

Name Change Options – Screening Analysis (ChatGPT-Assisted)

This document summarizes a structured naming screen for:

1. **nural.ai**
2. **nutral.ai**
3. **lezim.ai**
4. **nabler.ai**
5. **mizu.ai**
6. **redigo.ai**

The analysis below was generated with the help of **ChatGPT**, using public web data (company sites, GitHub, LinkedIn, app stores, startup listings, and general search results) as of early December 2025. It is **not** a legal or trademark opinion, but an informed pre-screen to identify obvious risks and tradeoffs.

1. Methodology

1.1 What we optimized for

We evaluated each candidate name as a potential long-term **company / platform brand** in AI-driven B2B software, assuming:

- **.ai** is the primary domain.
- **.com** is a nice-to-have but **not required**.
- The product may evolve; we want a name that can stretch beyond the current feature set.
- We care about:
 - Trademark distinctiveness (in a common-sense, non-lawyer way).
 - Actual **brand collisions** (other companies using the same name).
 - **SEO/search reality**: who currently “owns” page 1 for the name.
 - Pronounceability and spelling.
 - Strategic fit with likely future positioning (trust/neutrality vs. speed vs. creativity, etc.).

1.2 Data sources

ChatGPT pulled from:

- General web search (Google-like index)
- Company and product sites
- GitHub and developer docs
- LinkedIn pages
- App stores and download portals
- Social accounts (Facebook, Instagram, etc.)
- News / startup writeups where available

All links below are examples, not an exhaustive crawl.

1.3 Evaluation rubric

Each name was scored (1–5) on the following:

1. Trademark strength / distinctiveness

- How arbitrary / protectable is the name in software/AI?

2. `.ai` domain viability

- Is the .ai domain obviously taken and in active use, or parked/likely acquirable?

3. Searchability & SEO controllability

- Can we plausibly own the term “<name> ai” with normal effort?

4. Brand collision risk

- Are there existing companies, products, or libraries using the same/similar word in tech/AI?

5. Pronounceability (native English speakers)

- Is it easy to say without hesitation?

6. Spelling robustness

- Will people type it correctly on first try?

7. Global linguistic safety

- Any obvious problematic meanings in major markets?

8. Conceptual flexibility

- Can the name stretch with future product directions?

9. Emotional tone / brand fit

- Does the name's feel match an AI-powered B2B platform (trust, competence, speed, etc.)?

10. Storytelling & brand narrative potential

- Does it give us usable metaphors and brand narrative hooks?

Scores are directional, not precise. The more important takeaway is **where collisions and SEO headaches appear**, and which names look “clean” vs. “noisy.”

2. Per-Name Analysis

2.1 nural.ai

High-level verdict:

Weak distinctiveness, lots of ambient noise, and collisions in both AI and crypto.

Observed usage & collisions

- **nural.ai** itself is **registered and parked** via Sedo/Namecheap; not an active site, but clearly owned by someone else.[[nural.ai parking page](#)turn0search20]
- **Nural AI** is already used as a **memecoin / crypto project** on Solana with its own whitepaper and branding at [nuralai.com](#). [oai_citation:0:nuralai.com](#)
- There is also a “**Nural AI**” **blog** talking about AI automation and trends. [oai_citation:1:Nural AI](#)
- Coinbase lists “**KEKIUS NURAL AI**” as a token, further tying “Nural AI” into crypto-focused search results. [oai_citation:2:Coinbase](#)
- Separately, there are multiple “**Neural AI**” companies (note the different spelling) including Neural AI in Malta and NeuralAI/Primed Labs.[[oai_citation:3:Neural AI](#)] This increases confusion because “nural” and “neural” are homophones for many users.

SEO reality

- Searches for “**nural ai**” are a noisy mix of:
 - Crypto/coin content
 - The Nural AI blog
 - Generic “neural AI” misspellings
- It’s hard to imagine owning a clean, uncontested SERP for “Nural AI” without constantly fighting this noise.

