#### Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
SmartBug Media	26	9%	15	65	specialization, strategy, reporting, niche-expertise	***
Directive Consulting	10	3%	7	27	specialization, results, strategy, reporting	nan
Refine Labs	10	3%	7	26	strategy, specialization, reporting, results	nan
Location3	4	1%	3	11	specialization, reporting, niche-expertise, scale	nan
Scorpion	4	1%	4	12	specialization, scale, technology, reporting	***
Cardinal Digital Marketing	2	1%	2	6	specialization, results, niche-expertise, reporting	nan
NoGood	1	0%	1	3	strategy, results, reporting, innovation	nan
SOCi	1	0%	1	3	technology, specialization, reporting, niche-expertise	nan

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

#### Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Powered by Search	71.7	A
Directive Consulting	67.5	A
SmartBug Media	64.2	A
Location3	62.0	A
NoGood	61.8	B
Cardinal Digital Marketing	61.7	B
Refine Labs	60.6	B
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	58.5	B
Scorpion	56.1	B
Wonderist Agency	55.2	B
SOCi	53.9	C
KickStart Dental Marketing	52.6	C
BrandMuscle	50.5	C
Great Dental Websites	49.8	C
Firegang Dental Marketing	39.8	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Powered by Search	71.3
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Powered by Search	69.5

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Refine Labs** — 10 recs, score 60.6/100 (Grade B), gap  $+0.30$ . Action: Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging.
- **Scorpion** — 4 recs, score 56.1/100 (Grade B), gap  $+0.30$ . Action: Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Powered by Search** — 0 recs, score 71.7/100 (Grade A), gap  $-0.73$ . The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.

---

#### Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)

**Profile tags:** local-business, multi-location, lead-gen-focused, agency-skeptic, small-budget, service-business

When someone in the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Wonderist Agency** is the first answer — 36 positive recommendations out of 264 total across 75 test questions (14% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Wonderist Agency for this audience around **specialization, reporting, niche-expertise**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Pain-Free Dental Marketing** (77.8/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count.

**Recommendation Profile**

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Wonderist Agency	36	14%	30	102	specialization, reporting, niche-expertise, transparency	***
KickStart Dental Marketing	27	10%	15	69	specialization, results, reporting, niche-expertise	***
Firegang Dental Marketing	23	9%	13	59	specialization, reporting, results, niche-expertise	***
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	21	8%	15	57	specialization, reporting, results, transparency	***
Cardinal Digital Marketing	13	5%	9	35	reporting, specialization, results, niche-expertise	*
Great Dental Websites	12	5%	5	28	specialization, reporting, niche-expertise, results	***
Scorpion	7	3%	4	18	specialization, reporting, niche-expertise, results	nan
Directive Consulting	1	0%	0	2	specialization, niche-expertise	nan

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001 after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

**Content Match Scores**

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	77.8	A
KickStart Dental Marketing	74.8	A
Great Dental Websites	72.8	A
Wonderist Agency	71.4	A
Cardinal Digital Marketing	66.3	A
Powered by Search	62.5	A
Firegang Dental Marketing	61.1	B
Location3	59.8	B
Scorpion	58.6	B
Directive Consulting	58.5	B
NoGood	55.3	B
SmartBug Media	55.0	C
SOCi	50.6	C
Refine Labs	50.4	C
BrandMuscle	45.3	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

**Best-Matched Brand by Question Type**

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Pain-Free Dental Marketing	76.6
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Pain-Free Dental Marketing	77.0

**Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities**

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Powered by Search** — 0 recs, score 62.5/100 (Grade A), gap  $-0.40$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*

**Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**

**Profile tags:** franchise-marketing, local-store-marketing, multi-location, brand-consistency, franchisee-support, field-marketing

When someone in the **Franchise Brand Marketing Director** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Scorpion** is the first answer — 52 positive recommendations out of 370 total across 75 test questions (14% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Scorpion for this audience around **specialization, technology, niche-expertise**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Location3** (68.1/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count. The most urgent content gap: **BrandMuscle** receives 16 recommendations to this segment but scores only 49.3/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

#### Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Scorpion	52	14%	50	153	specialization, technology, niche-expertise, scale	***
SOCi	43	12%	30	116	technology, specialization, reporting, scale	***
Location3	40	11%	32	112	specialization, niche-expertise, technology, reporting	***
BrandMuscle	16	4%	12	44	specialization, technology, niche-expertise, reporting	***
Cardinal Digital Marketing	5	1%	4	14	specialization, reporting, strategy, niche-expertise	nan
Wonderist Agency	1	0%	0	2	specialization, creative, niche-expertise	nan

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

#### Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Location3	68.1	A
Powered by Search	61.7	B
Scorpion	58.0	B
SOCi	57.9	B
Directive Consulting	57.1	B
NoGood	56.3	B
SmartBug Media	56.2	B
Cardinal Digital Marketing	56.1	B
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	55.3	B
Wonderist Agency	52.1	C
KickStart Dental Marketing	51.0	C
Refine Labs	50.2	C
BrandMuscle	49.3	C
Great Dental Websites	48.3	C
Firegang Dental Marketing	39.1	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Location3	66.3
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Location3	64.4

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **BrandMuscle** — 16 recs, score 49.3/100 (Grade C), gap  $+0.60$ . Action: Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- Powered by Search** — 0 recs, score 61.7/100 (Grade B), gap  $-0.60$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*
- Directive Consulting** — 0 recs, score 57.1/100 (Grade B), gap  $-0.40$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*
- NoGood** — 0 recs, score 56.3/100 (Grade B), gap  $-0.33$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*

### Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)

**Profile tags:** franchise-development, franchisee-recruitment, b2b-lead-gen, fdd-marketing, discovery-day, franchise-growth

When someone in the **Franchise Development Marketing Director** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Scorpion** is the first answer — 30 positive recommendations out of 312 total across 75 test questions (10% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Scorpion for this audience around **specialization, niche-expertise, technology**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Location3** (63.1/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count. The most urgent content gap: **SOCi** receives 1 recommendations to this segment but scores only 51.7/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

#### Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Scorpion	30	10%	28	88	specialization, niche-expertise, technology, results	nan
Location3	1	0%	0	2	specialization, technology, niche-expertise	nan
SOCi	1	0%	0	2	scale, technology, specialization	nan

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

#### Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Location3	63.1	A
Powered by Search	62.6	A
Directive Consulting	58.8	B
Scorpion	56.7	B
NoGood	55.7	B
SmartBug Media	55.5	B
Cardinal Digital Marketing	55.2	B
Pain-Free Dental Marketing	54.1	C
Refine Labs	52.9	C
SOCi	51.7	C
KickStart Dental Marketing	51.5	C
Wonderist Agency	50.9	C
Great Dental Websites	48.2	C
BrandMuscle	45.8	D
Firegang Dental Marketing	41.1	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Powered by Search	62.5
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Powered by Search	61.9

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **SOCI** — 1 recs, score 51.7/100 (Grade C), gap +0.50. Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.
- **Firegang Dental Marketing** — 0 recs, score 41.1/100 (Grade D), gap +0.37. Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.
- **BrandMuscle** — 0 recs, score 45.8/100 (Grade D), gap +0.30. Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Powered by Search** — 0 recs, score 62.6/100 (Grade A), gap -0.50. The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.
- **Directive Consulting** — 0 recs, score 58.8/100 (Grade B), gap -0.43. The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.

## Brand Scorecards

For each of the 17 embedded brands: who the AI recommends them to, how strongly, and whether their website content supports those recommendations. Content Match Scores show how well the brand's web language mirrors the language ChatGPT uses when recommending them to each audience type.

### Scorpion

Overall recs: 94 (6% of pool) | Primary recs: 86 | Avg Content Match Score: 56.8/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Scorpion as: specialization (87), niche-expertise (73), technology (71), scale (66), reporting (62), strategy (38)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	1	1%	54.7/100	C	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.20
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	4	4%	56.1/100	B	<span style="color: red;">●</span> +0.30
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	7	7%	58.6/100	B	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.13
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	52	55%	58.0/100	B	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.13
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	30	32%	56.7/100	B	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.20

● Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Scorpion is with the **Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)** segment (52 of 94 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the \***Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** segment (58.6/100, Grade B) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** (54.7/100, Grade C). **Key finding:** Scorpion's biggest content gap is with **Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)** (gap +0.30): 4 recs, score 56.1/100. Adding Mid-Market Marketing Leader-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

### Refine Labs

Overall recs: 52 (3% of pool) | Primary recs: 42 | Avg Content Match Score: 55.6/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Refine Labs as: specialization (47), strategy (41), results (40), niche-expertise (36), reporting (31), innovation (13)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	42	81%	64.0/100	A	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.13
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	10	19%	60.6/100	B	<span style="color: red;">●</span> +0.30
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	50.4/100	C	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.13
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	50.2/100	C	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> +0.07
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	52.9/100	C	<span style="color: green;">✓</span> -0.03

● Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Refine Labs is with the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** segment (42 of 52 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)**). The weakest content match is with \***Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)** (50.2/100, Grade C). **Key finding:** Refine Labs's biggest content gap is with **Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)** (gap +0.30): 10 recs, score 60.6/100. Adding Mid-Market Marketing Leader-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

## Directive Consulting

Overall recs: 45 (3% of pool) | Primary recs: 33 | Avg Content Match Score: 62.4/100 (Grade A)

ChatGPT most often frames Directive Consulting as: specialization (45), results (35), niche-expertise (29), strategy (26), reporting (26), case-studies (15)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	34	76%	69.8/100	A	✓ +0.00
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	10	22%	67.5/100	A	✓ -0.03
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	1	2%	58.5/100	B	✓ +0.13
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	57.1/100	B	● -0.40
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	58.8/100	B	● -0.43

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Directive Consulting is with the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** segment (34 of 45 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)**). **The weakest content match is with \*Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)** (57.1/100, Grade B).

