

PRD: AI Search & Brand Visibility Intelligence Platform

1. Product Overview

Product Name (Working)

AIO Mapper

One-Line Description

A platform that measures, explains, and improves how brands appear, are cited, and are trusted across AI search and generative answer engines.

Problem Statement

Brands have no reliable way to understand:

- Whether they appear in AI-generated answers
- How often they are cited, recommended, or excluded
- Why competitors are referenced instead
- What specific content or authority gaps cause invisibility

Traditional SEO tools do not map to generative retrieval, citation behavior, or answer synthesis logic.

Solution

Provide a system that:

- Simulates real AI questions
- Measures brand presence, absence, and sentiment
- Explains why outcomes occur

- Prescribes concrete, content-level and authority-level fixes
-

2. Goals & Non-Goals

Primary Goals

1. Quantify brand visibility in AI answers
2. Attribute visibility to specific content and authority signals
3. Track change over time
4. Provide actionable remediation guidance

Non-Goals

- Rank tracking for classic SERPs
 - Traffic attribution or click modeling
 - Black-box “AI score” without explanation
-

3. Target Users & Jobs-to-Be-Done

Primary Users

- Enterprise SEO & Content Leads
- Brand & Comms Teams
- Digital Strategy Directors
- Agency Analytics & Search Teams

Jobs-to-Be-Done

- “Do AI systems recommend us for our category?”
 - “Which competitors are cited instead of us?”
 - “What content is AI actually pulling from?”
 - “How do we improve visibility without guessing?”
-

4. Core Use Cases

1. Brand Discovery Audit

- Is the brand mentioned for category-level prompts?

2. Competitive AI Share of Voice

- Who appears most often in AI answers?

3. Citation & Source Analysis

- Which URLs AI models rely on

4. Content Gap Detection

- What questions AI cannot answer using brand content

5. Trend Tracking

- Visibility before vs. after content changes
-

5. Functional Requirements

5.1 AI Query Simulation Engine

Description

Simulates real user prompts across AI systems.

Requirements

- Prompt library by intent:
 - Informational
 - Comparative
 - Transactional
 - Trust / safety / authority
- Ability to:
 - Run fixed prompts
 - Auto-generate prompts from site taxonomy
- Support for:
 - ChatGPT-style answers
 - Perplexity-style cited answers
 - Search-augmented AI flows

Outputs

- Full answer text
- Brand mentions
- Position in answer
- Citation presence or absence

5.2 Brand & Entity Detection

Description

Identifies how and where brands appear in responses.

Requirements

- Detect:
 - Explicit mentions
 - Implied references
 - Brand variants
 - Classify:
 - Primary recommendation
 - Supporting mention
 - Negative / cautionary mention
 - Confidence scoring per mention
-

5.3 AI Citation & Source Mapping

Description

Explains *why* a brand appears or does not.

Requirements

- Extract cited URLs when available
- Map uncited claims to likely source types:
 - Wikipedia
 - Government sites
 - High-authority publishers
 - Brand-owned content
- Identify:

- Missing citations
 - Over-reliance on third parties
 - Competitor authority dominance
-

5.4 AI Visibility Scoring Framework

Composite Score (Transparent)

- Presence Rate
- Recommendation Rate
- Citation Rate
- Authority Diversity
- Sentiment Weighting

Rules

- Scores must be explainable
 - Each sub-score visible
 - No single opaque “AI score”
-

5.5 Competitive Benchmarking

Description

Shows how visibility compares across brands.

Requirements

- Side-by-side comparison

- Prompt-level breakdowns
 - Share of AI answers by brand
 - Trend deltas over time
-

5.6 Prescriptive Insights Engine

Description

Translates findings into actions.

Requirements

- Content recommendations:
 - Missing pages
 - Missing claims
 - Weak explanations
 - Authority recommendations:
 - Third-party validation gaps
 - Schema and structure gaps
 - Prioritization by:
 - Impact
 - Effort
 - Risk
-

6. Non-Functional Requirements

Performance

- Full audit under 5 minutes per brand
- Incremental refresh for tracking runs

Transparency

- Every metric traceable to:
 - Prompt
 - Answer
 - Evidence

Security & Compliance

- No storage of proprietary prompts without consent
 - SOC-ready architecture
 - Clear AI usage disclosure
-

7. UX & IA Principles

Core UX Rules

- Always show:
 - The question asked
 - The answer returned
 - Why the result happened
- Avoid:
 - Alarmist language

- Red/green panic metrics
- Progressive disclosure:
 - High-level summary first
 - Evidence on demand

Key Screens

1. AI Visibility Overview
 2. Prompt Results Explorer
 3. Brand vs Competitor View
 4. Citation Source Breakdown
 5. Recommendations Dashboard
-

8. Metrics & Success Criteria

Product Metrics

- Time to insight
- % of users viewing evidence
- Recommendation adoption rate

Customer Outcomes

- Increased brand presence in AI answers
- Increased citation of brand-owned content
- Reduced reliance on third-party summaries

9. Risks & Mitigations

Risk

AI outputs change unpredictably

Mitigation

- Aggregate trends, not single runs
- Confidence bands on metrics

Risk

Users misinterpret absence as penalty

Mitigation

- Explicit education on:
 - Coverage vs exclusion
 - Authority vs popularity

10. Differentiation vs Existing Tools

Area	This Tool	Profound-Like Tools
Explainability	Full evidence trail	Often abstracted
Scoring	Transparent sub-scores	Composite only
Content Guidance	Page-level fixes	Topic-level
Trust Signals	Explicit authority modeling	Implicit

11. Phase Roadmap

Phase 1: Core Visibility

- Prompt simulation
- Brand detection
- Manual competitor input

Phase 2: Authority Intelligence

- Citation mapping
- Source dominance modeling

Phase 3: Continuous Monitoring

- Scheduled re-runs
 - Alerting on visibility shifts
-

12. Open Questions

- Should users define their brand entity explicitly?
- How much prompt customization is too much?
- Do we expose raw AI answers or summaries by default?