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **2/5** (too close to “neural”)
- **.ai** viability: **2/5** (parked, needs purchase; plus homophone issue)
- SEO controllability: **1/5** (crypto + “neural AI” noise)
- Collision risk: **2/5** (multiple entities using “Nural AI” or very close variants)
- Pronounceability: **4/5** (easy to say, but sounds like “neural”)
- Spelling robustness: **3/5**
- Global safety: **4/5**
- Flexibility: **4/5**
- Tone fit: **3/5**
- Story potential: **2/5**

Bottom line: I’d treat **nural.ai** as **high-risk / low-upside**: confusing, noisy, and hard to defend.

2.2 nutral.ai

High-level verdict:

Strategically interesting name if we lean into “neutrality” and trust. Some ambient noise from the concept of “neutral AI,” but no major direct SaaS collisions.

Observed usage & collisions

- There is no obvious active website branded as **nutral.ai**; the **.ai** appears unclaimed or unused (registrar check still required).
- “**Nutral Ai**” appears as:
 - A **Facebook page** promoting luxury/sports cars.[[oai_citation:4Facebook](#)]
 - An **Instagram handle** with the same branding.[[oai_citation:5Instagram](#)] These are not software products but they do use the string “Nutral Ai.”

- The phrase “**Neutral AI**” is actively used:
 - As the brand for **Neutral AI**, a customer-service chatbot/agent product at neutral-ai.io and related properties.[[oai_citation:6](#)†[Neutral AI](#)]
 - As a **concept** in AI ethics and policy writing (e.g., discussions of whether “neutral AI” is even possible).[[oai_citation:7](#)†[Open Ethics Initiative](#)]

SEO reality

- For “**nutral ai**”, current competition is mild: mostly the car-related accounts plus a few scattered mentions.
- For “**neutral AI**”, competition is intense (products, articles, thought pieces).
- With consistent branding and content, “**nutral.ai**” could likely own the modified spelling and the branded search term, but we’d always be living next door to the “neutral AI” discourse.

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **4/5** (spelling variant improves distinctiveness)
- `.ai` viability: **4/5** (appears acquirable)
- SEO controllability: **3/5** (can own “nutral.ai,” but “neutral AI” is noisy)
- Collision risk: **3/5** (small non-tech uses, plus conceptual overlap with Neutral AI products)
- Pronounceability: **4/5** (native English speakers will say it fine)
- Spelling robustness: **3/5** (people may type “neutral.ai” by mistake)
- Global safety: **4/5**
- Flexibility: **5/5** (works across many future product directions)
- Tone fit: **5/5** if we position around trust/neutrality/independence
- Story potential: **5/5** (“the neutral layer,” “structured neutrality,” etc.)

Bottom line:

If we want to lean into a “**trusted neutral infrastructure**” story, **nutral.ai** is one of the strongest options conceptually, with manageable but real SEO and conceptual noise from “neutral AI.”

////////////////////////////////////

2.3 lezim.ai

High-level verdict:

Cleanest slate legally and in search. No tech companies using it. Only meaningful competition is the Indian folk dance, which is unrelated.

Observed usage & collisions

- **Lezim** is a well-documented **folk dance from Maharashtra, India**, with strong presence on Wikipedia, YouTube, etc.[[oai_citation:8+|Wikipedia](#)]
- There is **no visible AI/tech company** branding as “**Lezim**” or “Lezim AI.”
- No active site at **lezim.ai** shows up in search; the domain appears unclaimed or unused.

SEO reality

- Generic search for “**lezim**” is—and likely will remain—dominated by dance content (Wikipedia, videos, cultural sites).
- For “**Lezim AI**”, there appears to be no competition today; we would likely become the canonical “Lezim AI” result quickly with even modest SEO effort.