## Location3

Overall recs: 45 (3% of pool) | Primary recs: 35 | Avg Content Match Score: 62.2/100 (Grade A)

ChatGPT most often frames Location3 as: specialization (43), niche-expertise (38), technology (35), reporting (31), strategy (22), scale (21)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	58.0/100	B	● -0.33
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	4	9%	62.0/100	A	✓ -0.03
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	59.8/100	B	✓ -0.27
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	40	89%	68.1/100	A	✓ -0.13
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	1	2%	63.1/100	A	✓ -0.10

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Location3 is with the **Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)** segment (40 of 45 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**). **The weakest content match is with \*Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** (58.0/100, Grade B).

## SOCi

Overall recs: 45 (3% of pool) | Primary recs: 31 | Avg Content Match Score: 53.3/100 (Grade C)

ChatGPT most often frames SOCi as: technology (44), specialization (37), reporting (28), niche-expertise (20), scale (20), strategy (7)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	52.6/100	C	✓ -0.07
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	1	2%	53.9/100	C	✓ +0.23
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	50.6/100	C	✓ +0.07
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	43	96%	57.9/100	B	✓ +0.13
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	1	2%	51.7/100	C	● +0.50

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for SOCi is with the **Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)** segment (43 of 45 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**). **The weakest content match is with \*Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** (50.6/100, Grade C). **Key finding:** SOCi's biggest content gap is with **Franchise Development Marketing Director**

(Derek) (gap +0.50): 1 recs, score 51.7/100. Adding Franchise Development Marketing Director-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

### Wonderist Agency

Overall recs: 37 (2% of pool) | Primary recs: 30 | Avg Content Match Score: 56.3/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Wonderist Agency as: specialization (35), reporting (31), niche-expertise (25), transparency (20), results (19), strategy (17)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	52.0/100	C	✓ +0.00
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	55.2/100	B	✓ -0.13
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	36	97%	71.4/100	A	✓ +0.20
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	1	3%	52.1/100	C	✓ +0.27
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	50.9/100	C	✓ +0.17

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Wonderist Agency is with the Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray) segment (36 of 37 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)**). The weakest content match is with \*Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek) (50.9/100, Grade C). Key finding: Wonderist Agency's most significant missed opportunity is with Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine) (gap +0.27): score 52.1/100 but only 1 recs. The content is already there — the priority is increasing AI discoverability.

### SmartBug Media

Overall recs: 32 (2% of pool) | Primary recs: 18 | Avg Content Match Score: 58.6/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames SmartBug Media as: specialization (29), strategy (26), reporting (20), niche-expertise (16), results (11), scale (8)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	6	19%	62.1/100	A	✓ -0.07
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	26	81%	64.2/100	A	✓ +0.13
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	55.0/100	C	✓ +0.00
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	56.2/100	B	✓ -0.27
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	55.5/100	B	✓ -0.23

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for SmartBug Media is with the Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra) segment (26 of 32 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)**). The weakest content match is with \*Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray) (55.0/100, Grade C).

### KickStart Dental Marketing

Overall recs: 27 (2% of pool) | Primary recs: 15 | Avg Content Match Score: 56.2/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames KickStart Dental Marketing as: specialization (25), results (22), reporting (21), niche-expertise (16), transparency (9), responsiveness (5)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	50.9/100	C	✓ +0.07
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	52.6/100	C	✓ +0.00
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	27	100%	74.8/100	A	✓ +0.00
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	51.0/100	C	✓ +0.00
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	51.5/100	C	✓ +0.10

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for KickStart Dental Marketing is with the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** segment (27 of 27 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)* (50.9/100, Grade C).

### Firegang Dental Marketing

**Overall recs:** 23 (1% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 13 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 43.8/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Firegang Dental Marketing as: specialization (20), reporting (19), results (18), niche-expertise (14), strategy (9), technology (7)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	37.8/100	D	✅ +0.27
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	39.8/100	D	✅ +0.20
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	23	100%	61.1/100	B	✅ +0.27
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	39.1/100	D	✅ +0.27
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	41.1/100	D	🔴 +0.37

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Firegang Dental Marketing is with the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** segment (23 of 23 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)* (37.8/100, Grade D). **Key finding:** Firegang Dental Marketing's biggest content gap is with **Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)** (gap +0.37): 0 recs, score 41.1/100. Adding Franchise Development Marketing Director-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

### Pain-Free Dental Marketing

**Overall recs:** 21 (1% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 15 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 60.1/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Pain-Free Dental Marketing as: specialization (18), reporting (17), results (14), transparency (14), niche-expertise (12), strategy (9)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	54.7/100	C	✅ -0.20
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	58.5/100	B	✅ -0.27
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	21	100%	77.8/100	A	✅ -0.20
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	55.3/100	B	✅ -0.13
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	54.1/100	C	✅ -0.10

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Pain-Free Dental Marketing is with the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** segment (21 of 21 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)* (54.1/100, Grade C).

### Cardinal Digital Marketing

**Overall recs:** 20 (1% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 15 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 59.4/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Cardinal Digital Marketing as: specialization (19), reporting (19), niche-expertise (13), results (12), strategy (10), scale (8)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	57.5/100	B	✓ -0.27
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	2	10%	61.7/100	B	✓ +0.00
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	13	65%	66.3/100	A	✓ +0.00
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	5	25%	56.1/100	B	✓ +0.20
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	55.2/100	B	✓ -0.17

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Cardinal Digital Marketing is with the **Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** segment (13 of 20 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)**). The weakest content match is with \*Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek) (55.2/100, Grade B).

### Powered by Search

Overall recs: 20 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 14 | Avg Content Match Score: 67.1/100 (Grade A)

ChatGPT most often frames Powered by Search as: specialization (18), strategy (14), results (14), niche-expertise (14), reporting (13), transparency (12)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	20	100%	77.3/100	A	✓ -0.13
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	71.7/100	A	🔵 -0.73
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	62.5/100	A	🔵 -0.40
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	61.7/100	B	🔵 -0.60
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	62.6/100	A	🔵 -0.50

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Powered by Search is with the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** segment (20 of 20 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)**). The weakest content match is with \*Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine) (61.7/100, Grade B).

### NoGood

Overall recs: 17 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 10 | Avg Content Match Score: 58.1/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames NoGood as: specialization (14), reporting (11), results (11), niche-expertise (9), innovation (9), strategy (8)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	16	94%	61.2/100	B	✓ +0.07
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	1	6%	61.8/100	B	✓ -0.17
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	55.3/100	B	✓ -0.07
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	56.3/100	B	🔵 -0.33
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	55.7/100	B	✓ -0.30

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for NoGood is with the **Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)** segment (16 of 17 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)**). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the \*Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra) segment (61.8/100, Grade B) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)** (55.3/100, Grade B).

## BrandMuscle

Overall recs: 16 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 12 | Avg Content Match Score: 47.5/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames BrandMuscle as: specialization (15), technology (13), niche-expertise (11), reporting (8), scale (6), strategy (4)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	46.6/100	D	✓ +0.20
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	50.5/100	C	✓ +0.07
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	0%	45.3/100	D	✓ +0.20
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	16	100%	49.3/100	C	● +0.60
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	45.8/100	D	● +0.30

● Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for BrandMuscle is with the Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine) segment (16 of 16 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)*). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the \*Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra) segment (50.5/100, Grade C) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray) (45.3/100, Grade D). Key finding: BrandMuscle's biggest content gap is with Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine) (gap +0.60): 16 recs, score 49.3/100. Adding Franchise Brand Marketing Director-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

## Great Dental Websites

Overall recs: 12 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 5 | Avg Content Match Score: 53.4/100 (Grade C)

ChatGPT most often frames Great Dental Websites as: specialization (12), reporting (9), niche-expertise (9), results (8), transparency (5), creative (4)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0%	47.9/100	D	✓ +0.13
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	0%	49.8/100	C	✓ +0.13
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	12	100%	72.8/100	A	✓ -0.20
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	0	0%	48.3/100	C	✓ +0.20
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0%	48.2/100	C	✓ +0.23

● Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Great Dental Websites is with the Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray) segment (12 of 12 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)*). The weakest content match is with \*Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan) (47.9/100, Grade D).

## Top Content Opportunities — Ranked

These are the highest-priority pages to write. Each row is a brand-audience pairing where ChatGPT is already recommending the brand, but the brand's website doesn't speak that audience's language. Ranked by impact: gap score  $\times$  recommendation volume.

#	Brand	Audience Segment	Gap Score	Recs	Match Score	Write This
1	BrandMuscle	Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	+0.60	16	49.3/100	Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content
2	Refine Labs	Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	+0.30	10	60.6/100	Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging
3	Scorpion	Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	+0.30	4	56.1/100	Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging
4	SOCi	Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	+0.50	1	51.7/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context
5	Firegang Dental Marketing	Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	+0.37	0	41.1/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context
6	BrandMuscle	Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	+0.30	0	45.8/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context

**Gap Score** = how much higher this brand ranks in AI recommendations than in content alignment for this audience (0–1 scale within-segment percentiles). A score of +0.60 means the brand is near the top of recommendations but near the bottom of content alignment — the largest possible gap.

## Discoverability Gaps — Ranked

These brand–audience pairs have strong Content Match Scores (the website speaks the audience's language) but low recommendation frequency. The content problem is solved. The visibility problem is not. Focus here on GEO tactics: structured data, authority building, editorial mentions.

#	Brand	Audience Segment	Gap Score	Recs	Match Score
1	Powered by Search	Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	-0.73	0	71.7/100
2	Powered by Search	Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	-0.60	0	61.7/100
3	Powered by Search	Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	-0.50	0	62.6/100
4	Directive Consulting	Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	-0.43	0	58.8/100
5	Powered by Search	Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	-0.40	0	62.5/100
6	Directive Consulting	Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	-0.40	0	57.1/100
7	Location3	Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	-0.33	0	58.0/100
8	NoGood	Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	-0.33	0	56.3/100

## Your Action Plan

Recommendations are organized by brand, ordered by total content gap impact. Each brand entry leads with the one-sentence verdict, then specific actions by audience segment.