Key Insight (Important)

You do **NOT** need to “integrate with ChatGPT” as a UI product.

You need:

- Controlled LLM calls
- Deterministic prompt templates
- Logged outputs
- Repeatable measurement

This is *backend inference*, not chat UX.

Part 2: Phase 1 Scope (Deliberately Constrained)

Phase 1 goal:

“Can we reliably measure whether a brand appears, is recommended, or is cited when AI answers category-level questions?”

Phase 1 Will Include

- Fixed prompt library
- Single LLM provider
- Brand-presence detection
- Prompt-level outputs
- No competitor auto-discovery
- No sentiment modeling yet

Phase 1 Will NOT Include

- Multiple AI engines

- User-custom prompts
 - Real-time monitoring
 - Alerting
 - Agent orchestration
-

Part 3: High-Level Architecture Additions

Current Stack (You)

Next.js (App Router)

Vercel

Supabase (Postgres + RLS)

Server actions / API routes

Phase 1 Additions

LLM Inference Layer (server-only)

Prompt Library

AI Answer Store

Brand Presence Analyzer

No infra changes. No queues yet. No workers.

Part 4: AI Integration Strategy (Vercel-Safe)

Recommended for Phase 1

OpenAI Responses API (server-only)

Why:

- Deterministic enough

- Supports structured output
- Cheap for batch prompts
- Well supported in Vercel edge or serverless

You do *not* need:

- LangChain
- Agents
- Vector DB
- Tool calling

This keeps your system auditable and explainable.

Example Vercel Pattern

- `/app/api/ai/runPrompt/route.ts`
 - Server-only
 - No client exposure
 - Logged to Supabase
-

Part 5: Data Model Additions (Supabase)

1. `ai_prompt_templates`

Stores your fixed prompt library.

```
create table ai_prompt_templates (  
  id uuid primary key default gen_random_uuid(),  
  name text not null,
```

```
intent text not null, -- informational | comparison | recommendation
prompt_template text not null,
is_active boolean default true,
created_at timestamp default now()
);
```

Example prompt template:

```
"What are the most trusted {category} brands in Canada and why?"
```

2. ai_prompt_runs

One execution of one prompt.

```
create table ai_prompt_runs (
  id uuid primary key default gen_random_uuid(),
  audit_id uuid references audits(id),
  prompt_id uuid references ai_prompt_templates(id),
  brand_name text not null,
  model text not null,
  raw_response text not null,
  executed_at timestamp default now()
);
```

This is your **ground truth log**.

3. ai_brand_presence

Normalized analysis output.

```
create table ai_brand_presence (
  id uuid primary key default gen_random_uuid(),
  prompt_run_id uuid references ai_prompt_runs(id),
  brand_detected boolean,
  mention_type text, -- primary | secondary | implied | none
  citation_present boolean,
```

```
confidence numeric,  
created_at timestamp default now()  
);
```

This mirrors your **claim support coverage logic** and will feel familiar.

4. Optional (Phase 1.5): **ai_citations**

Only if citations are detectable.

```
create table ai_citations (  
  id uuid primary key default gen_random_uuid(),  
  prompt_run_id uuid references ai_prompt_runs(id),  
  source_url text,  
  source_type text, -- wikipedia | publisher | brand | government  
  created_at timestamp default now()  
);
```

Part 6: API & Server Logic

1. Run AI Visibility Audit (Server Action)

POST /api/ai/run-visibility

Input

```
{  
  "audit_id": "uuid",  
  "brand_name": "PlayNow",  
  "category": "online lottery"  
}
```

Steps

1. Fetch active prompt templates

2. Interpolate category + brand
3. Run LLM calls sequentially
4. Store raw responses
5. Run brand presence parser
6. Save normalized results

2. Brand Presence Parser (Critical Logic)

You already do this conceptually for claims.

Phase 1 rules:

- Exact string match
- Known variants
- Position in answer
- Citation adjacency (if available)

This can be a **pure function**:

```
analyzeBrandPresence(responseText, brandName)
```

No ML yet. Keep it inspectable.

Part 7: UI Integration (Minimal, Non-Disruptive)

Where This Lives in AIO Mapper

Add a **new tab**, not a new product:

“AI Visibility”

Phase 1 UI Components

- Prompt list
- AI answer preview
- Brand presence badge
- Confidence note
- Educational copy

Do **not** mix this with SEO/GEO scores yet.

Part 8: Credit Model Integration

Treat this like a **premium audit extension**.

Suggested cost model:

- 1 AI prompt = X credits
- Phase 1 default run = 5–10 prompts

Reuse your existing **credits** ledger exactly as is.

Part 9: What You Are Explicitly NOT Doing Yet (Correctly)

- No competitor scraping
- No “AI rank”
- No visibility alerts
- No auto-prompt generation

Those come later once signal stability is proven.

Part 10: Phase 1 Success Criteria

You will know this is working when:

- Results are repeatable across runs
- Users understand *why* they appear or not
- Outputs feel grounded, not alarming
- You can explain every score on a call

Final Take (Important)

This is **not a new product**.

It is a **new analysis layer** that fits naturally beside:

- Claim Support Coverage
- Source Transparency
- GEO Readiness

Which is why AIO Mapper can credibly compete with Profound *without* copying it.