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **5/5** (arbitrary in software; very protectable)
- **.ai** viability: **5/5** (appears clean)
- SEO controllability: **3/5** (we can own “Lezim AI,” but not the generic dance term)
- Collision risk: **5/5** (no tech/AI brand collisions)
- Pronounceability: **3/5** (some English speakers may stumble at first: “LEH-zim” vs. “LEE-zim”)
- Spelling robustness: **4/5**
- Global safety: **4/5** (no negative connotations found)
- Flexibility: **5/5** (totally abstract in tech)
- Tone fit: **3/5** (neutral; doesn’t naturally say “trust” or “AI”—we’d have to build it)
- Story potential: **4/5** (can lean into ideas of rhythm, coordination, energy, “bringing teams into sync”)

Bottom line:

From a **collision + SEO + trademark** standpoint, **lezim.ai** is arguably the cleanest option. It’s a classic “invented brand” situation where we would give the name its meaning over time.

2.4 nabler.ai

High-level verdict:

There is an existing, well-established analytics consultancy called **Nabler**, which is now part of Brainlabs. This creates real confusion risk in a neighboring space.

Observed usage & collisions

- **Nabler** (no .ai) is an **established digital analytics consultancy** now part of Brainlabs,

with a long web history, case studies, and staffing pages at nabler.com and on LinkedIn:[
[oai_citation:9+LinkedIn](#)]

- Focus on data analytics, digital media, and marketing analytics.
- In at least one Korean technical document, “**nabler AI**” appears as a term in the semiconductor context, though this looks more like a descriptive label than a brand.[
[oai_citation:10+etri.re.kr](#)]
- There’s no obvious active website at **nabler.ai**, but even if we took that domain, search and conversation around “Nabler” would not be a blank slate.

SEO reality

- For “**Nabler**”, the analytics consultancy (now tied to Brainlabs) dominates results.
- For “**Nabler AI**”, we get a mix of the above plus scattered mentions; we would always be competing with that prior brand history in a related field (analytics/data).

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **3/5** (not generic, but existing firm muddying the water)
- [.ai](#) viability: **4/5** (likely acquirable)
- SEO controllability: **2/5** (Nabler’s legacy footprint is strong)
- Collision risk: **2/5** (clear, established company in adjacent domain)
- Pronounceability: **5/5**
- Spelling robustness: **5/5**
- Global safety: **4/5**
- Flexibility: **4/5**
- Tone fit: **4/5** (“enabler” → empowerment)
- Story potential: **4/5**

Bottom line:

Even if we secure **nabler.ai**, we’d be the second well-known tech/analytics “Nabler” in the market. That’s a non-trivial brand and SEO risk.

2.5 mizu.ai

High-level verdict:

“Mizu” is a beautiful, high-potential brand word (“water” in Japanese), but multiple AI-related companies are *already* using “Mizu AI” or “Mizu” in AI contexts.

Observed usage & collisions

- **Mizu AI Solutions** at mizuaisolutions.com – an AI automation company helping non-technical entrepreneurs automate operations and reclaim time.[
[oai_citation:11‡mizuaisolutions.com](#)]
- **Mizu AI** voice model in the Fineshare AI voice generator / TTS platform.[
[oai_citation:12‡Fineshare](#)]
- **MIZU** at mizu.global – focuses on **AI-ready datasets** and infrastructure for RAG, fine-tuning, etc.[
[oai_citation:13‡mizu.global](#)]
- **Mizuai** at mizuai.com – uses AI plus human talent to streamline coding and development workflows.[
[oai_citation:14‡mizuai.com](#)]
- These are all **squarely in the AI / automation / devtools space**, overlapping heavily with our world.

We didn't see an actively branded site at **mizu.ai** itself, but even if the domain were obtainable, the brand field for "Mizu / Mizu AI" is already crowded.

SEO reality

- Searches for "**Mizu AI**" return multiple independent AI companies and products using that exact phrase.[
[oai_citation:15‡mizuaisolutions.com](#)]
- Owning the SERP would be difficult and, even if achieved, potentially confusing to users.

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **4/5** (in isolation)
- **.ai** viability: **1–2/5** (domain usage unclear, but collision risk is high regardless)
- SEO controllability: **1/5** (busy with existing Mizu AI brands)
- Collision risk: **1/5** (multiple active AI products/companies using "Mizu AI")
- Pronounceability: **5/5**
- Spelling robustness: **5/5**
- Global safety: **5/5**
- Flexibility: **5/5**
- Tone fit: **5/5** (great metaphor: flow, clarity, adaptability)
- Story potential: **5/5**

Bottom line:

Amazing *word*, but from a **name + .ai + SEO** perspective, this is already heavily occupied by other AI players. We'd be jumping into a crowded "Mizu AI" namespace.