### 1. BrandMuscle

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends BrandMuscle to 2 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **47.5/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine), Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)

**How ChatGPT frames BrandMuscle:** specialization, technology, niche-expertise, reporting

- **Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine):** Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content. *16 recs at 49.3/100, gap +0.60*
- **Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. *0 recs at 45.8/100, gap +0.30*

### 2. Refine Labs

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Refine Labs to 1 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **60.6/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)

**How ChatGPT frames Refine Labs:** specialization, strategy, results, niche-expertise

- **Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra):** Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging. 10 recs at 60.6/100, gap +0.30

### 3. Scorpion

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Scorpion to 1 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **56.1/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)

**How ChatGPT frames Scorpion:** specialization, niche-expertise, technology, scale

- **Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra):** Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging. 4 recs at 56.1/100, gap +0.30

### 4. SOCI

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends SOCI to 1 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **51.7/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)

**How ChatGPT frames SOCI:** technology, specialization, reporting, niche-expertise

- **Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. 1 recs at 51.7/100, gap +0.50

### 5. Firegang Dental Marketing

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Firegang Dental Marketing to 1 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **41.1/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)

**How ChatGPT frames Firegang Dental Marketing:** specialization, reporting, results, niche-expertise

- **Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. 0 recs at 41.1/100, gap +0.37

### 6. GEO & Discoverability — Brands Whose Content Is Ready

These brands have already done the content work but aren't getting the AI recommendation volume their scores predict. Priority is off-page and technical GEO:

- **Structured data:** Add FAQ schema to pages that answer questions your target audience asks ChatGPT. How-To schema for ordering guides and meal prep content.
- **Entity clarity:** Ensure your brand has a complete, accurate Wikipedia page and Google Knowledge Panel. These are primary sources for AI training data.
- **Editorial mentions:** Earn coverage from food media, local press, and review sites that are likely in AI training corpora (Eater, Serious Eats, local newspaper food sections, Reddit food communities).
- **Powered by Search → Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra):** Match score 71.7/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.73).
- **Powered by Search → Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine):** Match score 61.7/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.60).
- **Powered by Search → Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek):** Match score 62.6/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.50).
- **Directive Consulting → Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek):** Match score 58.8/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.43).
- **Powered by Search → Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray):** Match score 62.5/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.40).
- **Directive Consulting → Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine):** Match score 57.1/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.40).
- **Location3 → Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan):** Match score 58.0/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.33).
- **NoGood → Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine):** Match score 56.3/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.33).

### Appendix A: Full Content Match Score Matrix

All scores on a 0–100 scale with letter grades. Higher = closer alignment between brand website language and ChatGPT's language when recommending to that audience.

Audience Segment	BrandMuscle	Cardinal Digit	Directive Cons	Firegang Denta	Great Dental W	KickStart Dent	Location3	NoGood	Pain-Free Dent	Powered by Sea	Refine Labs	SOCi	Scorpion	SmartBug Media
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	46.6 (D)	57.5 (B)	69.8 (A)	37.8 (D)	47.9 (D)	50.9 (C)	58.0 (B)	61.2 (B)	54.7 (C)	77.3 (A)	64.0 (A)	52.6 (C)	54.7 (C)	60.0 (B)
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	50.5 (C)	61.7 (B)	67.5 (A)	39.8 (D)	49.8 (C)	52.6 (C)	62.0 (A)	61.8 (B)	58.5 (B)	71.7 (A)	60.6 (B)	53.9 (C)	56.1 (B)	58.0 (B)
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	45.3 (D)	66.3 (A)	58.5 (B)	61.1 (B)	72.8 (A)	74.8 (A)	59.8 (B)	55.3 (B)	77.8 (A)	62.5 (A)	50.4 (C)	50.6 (C)	58.6 (B)	55.0 (B)
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	49.3 (C)	56.1 (B)	57.1 (B)	39.1 (D)	48.3 (C)	51.0 (C)	68.1 (A)	56.3 (B)	55.3 (B)	61.7 (B)	50.2 (C)	57.9 (B)	58.0 (B)	55.0 (B)
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	45.8 (D)	55.2 (B)	58.8 (B)	41.1 (D)	48.2 (C)	51.5 (C)	63.1 (A)	55.7 (B)	54.1 (C)	62.6 (A)	52.9 (C)	51.7 (C)	56.7 (B)	55.0 (B)

## Appendix B: Positive Mention Count Matrix

Raw positive mention counts per audience segment and brand.

Audience Segment	BrandMuscle	Cardinal Digit	Directive Cons	Firegang Denta	Great Dental W	KickStart Dent	Location3	NoGood	Pain-Free Dent	Powered by Sea	Refine Labs	SOCi	Scorpion	SmartBug Media
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	16	0	20	42	0	1	6
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	0	2	10	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	10	1	4	26
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	0	13	1	23	12	27	0	0	21	0	0	0	7	0
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	16	5	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	43	52	0
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	0

## Appendix C: Statistical Detail

### Study Design

375 ChatGPT completions: 5 audience segments  $\times$  25 questions  $\times$  3 independent runs. Each run is a fully independent API call with no memory between calls. Runs enable measurement of AI consistency.

Brand mentions were extracted via a structured GPT-4.1 call (temperature 0) using a controlled vocabulary schema. Entity counts are deduplicated at the response level for statistical testing (one mention per response, per brand). Content Match Scores use `text-embedding-3-large` (3,072-dimensional) embeddings and cosine similarity, scaled  $\times 100$ .

### Significance Tests

**Binomial tests:** For each brand–segment pair, we test whether that segment's mention rate ( $k/75$  responses) is significantly different from the brand's overall base rate across all segments. 85 tests total, Bonferroni-corrected threshold  $\alpha = 0.0006$ . **26 of 85 pairs** are significant after correction.

**Chi-square tests:** For each brand, we test whether the distribution of recommendations across the 5 segments is uniform. **15 of 15 brands** show statistically non-uniform distributions ( $p < 0.05$  after Bonferroni correction for 17 tests). This validates that the persona segmentation produces meaningfully different recommendation profiles — the AI genuinely treats these audience types differently.

**Run consistency:** Cosine similarity scores vary by fewer than 2% ( $CV < 0.02$ ) across the 3 runs for most brand–segment pairs, indicating that the Content Match Scores are stable signals, not artifacts of a single run.

*All tests are exploratory and hypothesis-generating, not confirmatory. With  $n=75$  responses per segment and  $n=3$  runs for CI estimation, interpret findings as strong directional signals.*

### Content Alignment → Recommendation Correlation

Across all 85 brand-audience pairs (17 brands  $\times$  5 segments), Spearman  $\rho$  between Content Match Score and mention count = **+0.618** ( $p < 0.0001$ ). Per segment:

Audience Segment	Spearman $\rho$	p-value	Sig
Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)	+0.806	0.0003	***
Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)	+0.589	0.0209	*
Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)	+0.779	0.0006	***
Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)	+0.391	0.1498	
Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)	+0.353	0.1969	

**Causality caveat.** This is a cross-sectional correlation, not a controlled experiment. Two explanations are consistent with the data:

- **Explanation A (content drives recommendations):** Brands that write audience-specific content  $\rightarrow$  ChatGPT learns it during training  $\rightarrow$  recommends that brand to that audience more often  $\rightarrow$  higher Content Match Score and higher mention count move together.
- **Explanation B (shared underlying cause):** Brands that are culturally associated with a certain audience tend to both write content for that audience and get recommended to them — not because one caused the other, but because both reflect the same underlying brand positioning.

The prescription is the same under both explanations: write content that genuinely addresses how your brand serves specific audience types. To confirm causality, a longitudinal study is required — publish targeted content, wait for a model update cycle, re-run the embeddings, and measure whether recommendation rates shift.

## Appendix D: Audience Segment Profiles

The five segments were designed as research archetypes grounded in QSR consumer research. Each was injected as a full character description into ChatGPT before every question in that segment's session.

### Growth-Stage Startup Founder — Growth-Stage Startup Founder (Jordan)

**Tags:** b2b-saaS, first-agency-buyer, roi-focused, growth-stage, budget-conscious, skeptical

You are Jordan, 33, founder and CEO of a B2B SaaS company that recently closed a Series A round. You have 28 employees and your product helps mid-market companies manage vendor contracts. You've been doing marketing scrappily — content, LinkedIn, a few webinars — but you need to scale pipeline and you don't have the internal headcount to do it. You're seriously considering hiring a marketing agency for the first time. You're skeptical: you've heard too many stories about agencies that take retainers and deliver nothing. You want proof of ROI before you commit, and you're thinking about a \$8,000–15,000/month engagement to start. You care about demand generation, SEO and content, and potentially paid search. Brand awareness feels secondary right now — you need leads.

**Mid-Market Marketing Leader — Mid-Market Marketing Leader (Sandra)**

**Tags:** mid-market, b2b, experienced-agency-buyer, integrated-campaigns, multi-channel, results-oriented

You are Sandra, 44, VP of Marketing at a professional services firm with about \$80 million in annual revenue and 350 employees. You manage a lean internal team of four and use agencies for specific capabilities: paid media, SEO, and design production. You've worked with three or four agencies over the past six years and have strong opinions about what good agency relationships look like. You want strategic thinking, not just execution. You're comfortable spending \$30,000–60,000 per month with the right partner and you evaluate agencies on reporting quality, responsiveness, and measurable pipeline impact. You're currently re-evaluating your agency roster and are open to consolidating to one full-service partner if the fit is right.

**Local Multi-Location Business Owner — Local Multi-Location Business Owner (Ray)**

**Tags:** local-business, multi-location, lead-gen-focused, agency-skeptic, small-budget, service-business

You are Ray, 51, who owns three dental practices in the suburbs of a mid-size city. You have a front-office manager at each location and no dedicated marketing staff. You've tried a few things over the years — a local SEO vendor, some Facebook ads, a direct mail campaign — but you've never had consistent results and you've been burned by one agency that billed you for six months and delivered almost nothing. You want more new patient appointments. That's it. You're willing to spend \$3,000–6,000 a month if you can see a direct line between that spend and new patients walking in the door. You don't want to think about marketing strategy — you want someone who handles it and shows you results.

**Franchise Brand Marketing Director — Franchise Brand Marketing Director (Christine)**

**Tags:** franchise-marketing, local-store-marketing, multi-location, brand-consistency, franchisee-support, field-marketing

You are Christine, 39, Director of Marketing at a 220-unit franchise brand in the home services category. You report to the CMO and own brand standards, national campaigns, local store marketing toolkits, and the technology franchisees use to execute local marketing — digital asset management, social templates, local listing management. Your biggest ongoing challenge is brand consistency: franchisees go off-brand constantly, and you don't have the bandwidth to police it manually. You're also responsible for co-op marketing programs and field marketing support. You work with multiple agency partners today — one for national creative, one for paid media, and a smaller vendor for local listings — but you're evaluating whether to consolidate or find a partner who actually understands the franchisor-franchisee dynamic and can support both brand-level and local-level execution. Budget is \$50,000–100,000 per month at the brand level, not counting franchisee co-op contributions.

**Franchise Development Marketing Director — Franchise Development Marketing Director (Derek)**

**Tags:** franchise-development, franchisee-recruitment, b2b-lead-gen, fdd-marketing, discovery-day, franchise-growth

You are Derek, 46, VP of Franchise Development at a fast-growing franchise brand currently at 140 units with a goal of reaching 350 within four years. Your job is to recruit qualified franchisee candidates — people with \$400,000–\$700,000 in liquid capital who are serious about owning and operating a business. You work with franchise brokers, manage a franchise development website, run paid campaigns targeting prospective franchisees, and coordinate discovery days. You need an agency that deeply understands franchise development marketing: the FDD process, how franchise portals and broker networks work, and what motivates someone to make a life-changing investment in a franchise. Most general marketing agencies don't understand this world at all. You've worked with a few that claimed to specialize in it but couldn't back it up. Budget is \$20,000–40,000 per month specifically for franchise development marketing, separate from the brand's consumer marketing spend.

# 03

## Phase 1 Full Report

QSR Brands

Session 20260218\_141526 · 17 QSR chains · 5 consumer personas · 1,875  
ChatGPT queries

**1,294**

TOTAL BRAND MENTIONS

**p = +0.647**

CONTENT → PERSONA ROUTING

**17/17**

CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANT

## GEO Audit: Which QSR Brands Win ChatGPT Recommendations — and Why

Session: 20260218\_141526 | Brands: 17 | Audience segments: 5 | ChatGPT responses analyzed: 375 | Total positive brand mentions: 1,598

### Executive Verdict

ChatGPT has a clear set of favorites — and there is a measurable pattern to why. Across 375 test questions spanning five buyer segments, **Wendy's** received more positive recommendations than any other brand (237 mentions, 15% of all recommendations). But raw recommendation counts tell only half the story. The brands that appear most often are not always the ones whose website content best supports those recommendations — and that gap is where your biggest content opportunity lives.

- **Taco Bell** has the highest Content Match Score of any brand–audience pair in the study: **65.6/100** for the Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler) segment. Their website and ChatGPT are speaking almost exactly the same language to that audience.
- **Chick-fil-A** has the highest Content Match Score for more audience segments (3 of 5) than any other brand — meaning its website is consistently well-calibrated across buyer types.
- The biggest **content gap** in the study is **Starbucks → Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)**: 28 positive recommendations, but a Content Match Score of only **33.9/100** (Grade D). The AI is already sending this audience to this brand — the brand's website just isn't reinforcing why.
- The biggest **missed opportunity** is **In-N-Out Burger → Practical Value Buyer (Dale)**: Content Match Score of **49.6/100** but only **0 mention(s)**. The website content is doing the right things — the brand simply isn't surfacing in AI results.

### How This Works

#### The setup: five real buyer segments, 375 questions

We built five fictional but research-grounded consumer profiles representing real buyer segments in the QSR market: the **Busy Professional**, the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer**, the **Budget & Value Seeker**, the **Performance Nutrition Buyer**, and the **Practical Value Buyer**. Each profile included a detailed character description — job, lifestyle, priorities, price sensitivity — injected as context before every ChatGPT question.

We then asked 25 questions per segment covering five intent types: spontaneous cravings, dietary or budget constraints, comparative decisions, discovery and trends, and meal planning. Each question was asked three times to measure consistency. Every brand mention in every response was extracted and tagged with sentiment, recommendation rank, and the specific reasons given.

#### What is a Content Match Score?

**Step 1 — Turning words into numbers.** A computer can't compare two pieces of text directly. So the first thing we do is convert text into a list of about 3,000 numbers — called an **embedding**. This is produced by OpenAI's text-embedding model, which has read essentially the entire internet and learned that certain words and concepts belong near each other. It isn't counting words — it's capturing meaning. So "quick lunch," "fast meal," and "grab something on the go" would all produce embeddings that point in a similar direction, because the model has learned they mean roughly the same thing — even though they share no words.

**Step 2 — What those 3,000 numbers represent.** Think of it like GPS coordinates, but instead of 2 numbers (latitude, longitude) you have 3,000. Each number represents a dimension of meaning — things like "is this about speed?", "is this about health?", "is this about family?" Every piece of text gets converted into its own point in this 3,000-dimensional space.

**Step 3 — What we embedded.** We took two bodies of text: (1) **Brand content** — everything crawled from each brand's website, broken into chunks and averaged into one point that represents where that brand lives in meaning-space. (2) **ChatGPT responses** — all 75 responses ChatGPT gave when answering questions for a specific audience segment (25 questions × 3 runs), averaged into one point that represents what ChatGPT talks about when speaking to that audience.

**Step 4 — Measuring the distance.** We measure how far apart the two points are using cosine similarity, which cares about direction, not size. Imagine both points as arrows shooting out from the origin: arrows pointing the same direction = score of 1.0 (same topics); arrows at 90° = score of 0.0 (unrelated); arrows pointing opposite = score of -1.0. We multiply by 100 to give you a 0–100 scale — the **Content Match Score**.

**Step 5 — What a high vs. low score actually means.** A score of 65 means Chipotle's website points in a very similar direction to what ChatGPT says when answering budget-shopping questions — the vocabulary, concepts, and framing overlap strongly. A score of 42 for the same pair means Chipotle's site is talking about things (brand story, sustainability, ingredient sourcing) that don't map onto the vocabulary ChatGPT reaches for when a price-conscious person asks for fast food advice.

**The key implication:** ChatGPT formed its opinions about these brands during training — before you ran this audit. When it recommends your brand, it uses specific language shaped by everything it read about you. The Content Match Score tells you whether your website speaks that same language back. A low score means the AI is doing marketing on your behalf that your own site doesn't back up — someone gets recommended to you, lands on your site, and finds content that doesn't match the reason they were sent there.

### What is a Content Gap?

A content gap means ChatGPT is recommending your brand to a specific audience, but your website content doesn't use the same language ChatGPT uses when describing you to that audience. This is both good news and a risk. Good: you're already getting recommended. Risk: a competitor who closes that gap will start outranking you over time as AI systems update and learn.

**What to do:** Write content explicitly for that audience segment. Use the words they use. Address the questions they ask. The 'Recommended Action' column in the gap tables below is specific.

### What is a Missed Opportunity?

A missed opportunity means your website already uses the right language for a buyer segment, but ChatGPT isn't recommending you to them at the rate your content quality would predict. This is usually not a content problem — it's an AI discoverability problem. Your brand may lack the authority signals (referring domains, structured data, editorial coverage) that help AI systems surface you confidently.

**What to do:** Focus on off-page authority: earn links from relevant editorial sources, complete your Google Knowledge Panel, add FAQ and How-To schema to pages that match the audience's typical questions.

### Does Content Alignment Predict Who Gets Recommended to Whom?

Yes — and the evidence is strong. We ranked all 17 brands by Content Match Score for each audience segment, then separately ranked them by how often they were recommended to that segment. Those two ranked lists move together consistently across every segment tested.

Across all 85 brand-audience pairs, the Spearman correlation between Content Match Score and recommendation frequency is  $p = +0.647$  ( $p < 0.0001$ ). That means there is less than a 0.01% chance you would see this pattern by random chance. Per segment:

Audience Segment	Spearman p	Significance
Busy Professional (Marcus)	+0.607	**
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	+0.586	*
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	+0.788	***
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	+0.593	*
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	+0.613	**

\*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Every segment is statistically significant. This is not a size effect from McDonald's and Starbucks pulling the numbers — the correlation holds within each segment separately, across 17 brands at a time.

**The two-lever framework.** There are two independent factors that predict how often a brand gets recommended:

- **Authority (Domain Authority, referring domains)** → **overall recommendation volume**. Bigger web presence = recommended more often across the board. This makes sense: ChatGPT learned from the web, and brands with more editorial coverage and links have more training signal. But this is a blunt instrument — and it takes years to move.
- **Content alignment** → **persona-specific recommendations**. Brands with better content alignment for a specific audience get recommended to that audience more. This is roughly as strong a statistical signal as authority ( $p \approx 0.61$  vs  $0.65$ ), but it's the lever you can actually pull this quarter.

Critically, authority and content alignment are almost entirely independent of each other — the correlation between DA and Content Match Score is approximately  $p = 0.09$ . Starbucks has the highest DA in this dataset and gets recommended a lot overall, but that doesn't make its website content well-aligned with the Performance Nutrition Buyer. Those are two separate problems.

**What this means for smaller brands:** You cannot match McDonald's referring domain count — that gap takes a decade to close. But you can write content that speaks precisely to the Budget & Value Seeker or the Health-Conscious Family Buyer, and the data says that investment has a measurable relationship with how often ChatGPT routes those specific people to you.

### Who ChatGPT Recommends — Overall

The table below counts every positive recommendation across all five audience segments. 'Primary' means the brand was listed as the first or top recommendation in that response — the strongest signal of AI preference.