////////////////////////////////////

2.6 redigo.ai

High-level verdict:

Energetic and pronounceable, but “Redigo” already exists in several tech products: a major Redis client library and a travel/taxi app, among others.

Observed usage & collisions

- **Redigo** – a widely used **Go client for Redis/Valkey**, hosted at github.com/gomodule/redigo and documented on pkg.go.dev.[[oai_citation:16](#)†[GitHub](#)]
- **Redigo** Android app – a **travel/taxi-style app** from Rambler&Co, distributed via Uptodown and other app stores.[[oai_citation:17](#)†[Uptodown](#)]
- “Redigo” also appears:
 - As a **pesticide product name** in agricultural contexts (“Redigo” as a formulation).
[oai_citation:18](#)†[ScienceDirect](#)
 - In various content snippets mentioning “Redigo AI mode” or “#redigo #ai” in social/short-video content.[[oai_citation:19](#)†[Facebook](#)]
- We didn’t see an active site at **redigo.ai**, so the domain itself may be obtainable, but the name is already in wide use.

SEO reality

- For “**Redigo**”, the Redis client and the travel app dominate early results.
- For “**Redigo AI**”, results are currently more scattered but still influenced by those existing uses and generic AI mentions.
- We’d always be the third or fourth “Redigo” in tech unless we out-invest everyone in brand/SEO.

Qualitative scores (directional)

- TM distinctiveness: **4/5** (not generic, but already used in tech)
- **.ai** viability: **4/5** (appears acquirable)
- SEO controllability: **2/5** (Redis client + app have entrenched presence)
- Collision risk: **2/5** (different verticals, but overlapping tech ecosystem)
- Pronounceability: **5/5**
- Spelling robustness: **5/5**
- Global safety: **5/5**
- Flexibility: **4/5**
- Tone fit: **4/5** (fast, “ready to go”)
- Story potential: **4/5**

Bottom line:

If we want a “**speed/automation**” story, “Redigo” is appealing on tone and meaning, but we’d be living alongside several other Redigos, including a well-known open-source library that developer audiences already associate with the word.

3. Summary & Ranking

3.1 Comparative summary

Very rough ranking (higher is better overall, based on the rubric):

- **Lezim.ai** – cleanest in terms of collisions and trademark; abstract, flexible, brandable.
- **Nutral.ai** – strong if neutrality/trust are core themes; some noise from “neutral AI” but manageable.
- **Redigo.ai** – good energy, but meaningful collisions in tech.
- **Mizu.ai** – great word, but “Mizu AI” space already crowded.
- **Nabler.ai** – okay as a word, but clear conflict with existing Nabler analytics.
- **Nural.ai** – noisy and weakly differentiated (especially vs “neural AI” and existing Nural AI projects).

3.2 How this should be used

This analysis is best treated as:

- A **filter** to avoid obviously painful choices, and
 - A way to narrow a short list for **legal trademark search** and **board-level discussion**, not as the final word.
-

4. My Subjective Take (Ed’s perspective)

Stepping out of the rubric for a moment:

- **None** of these names absolutely blow me away.
- **Some are clearly acceptable** and workable if we pick one and commit.
- From a mix of practicality + strategy:
 - I’d be most comfortable short-listing **Lezim.ai** and **Nutral.ai**.
 - I’d keep **Redigo.ai** in the conversation only if we heavily weight “speed/automation”

and are comfortable with collisions.

- I'd drop **Nural.ai**, **Nabler.ai**, and probably **Mizu.ai** from serious contention unless we have a strong emotional/strategic reason to keep them.

This write-up was assembled with ChatGPT's help, using public web data plus a structured rubric we defined. Any final decision should also run through formal trademark counsel and our own sense of where the product and brand are headed over the next 5–10 years.