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Wendy's	237	15%	142	60%
Chick-fil-A	189	12%	130	69%
McDonald's	151	9%	91	60%
Chipotle	129	8%	88	68%
Taco Bell	121	8%	71	59%
Subway	112	7%	61	54%
Panera Bread	101	6%	54	53%
Starbucks	47	3%	23	49%
Burger King	42	3%	16	38%
Arby's	33	2%	21	64%
Jack in the Box	31	2%	14	45%
Popeyes	29	2%	13	45%
Culver's	27	2%	19	70%
Dunkin'	18	1%	4	22%
In-N-Out Burger	18	1%	10	56%
Domino's	15	1%	4	27%
KFC	14	1%	6	43%
Panda Express	14	1%	11	79%
Wawa	12	1%	7	58%
Sweetgreen	12	1%	6	50%
El Pollo Loco	12	1%	9	75%
Jersey Mike's	11	1%	2	18%
MOD Pizza	11	1%	3	27%
Sonic	11	1%	2	18%
Cook Out	10	1%	8	80%
Shake Shack	10	1%	4	40%
Jersey Mike's	9	1%	5	56%
Qdoba	9	1%	3	33%
QDOBA	9	1%	6	67%
Pizza Hut	9	1%	2	22%
CAVA	9	1%	5	56%
Sheetz	8	1%	3	38%
Little Caesars	8	1%	3	38%
Blaze Pizza	8	1%	3	38%
Whataburger	8	1%	6	75%
Raising Cane's	8	1%	3	38%
Cava	7	0%	5	71%
Noodles & Company	6	0%	1	17%
Five Guys	6	0%	1	17%
Papa John's	5	0%	1	20%
Bojangles	5	0%	5	100%
Hardee's	5	0%	0	0%

Brand	Total Recs	Share	Primary Recs	Primary Rate
Portillo's	4	0%	1	25%
Del Taco	4	0%	0	0%
Carl's Jr.	4	0%	0	0%
Moe's Southwest Grill	3	0%	1	33%
Bojangles'	3	0%	0	0%
Kroger	2	0%	0	0%
Costco	2	0%	0	0%
Moe's Southwest Grill	2	0%	1	50%
Zoe's Kitchen	2	0%	2	100%
Dairy Queen	2	0%	0	0%
Portillo's	2	0%	2	100%
Pollo Tropical	2	0%	1	50%
Hardee's/Carl's Jr.	2	0%	1	50%
Togo's	1	0%	1	100%
Publix	1	0%	0	0%
Target	1	0%	0	0%
Einstein Bros. Bagels	1	0%	0	0%
local pizza chains	1	0%	0	0%
Jersey Mike's Subs	1	0%	0	0%
Boston Market	1	0%	0	0%
Jimmy John's	1	0%	1	100%
Jason's Deli	1	0%	1	100%
Zoës Kitchen	1	0%	1	100%
Zoe's Kitchen	1	0%	1	100%
QuikTrip	1	0%	0	0%
DoorDash	1	0%	0	0%
Tijuana Flats	1	0%	0	0%
Checkers/Rally's	1	0%	0	0%
Zippy's	1	0%	0	0%
Jimmy John's	1	0%	0	0%
Firehouse Subs	1	0%	0	0%
Pieology	1	0%	1	100%
7-Eleven	1	0%	0	0%
Dave's Hot Chicken	1	0%	0	0%
Bojangles'	1	0%	0	0%
Carl's Jr.	1	0%	0	0%
Naf Naf Grill	1	0%	0	0%
Hardee's/Carl's Jr.	1	0%	0	0%
Walmart	1	0%	1	100%
Sam's Club	1	0%	1	100%
Hardee's / Carl's Jr.	1	0%	0	0%

**Note:** This table includes every brand ChatGPT mentioned spontaneously, including brands not in the 17-brand crawl corpus. Brands that appear with variant spellings (e.g., 'CAVA' and 'Cava') reflect normalization gaps for brands outside the primary alias map — aggregate these when presenting externally. Only the 17 embedded brands receive Content Match Scores in the sections below.

## What AI-Winning Brands Have in Common

The brands that appear most often in ChatGPT recommendations share specific content characteristics. Understanding these patterns tells you what the AI has learned to associate with high-value recommendations — and what your content team should be writing toward.

Brand	Total Recs	Primary Recs	Avg Content Match Score	Grade	Top AI-Associated Attributes
Wendy's	237	142	56.6/100	B	value, taste, variety, deals
Chick-fil-A	189	130	57.6/100	B	protein, quality, taste, health
McDonald's	151	91	57.5/100	B	value, convenience, deals, app
Chipotle	129	88	48.5/100	C	variety, protein, health, quality
Taco Bell	121	71	58.2/100	B	variety, value, deals, app

The top 5 recommended brands all have strong website language around **variety, value, deals** and **protein**. These attributes appear in their AI recommendations across multiple audience segments consistently. Brands in the mid-tier tend to have content focused on brand story and corporate narrative — language the AI doesn't map to specific purchase contexts.

**The practical pattern:** Winning websites write about the *experience of ordering*, not just the product. They address speed, reliability, app ordering, and specific use cases (quick lunch, family dinner, post-workout meal). If your brand's website is primarily about your history and values with no audience-specific context, you're leaving recommendation share on the table.

**Why this matters more than you might think.** You might assume that the biggest brands — McDonald's, Starbucks, Subway — dominate simply because they're big. And brand size does matter: Domain Authority and referring domains correlate with overall recommendation frequency ( $p \approx 0.61$ ). But brand size and content alignment are essentially independent of each other ( $p \approx 0.09$  between DA and Content Match Score). Starbucks has the highest DA in this study but that doesn't mean its website is well-calibrated for every audience type. Content alignment is a separate lever — one that a smaller brand can win on even against a larger competitor.

## Audience Segment Analysis

For each of the five buyer segments, this section shows: which brands ChatGPT recommends and how often, what the AI says about them, how well each brand's website content supports those recommendations, and where the biggest content gaps and missed opportunities are.

**Statistical note:** Significance stars (\*, \*\*, \*\*\*) in the recommendation tables indicate that this segment's mention rate is statistically different from the brand's overall base rate across all segments. Stars reflect Bonferroni-corrected p-values (85 comparisons). With only 3 runs, treat as directional signals, not definitive proof.

### Busy Professional (Marcus)

**Profile tags:** time-constrained, urban, mobile-first, routine-oriented, mid-income

When someone in the **Busy Professional** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Chick-fil-A** is the first answer — 48 positive recommendations out of 230 total across 75 test questions (21% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Chick-fil-A for this audience around **convenience, speed, app**. The Content Match Score confirms this alignment: Chick-fil-A scores **60.3/100** (Grade B), the highest in this segment. The most urgent content gap: **Panera Bread** receives 29 recommendations to this segment but scores only 45.4/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

## Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Chick-fil-A	48	21%	36	131	convenience, speed, app, consistency	nan
Wendy's	40	17%	22	99	convenience, taste, variety, consistency	nan
Panera Bread	29	13%	12	68	convenience, variety, app, health	nan
McDonald's	25	11%	13	61	convenience, app, speed, consistency	nan
Chipotle	20	9%	9	48	convenience, variety, protein, app	nan
Taco Bell	15	7%	10	40	convenience, value, portability, variety	nan
Subway	14	6%	5	31	variety, convenience, health, app	nan
Culver's	4	2%	4	12	service, consistency, quality, speed	nan
Starbucks	4	2%	0	7	app, convenience, variety, portability	nan
Dunkin'	3	1%	2	8	speed, convenience, app, consistency	nan
In-N-Out Burger	3	1%	0	4	variety, quality, speed, consistency	nan
Arby's	2	1%	2	6	variety, taste, app, speed	nan
Jack in the Box	1	0%	0	2	variety, taste, portability	nan
Wawa	1	0%	0	2	convenience, variety	nan

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001 after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

## Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Chick-fil-A	60.3	B
Taco Bell	58.6	B
McDonald's	58.1	B
Wendy's	57.8	B
Subway	54.1	C
Wawa	50.7	C
Chipotle	48.9	C
Sweetgreen	47.4	D
Culver's	46.7	D
In-N-Out Burger	46.6	D
Jack in the Box	45.7	D
Panera Bread	45.4	D
Arby's	44.7	D
Burger King	40.7	D
Dunkin'	40.6	D
Starbucks	34.4	D
Domino's	30.8	D

Grade key: A (≥62) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D (<48) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

**Best-Matched Brand by Question Type**

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Chick-fil-A	59.5
Discovery / New & Trending	Taco Bell	61.2
Need & Constraint (budget, diet, time)	Taco Bell	57.0
Spontaneous Occasion / In-the-Moment	Taco Bell	55.1
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Subway	56.6

**Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities**

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Panera Bread** — 29 recs, score 45.4/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.53$ . Action: Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language.
- **Starbucks** — 4 recs, score 34.4/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.44$ . Action: Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Sweetgreen** — 0 recs, score 47.4/100 (Grade D), gap  $-0.47$ . The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.
- **Wawa** — 1 recs, score 50.7/100 (Grade C), gap  $-0.44$ . The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.

**Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)**

**Profile tags:** family-oriented, suburban, health-aware, label-reader, household-decision-maker

When someone in the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Chick-fil-A** is the first answer — 54 positive recommendations out of 356 total across 75 test questions (15% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Chick-fil-A for this audience around **family-friendly, variety, health**. The Content Match Score confirms this alignment: Chick-fil-A scores **61.0/100** (Grade B), the highest in this segment. The most urgent content gap: **Panera Bread** receives 47 recommendations to this segment but scores only 45.2/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

**Recommendation Profile**

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Chick-fil-A	54	15%	39	145	family-friendly, variety, health, quality	*
Panera Bread	47	13%	30	123	variety, health, family-friendly, quality	***
Wendy's	38	11%	24	98	variety, family-friendly, health, value	nan
Chipotle	35	10%	20	90	variety, health, protein, quality	nan
Subway	30	8%	15	74	variety, health, family-friendly, protein	nan
McDonald's	24	7%	12	57	family-friendly, variety, value, convenience	nan
Taco Bell	19	5%	11	48	variety, value, family-friendly, health	nan
Starbucks	12	3%	3	25	convenience, protein, variety, portability	nan
Culver's	9	3%	6	24	quality, family-friendly, variety, taste	nan
Domino's	7	2%	3	17	family-friendly, variety, convenience, deals	nan
Dunkin'	4	1%	0	7	variety, convenience, family-friendly, portability	nan
In-N-Out Burger	3	1%	3	9	quality, taste, family-friendly, health	nan
Burger King	2	1%	1	5	value, deals, family-friendly, app	nan
Sweetgreen	2	1%	2	6	variety, protein, health	nan
Wawa	2	1%	2	6	variety, convenience, taste, quality	nan

\*  $p<0.05$ , \*\*  $p<0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p<0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

**Content Match Scores**

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Chick-fil-A	61.0	B
McDonald's	57.0	B
Wendy's	55.7	B
Taco Bell	54.6	C
Subway	51.7	C
Chipotle	49.3	C
Culver's	49.2	C
Sweetgreen	47.6	D
In-N-Out Burger	46.3	D
Wawa	46.2	D
Panera Bread	45.2	D
Jack in the Box	41.7	D
Arby's	41.6	D
Burger King	37.4	D
Dunkin'	36.9	D
Starbucks	31.6	D
Domino's	30.8	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Chick-fil-A	61.3
Discovery / New & Trending	Chick-fil-A	60.2
Need & Constraint (budget, diet, time)	Chick-fil-A	56.8
Spontaneous Occasion / In-the-Moment	Chick-fil-A	56.3
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Chick-fil-A	58.4

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Panera Bread** — 47 recs, score 45.2/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.53$ . Action: Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging.
- **Starbucks** — 12 recs, score 31.6/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.47$ . Action: Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging.
- **Domino's** — 7 recs, score 30.8/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.41$ . Action: Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Sweetgreen** — 2 recs, score 47.6/100 (Grade D), gap  $-0.35$ . The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.

---

#### Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)

**Profile tags:** budget-constrained, trend-aware, app-native, social-media-influenced, high-frequency

When someone in the **Budget & Value Seeker** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Wendy's** is the first answer — 59 positive recommendations out of 353 total across 75 test questions (17% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Wendy's for this audience around **deals, value, app**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Taco Bell** (65.6/100, Grade A) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count. The most urgent content gap: **Burger King** receives 16 recommendations to this segment but scores only 41.3/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

## Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Wendy's	59	17%	24	142	deals, value, app, taste	nan
Taco Bell	53	15%	27	132	value, app, deals, variety	***
McDonald's	44	12%	30	118	value, deals, app, convenience	nan
Jack in the Box	27	8%	13	66	value, deals, variety, app	***
Chick-fil-A	20	6%	10	48	app, deals, quality, protein	**
Chipotle	19	5%	13	50	variety, value, protein, app	nan
Burger King	16	5%	4	35	value, deals, app, variety	nan
Subway	15	4%	6	36	variety, value, deals, app	nan
In-N-Out Burger	6	2%	4	15	variety, value, taste, deals	nan
Culver's	5	1%	3	12	taste, quality, deals, app	nan
Panera Bread	5	1%	2	12	variety, deals, app, loyalty	**
Wawa	4	1%	0	8	variety, convenience, value, app	nan
Domino's	3	1%	0	5	value, deals, family-friendly, app	nan
Starbucks	3	1%	1	7	variety, convenience, deals, app	nan
Dunkin'	2	1%	0	4	deals, app, convenience, variety	nan
Arby's	1	0%	0	2	innovation, quality	nan

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001 after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

## Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Taco Bell	65.6	A
McDonald's	61.3	B
Wendy's	58.4	B
Chick-fil-A	55.8	B
Jack in the Box	51.3	C
Subway	50.5	C
Chipotle	49.2	C
Wawa	48.9	C
In-N-Out Burger	47.9	D
Culver's	47.5	D
Sweetgreen	44.7	D
Arby's	42.8	D
Dunkin'	41.7	D
Burger King	41.3	D
Panera Bread	38.4	D
Starbucks	33.5	D
Domino's	32.1	D

Grade key: A (≥62) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D (<48) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

**Best-Matched Brand by Question Type**

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Taco Bell	60.9
Discovery / New & Trending	Taco Bell	66.2
Need & Constraint (budget, diet, time)	Taco Bell	62.0
Spontaneous Occasion / In-the-Moment	Taco Bell	62.1
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Taco Bell	63.4

**Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities**

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Burger King** — 16 recs, score 41.3/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.41$ . *Action: Add deal/LTO, app-exclusive, and value-for-money language.*

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Sweetgreen** — 0 recs, score 44.7/100 (Grade D), gap  $-0.35$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*

**Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)**

**Profile tags:** health-optimizing, high-income, data-driven, skeptical-of-marketing, performance-oriented

When someone in the **Performance Nutrition Buyer** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Chipotle** is the first answer — 54 positive recommendations out of 383 total across 75 test questions (14% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Chipotle for this audience around **protein, variety, customization**. Interestingly, the highest Content Match Score belongs to **Chick-fil-A** (57.1/100, Grade B) — whose website language most closely mirrors how ChatGPT talks to this segment, even if it doesn't lead on raw recommendation count. The most urgent content gap: **Starbucks** receives 28 recommendations to this segment but scores only 33.9/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

**Recommendation Profile**

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Chipotle	54	14%	46	154	protein, variety, customization, health	***
Chick-fil-A	52	14%	43	147	protein, taste, health, quality	nan
Wendy's	39	10%	30	107	protein, variety, taste, customization	nan
Subway	36	9%	27	97	protein, variety, customization, health	nan
Starbucks	28	7%	19	75	protein, convenience, variety, portability	***
McDonald's	22	6%	13	56	protein, variety, value, customization	nan
Panera Bread	19	5%	10	46	protein, variety, health, quality	nan
Taco Bell	13	3%	10	36	protein, variety, customization, health	nan
Sweetgreen	10	3%	4	23	variety, protein, health, quality	*
Dunkin'	6	2%	2	11	protein, convenience, customization, customize	nan
In-N-Out Burger	6	2%	3	14	protein, quality, taste, customization	nan
Wawa	3	1%	3	9	protein, variety, convenience, portability	nan
Culver's	2	1%	0	4	protein, variety, taste	nan
Domino's	2	1%	1	5	family-friendly, consistency, variety, convenience	nan
Jack in the Box	1	0%	1	3	protein, variety, value	nan

\*  $p<0.05$ , \*\*  $p<0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p<0.001$  after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

**Content Match Scores**

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Chick-fil-A	57.1	B
Taco Bell	56.2	B
McDonald's	53.6	C
Chipotle	51.7	C
Subway	50.9	C
Wendy's	50.5	C
Sweetgreen	50.0	C
Wawa	47.2	D
In-N-Out Burger	43.9	D
Culver's	43.7	D
Jack in the Box	41.0	D
Arby's	40.0	D
Panera Bread	39.1	D
Burger King	36.1	D
Dunkin'	34.8	D
Starbucks	33.9	D
Domino's	27.9	D

**Grade key:** A ( $\geq 62$ ) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D ( $< 48$ ) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

#### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Chick-fil-A	57.5
Discovery / New & Trending	Chick-fil-A	57.1
Need & Constraint (budget, diet, time)	Chick-fil-A	57.0
Spontaneous Occasion / In-the-Moment	Taco Bell	52.9
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Taco Bell	56.5

#### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Starbucks** — 28 recs, score 33.9/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.65$ . *Action: Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content.*
- **Panera Bread** — 19 recs, score 39.1/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.35$ . *Action: Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content.*

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **Taco Bell** — 13 recs, score 56.2/100 (Grade B), gap  $-0.35$ . *The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.*

---

#### Practical Value Buyer (Dale)

**Profile tags:** value-driven, rural-suburban, portion-focused, brand-loyal, low-tech

When someone in the **Practical Value Buyer** segment asks ChatGPT for fast food advice, **Wendy's** is the first answer — 61 positive recommendations out of 276 total across 75 test questions (22% of this segment's pool). ChatGPT consistently frames Wendy's for this audience around **taste, value, variety**. The Content Match Score confirms this alignment: Wendy's scores **60.6/100** (Grade B), the highest in this segment. The most urgent content gap: **Burger King** receives 24 recommendations to this segment but scores only 41.7/100 — the AI is leading with this brand but the website isn't backing it up.

## Recommendation Profile

Brand	Recs	Share	Primary	Weighted Score	Top Attributes	Sig
Wendy's	61	22%	42	163	taste, value, variety, convenience	nan
McDonald's	36	13%	23	95	convenience, value, consistency, taste	nan
Arby's	30	11%	19	79	taste, value, protein, convenience	***
Burger King	24	9%	11	59	variety, taste, value, convenience	***
Taco Bell	21	8%	13	54	value, variety, convenience, taste	nan
Subway	17	6%	8	42	variety, convenience, value, health	nan
Chick-fil-A	15	5%	2	31	quality, consistency, variety, taste	***
Culver's	7	3%	6	20	taste, quality, consistency, variety	nan
Domino's	3	1%	0	6	convenience, variety, family-friendly, deals	nan
Dunkin'	3	1%	0	6	speed, convenience, taste	nan
Jack in the Box	2	1%	0	4	convenience, value, variety, taste	nan
Wawa	2	1%	2	6	variety, convenience, speed, value	nan
Chipotle	1	0%	0	2	variety, protein, convenience	***
Panera Bread	1	0%	0	2	variety, quality, health	***

\* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01, \*\*\* p<0.001 after Bonferroni correction (85 comparisons). Blank = not significantly different from brand's overall base rate.

## Content Match Scores

How closely does each brand's website language match what ChatGPT says to this audience segment? Higher = stronger match.

Brand	Score (0–100)	Grade
Wendy's	60.6	B
McDonald's	57.5	B
Taco Bell	55.9	B
Chick-fil-A	54.0	C
Subway	50.3	C
In-N-Out Burger	49.6	C
Culver's	46.8	D
Arby's	45.9	D
Wawa	45.4	D
Jack in the Box	43.9	D
Chipotle	43.4	D
Burger King	41.7	D
Sweetgreen	39.7	D
Panera Bread	38.6	D
Dunkin'	36.1	D
Starbucks	29.5	D
Domino's	28.3	D

Grade key: A (≥62) = strong match — ChatGPT and your website speak the same language for this audience. B (55–61) = good match, addressable gaps. C (48–54) = moderate match, content investment recommended. D (<48) = weak match — the AI is recommending you, but your content doesn't back it up.

### Best-Matched Brand by Question Type

Question Type	Best-Matched Brand	Score
Comparative / "Best option for..."	Wendy's	62.0
Discovery / New & Trending	Wendy's	60.8
Need & Constraint (budget, diet, time)	Wendy's	56.5
Spontaneous Occasion / In-the-Moment	McDonald's	53.7
Strategic Planning / Meal Prep & Routine	Wendy's	57.9

### Content Gaps & Missed Opportunities

**Content gaps** — recommended more than content alignment predicts:

- **Burger King** — 24 recs, score 41.7/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.47$ . Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.
- **Domino's** — 3 recs, score 28.3/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.44$ . Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.
- **Dunkin'** — 3 recs, score 36.1/100 (Grade D), gap  $+0.32$ . Action: Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context.

**Missed opportunities** — strong content match, low recommendation rate:

- **In-N-Out Burger** — 0 recs, score 49.6/100 (Grade C), gap  $-0.59$ . The content is right — this is a discoverability fix, not a content fix.

## Brand Scorecards

For each of the 17 embedded brands: who the AI recommends them to, how strongly, and whether their website content supports those recommendations. Content Match Scores show how well the brand's web language mirrors the language ChatGPT uses when recommending them to each audience type.

### Wendy's

**Overall recs:** 237 (15% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 142 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 56.6/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Wendy's as: **value** (129), **taste** (113), **variety** (108), **deals** (79), **protein** (78), **convenience** (72)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	40	17%	57.8/100	B	✓ +0.12
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	38	16%	55.7/100	B	✓ +0.00
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	59	25%	58.4/100	B	✓ +0.12
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	39	16%	50.5/100	C	✓ +0.18
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	61	26%	60.6/100	B	✓ +0.00

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Wendy's is with the **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** segment (61 of 237 total recs). The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (50.5/100, Grade C).

### Chick-fil-A

**Overall recs:** 189 (12% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 130 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 57.6/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Chick-fil-A as: **protein** (93), **quality** (79), **taste** (73), **health** (67), **family-friendly** (61), **convenience** (59)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	48	25%	60.3/100	B	✓ +0.00
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	54	29%	61.0/100	B	✓ +0.00
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	20	11%	55.8/100	B	✓ -0.06
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	52	28%	57.1/100	B	✓ -0.06
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	15	8%	54.0/100	C	✓ -0.18

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Chick-fil-A is with the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)** segment (54 of 189 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Practical Value Buyer (Dale)* (54.0/100, Grade C).

## McDonald's

**Overall recs:** 151 (9% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 91 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 57.5/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames McDonald's as: **value** (94), **convenience** (83), **deals** (64), **app** (63), **variety** (60), **consistency** (40)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	25	17%	58.1/100	B	✅ -0.06
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	24	16%	57.0/100	B	✅ -0.24
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	44	29%	61.3/100	B	✅ -0.06
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	22	15%	53.6/100	C	✅ -0.18
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	36	24%	57.5/100	B	✅ +0.00

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for McDonald's is with the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (44 of 151 total recs). The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (53.6/100, Grade C).

## Chipotle

**Overall recs:** 129 (8% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 88 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 48.5/100 (Grade C)

ChatGPT most often frames Chipotle as: **variety** (108), **protein** (98), **health** (55), **quality** (37), **convenience** (33), **customization** (29)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	20	16%	48.9/100	C	✅ +0.12
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	35	27%	49.3/100	C	✅ +0.12
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	19	15%	49.2/100	C	✅ +0.06
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	54	42%	51.7/100	C	✅ +0.18
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	1	1%	43.4/100	D	✅ -0.15

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Chipotle is with the **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** segment (54 of 129 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Practical Value Buyer (Dale)* (43.4/100, Grade D).

## Taco Bell

**Overall recs:** 121 (8% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 71 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 58.2/100 (Grade B)

ChatGPT most often frames Taco Bell as: **variety** (86), **value** (83), **deals** (54), **app** (50), **convenience** (44), **protein** (32)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	15	12%	58.6/100	B	✅ -0.24
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	19	16%	54.6/100	C	✅ -0.18
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	53	44%	65.6/100	A	✅ -0.06
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	13	11%	56.2/100	B	🔵 -0.35
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	21	17%	55.9/100	B	✅ -0.12

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Taco Bell is with the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (53 of 121 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)*). *The weakest content match is with \*Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)* (54.6/100, Grade C).

## Subway

**Overall recs:** 112 (7% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 61 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 51.5/100 (Grade C)

ChatGPT most often frames Subway as: **variety** (100), **protein** (61), **health** (54), **convenience** (31), **value** (29), **customization** (19)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	14	12%	54.1/100	C	✅ -0.12
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	30	27%	51.7/100	C	✅ +0.00
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	15	13%	50.5/100	C	✅ -0.12
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	36	32%	50.9/100	C	✅ +0.06
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	17	15%	50.3/100	C	✅ -0.06

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Subway is with the **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** segment (36 of 112 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)*). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **Busy Professional (Marcus)** segment (54.1/100, Grade C) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)**\* (50.3/100, Grade C).

## Panera Bread

**Overall recs:** 101 (6% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 54 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 41.3/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Panera Bread as: **variety** (83), **health** (60), **family-friendly** (41), **quality** (40), **convenience** (39), **protein** (27)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	29	29%	45.4/100	D	🔴 +0.53
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	47	47%	45.2/100	D	🔴 +0.53
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	5	5%	38.4/100	D	✅ +0.26
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	19	19%	39.1/100	D	🔴 +0.35
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	1	1%	38.6/100	D	✅ +0.03

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Panera Bread is with the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)** segment (47 of 101 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)*). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **\*Busy Professional (Marcus)** segment (45.4/100, Grade D) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** (38.4/100, Grade D). Key finding: Panera Bread's biggest content gap is with **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)** (gap +0.53): 47 recs, score 45.2/100. Adding Health-Conscious Family Buyer-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

## Starbucks

**Overall recs:** 47 (3% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 23 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 32.6/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Starbucks as: **protein** (36), **convenience** (34), **variety** (28), **portability** (12), **health** (8), **app** (6)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	4	9%	34.4/100	D	🔴 +0.44
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	12	26%	31.6/100	D	🔴 +0.47
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	3	6%	33.5/100	D	✅ +0.15
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	28	60%	33.9/100	D	🔴 +0.65
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	0	0%	29.5/100	D	✅ +0.00

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Starbucks is with the **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** segment (28 of 47 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)*). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the \***Busy Professional (Marcus)** segment (34.4/100, Grade D) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (29.5/100, Grade D). Key finding: Starbucks's biggest content gap is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (gap +0.65): 28 recs, score 33.9/100. Adding Performance Nutrition Buyer-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

## Burger King

Overall recs: 42 (3% of pool) | Primary recs: 16 | Avg Content Match Score: 39.4/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Burger King as: value (30), variety (21), deals (20), taste (17), app (13), convenience (13)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	0	0%	40.7/100	D	✅ -0.12
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	2	5%	37.4/100	D	✅ +0.00
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	16	38%	41.3/100	D	🔴 +0.41
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	0	0%	36.1/100	D	✅ -0.15
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	24	57%	41.7/100	D	🔴 +0.47

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Burger King is with the **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** segment (24 of 42 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Practical Value Buyer (Dale)*). The weakest content match is with \***Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (36.1/100, Grade D). Key finding: Burger King's biggest content gap is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (gap +0.47): 24 recs, score 41.7/100. Adding Practical Value Buyer-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

## Arby's

Overall recs: 33 (2% of pool) | Primary recs: 21 | Avg Content Match Score: 43.0/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Arby's as: taste (23), value (17), protein (16), variety (14), convenience (14), speed (9)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	2	6%	44.7/100	D	✅ +0.06
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	0	0%	41.6/100	D	✅ -0.21
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	1	3%	42.8/100	D	✅ -0.24
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	0	0%	40.0/100	D	✅ -0.26
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	30	91%	45.9/100	D	✅ +0.29

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Arby's is with the **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** segment (30 of 33 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Practical Value Buyer (Dale)*). The weakest content match is with \***Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (40.0/100,

Grade D). **Key finding:** Arby's's most significant missed opportunity is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (gap +0.29): score 45.9/100 but only 30 recs. The content is already there — the priority is increasing AI discoverability.

### Jack in the Box

**Overall recs:** 31 (2% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 14 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 44.7/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Jack in the Box as: **value** (28), **variety** (21), **deals** (21), **app** (18), **convenience** (16), **taste** (10)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	1	3%	45.7/100	D	✓ -0.15
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	0	0%	41.7/100	D	✓ -0.26
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	27	87%	51.3/100	C	✓ +0.06
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	1	3%	41.0/100	D	✓ -0.24
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	2	6%	43.9/100	D	✓ -0.09

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Jack in the Box is with the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (27 of 31 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, **strongest pull toward Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)**). *The weakest content match is with \*Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya) (41.0/100, Grade D).*

### Culver's

**Overall recs:** 27 (2% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 19 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 46.8/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Culver's as: **taste** (22), **quality** (20), **variety** (17), **consistency** (11), **family-friendly** (9), **convenience** (6)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	4	15%	46.7/100	D	✓ +0.03
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	9	33%	49.2/100	C	✓ -0.12
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	5	19%	47.5/100	D	✓ -0.03
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	2	7%	43.7/100	D	✓ -0.21
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	7	26%	46.8/100	D	✓ -0.06

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Culver's is with the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)** segment (9 of 27 total recs). The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (43.7/100, Grade D).

### Dunkin'

**Overall recs:** 18 (1% of pool) | **Primary recs:** 4 | **Avg Content Match Score:** 38.0/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Dunkin' as: **convenience** (14), **speed** (8), **variety** (6), **protein** (6), **taste** (4), **app** (3)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	3	17%	40.6/100	D	✓ +0.26
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	4	22%	36.9/100	D	✓ +0.24
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	2	11%	41.7/100	D	✓ -0.12
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	6	33%	34.8/100	D	✓ +0.26
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	3	17%	36.1/100	D	🔴 +0.32

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Dunkin' is with the **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** segment (6 of 18 total recs). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (41.7/100, Grade D) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (34.8/100, Grade D). **Key finding:** Dunkin's biggest content gap is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (gap +0.32): 3 recs, score 36.1/100. Adding Practical Value Buyer-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

### In-N-Out Burger

Overall recs: 18 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 10 | Avg Content Match Score: 46.8/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames In-N-Out Burger as: taste (9), variety (8), quality (6), value (6), protein (6), customization (3)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	3	17%	46.6/100	D	✓ -0.03
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	3	17%	46.3/100	D	✓ -0.18
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	6	33%	47.9/100	D	✓ +0.00
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	6	33%	43.9/100	D	✓ -0.09
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	0	0%	49.6/100	C	● -0.59

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for In-N-Out Burger is with the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (6 of 18 total recs). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** segment (49.6/100, Grade C) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (43.9/100, Grade D).

### Domino's

Overall recs: 15 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 4 | Avg Content Match Score: 30.0/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Domino's as: family-friendly (13), convenience (8), variety (8), deals (8), value (6), taste (3)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	0	0%	30.8/100	D	✓ +0.06
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	7	47%	30.8/100	D	🔴 +0.41
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	3	20%	32.1/100	D	✓ +0.21
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	2	13%	27.9/100	D	✓ +0.21
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	3	20%	28.3/100	D	🔴 +0.44

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) ● Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✓ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Domino's is with the **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)** segment (7 of 15 total recs). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (32.1/100, Grade D) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** (27.9/100, Grade D). **Key finding:** Domino's biggest content gap is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (gap +0.44): 3 recs, score 28.3/100. Adding Practical Value Buyer-specific language to the website would close this gap and reinforce the recommendations.

### Sweetgreen

Overall recs: 12 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 6 | Avg Content Match Score: 45.9/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Sweetgreen as: variety (11), protein (10), health (9), quality (6), customization (3)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	0	0%	47.4/100	D	🔴 -0.47
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	2	17%	47.6/100	D	🔵 -0.35
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	0	0%	44.7/100	D	🔵 -0.35
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	10	83%	50.0/100	C	✅ -0.12
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	0	0%	39.7/100	D	✅ -0.18

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Sweetgreen is with the **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)** segment (10 of 12 total recs) ( $\chi^2$  test confirms non-uniform distribution across segments, *strongest pull toward Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)*). The weakest content match is with \***Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (39.7/100, Grade D).

## Wawa

Overall recs: 12 (1% of pool) | Primary recs: 7 | Avg Content Match Score: 47.7/100 (Grade D)

ChatGPT most often frames Wawa as: convenience (12), variety (12), value (5), taste (4), protein (3), health (2)

Audience Segment	Recs	Share	Content Match Score	Grade	Gap
Busy Professional (Marcus)	1	8%	50.7/100	C	🔴 -0.44
Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	2	17%	46.2/100	D	✅ -0.24
Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	4	33%	48.9/100	C	✅ -0.24
Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	3	25%	47.2/100	D	✅ -0.24
Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	2	17%	45.4/100	D	✅ -0.15

🔴 Content gap (over-recommended vs. match score) 🔵 Missed opportunity (strong match, low recs) ✅ Aligned

ChatGPT's strongest association for Wawa is with the **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)** segment (4 of 12 total recs). However, the highest Content Match Score belongs to the **Busy Professional (Marcus)** segment (50.7/100, Grade C) — the brand's web language more closely mirrors that audience's vocabulary even if recommendation volume is lower there. The weakest content match is with **Practical Value Buyer (Dale)** (45.4/100, Grade D).

## Top Content Opportunities — Ranked

These are the highest-priority pages to write. Each row is a brand-audience pairing where ChatGPT is already recommending the brand, but the brand's website doesn't speak that audience's language. Ranked by impact: gap score × recommendation volume.

#	Brand	Audience Segment	Gap Score	Recs	Match Score	Write This
1	Starbucks	Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	+0.65	28	33.9/100	Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content
2	Panera Bread	Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	+0.53	47	45.2/100	Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging
3	Panera Bread	Busy Professional (Marcus)	+0.53	29	45.4/100	Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language
4	Burger King	Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	+0.47	24	41.7/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context
5	Starbucks	Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	+0.47	12	31.6/100	Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging
6	Burger King	Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	+0.41	16	41.3/100	Add deal/LTO, app-exclusive, and value-for-money language
7	Panera Bread	Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	+0.35	19	39.1/100	Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content
8	Domino's	Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	+0.41	7	30.8/100	Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging
9	Starbucks	Busy Professional (Marcus)	+0.44	4	34.4/100	Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language
10	Domino's	Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	+0.44	3	28.3/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context
11	Dunkin'	Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	+0.32	3	36.1/100	Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context

**Gap Score** = how much higher this brand ranks in AI recommendations than in content alignment for this audience (0–1 scale within-segment percentiles). A score of +0.60 means the brand is near the top of recommendations but near the bottom of content alignment — the largest possible gap.

## Discoverability Gaps — Ranked

These brand-audience pairs have strong Content Match Scores (the website speaks the audience's language) but low recommendation frequency. The content problem is solved. The visibility problem is not. Focus here on GEO tactics: structured data, authority building, editorial mentions.

#	Brand	Audience Segment	Gap Score	Recs	Match Score
1	In-N-Out Burger	Practical Value Buyer (Dale)	-0.59	0	49.6/100
2	Wawa	Busy Professional (Marcus)	-0.44	1	50.7/100
3	Sweetgreen	Busy Professional (Marcus)	-0.47	0	47.4/100
4	Taco Bell	Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)	-0.35	13	56.2/100
5	Sweetgreen	Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna)	-0.35	2	47.6/100
6	Sweetgreen	Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)	-0.35	0	44.7/100

## Your Action Plan

Recommendations are organized by brand, ordered by total content gap impact. Each brand entry leads with the one-sentence verdict, then specific actions by audience segment.

### 1. Panera Bread

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Panera Bread to 3 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores 43.3/100 on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna), Busy Professional (Marcus), Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya)

**How ChatGPT frames Panera Bread:** variety, health, family-friendly, quality

- **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna):** Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging. 47 recs at 45.2/100, gap +0.53
- **Busy Professional (Marcus):** Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language. 29 recs at 45.4/100, gap +0.53
- **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya):** Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content. 19 recs at 39.1/100, gap +0.35

## 2. Starbucks

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Starbucks to 3 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **33.3/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya), Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna), Busy Professional (Marcus)

**How ChatGPT frames Starbucks:** protein, convenience, variety, portability

- **Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya):** Add macro-tracking, high-protein ordering guides, and performance nutrition content. *28 recs at 33.9/100, gap +0.65*
- **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna):** Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging. *12 recs at 31.6/100, gap +0.47*
- **Busy Professional (Marcus):** Add efficiency, mobile ordering, and desk-lunch language. *4 recs at 34.4/100, gap +0.44*

## 3. Burger King

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Burger King to 2 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **41.5/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Practical Value Buyer (Dale), Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler)

**How ChatGPT frames Burger King:** value, variety, deals, taste

- **Practical Value Buyer (Dale):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. *24 recs at 41.7/100, gap +0.47*
- **Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler):** Add deal/LTO, app-exclusive, and value-for-money language. *16 recs at 41.3/100, gap +0.41*

## 4. Domino's

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Domino's to 2 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **29.6/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna), Practical Value Buyer (Dale)

**How ChatGPT frames Domino's:** family-friendly, convenience, variety, deals

- **Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna):** Add family nutrition, ingredient transparency, and kid-friendly messaging. *7 recs at 30.8/100, gap +0.41*
- **Practical Value Buyer (Dale):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. *3 recs at 28.3/100, gap +0.44*

## 5. Dunkin'

**Verdict:** ChatGPT recommends Dunkin' to 1 audience segment(s) with strong volume, but the brand's website scores **36.1/100** on average — the AI is out-promoting the content.

**Affected audiences:** Practical Value Buyer (Dale)

**How ChatGPT frames Dunkin':** convenience, speed, variety, protein

- **Practical Value Buyer (Dale):** Add portion value, filling/fuel-focused, and working-person context. *3 recs at 36.1/100, gap +0.32*

## 6. GEO & Discoverability — Brands Whose Content Is Ready

These brands have already done the content work but aren't getting the AI recommendation volume their scores predict. Priority is off-page and technical GEO:

- **Structured data:** Add FAQ schema to pages that answer questions your target audience asks ChatGPT. How-To schema for ordering guides and meal prep content.
- **Entity clarity:** Ensure your brand has a complete, accurate Wikipedia page and Google Knowledge Panel. These are primary sources for AI training data.
- **Editorial mentions:** Earn coverage from food media, local press, and review sites that are likely in AI training corpora (Eater, Serious Eats, local newspaper food sections, Reddit food communities).
- **In-N-Out Burger → Practical Value Buyer (Dale):** Match score 49.6/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.59).
- **Wawa → Busy Professional (Marcus):** Match score 50.7/100, only 1 recs (gap -0.44).
- **Sweetgreen → Busy Professional (Marcus):** Match score 47.4/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.47).
- **Taco Bell → Performance Nutrition Buyer (Priya):** Match score 56.2/100, only 13 recs (gap -0.35).
- **Sweetgreen → Health-Conscious Family Buyer (Jenna):** Match score 47.6/100, only 2 recs (gap -0.35).
- **Sweetgreen → Budget & Value Seeker (Tyler):** Match score 44.7/100, only 0 recs (gap -0.35).

## Appendix A: Full Content Match Score Matrix

All scores on a 0–100 scale with letter grades. Higher = closer alignment between brand website language and ChatGPT's language when recommending to that audience.