

Sparkling Authority Product Review Template

Structure

Verdict

- Always visible
- 2-3 sentences
- 50-75 words
- Verdict should not repeat sentences or phrases from the full review verbatim
- Avoid hedging language unless uncertainty is genuinely part of the product experience
- Components:
 - ◆ Opening statement: What makes the product notable/distinctive
 - ◆ Key strength or weakness
 - ◆ Who it's for / recommendation

Full Review

- Behind "Show More" button
- ~200-300 words total
- 3 sections with headers, no intro/outro paragraphs
- Natural prose within each section (no bullet points)

Three Sections Spec

1. Taste & Flavor (~60-80 words)

- ◆ Flavor accuracy and intensity
- ◆ Sweetness level (if flavored)
- ◆ Aftertaste notes

2. Carbonation & Mouthfeel (~60-80 words)

- ◆ Bubble size, intensity, longevity
- ◆ How it feels in the mouth

3: Value & Context (~60-80 words)

- ◆ Price positioning
- ◆ Comparison to similar products
- ◆ Market positioning / where it fits
- ◆ Reinforce or nuance the verdict in context of price and category

Storage in Supabase and output on page

- `verdict` column: The 2-3 sentence summary
- `review_full` column: Three sections joined with `===SECTION_BREAK===` delimiter
 - **Format:**
 - ♦ [Taste & Flavor]
 - ♦ ===SECTION_BREAK===
 - ♦ [Carbonation & Mouthfeel]
 - ♦ ===SECTION_BREAK===
 - ♦ [Value & Context]

Factual Integrity

- Do not invent or infer details such as sourcing, mineral content, flavor notes, carbonation levels, market value, comparisons to other products or brands, production methods, or certifications.
- Only multi-sourced content that is cross referenced and fact checked is acceptable to be used as research content to write reviews.
- If information is unknown, and that information is needed to write the review 100% accurately, stop writing and alert the person providing the prompt of what is needed if you can't access that information yourself externally.

Low-Character / Utility Products

When a product has minimal flavor, weak carbonation, or little to distinguish it:

- It is acceptable and preferred to describe the product as neutral, flat, or unremarkable.
- Do not invent nuance, hidden complexity, or "approachability" to compensate for lack of character.
- Favor clarity over creativity. Shorter, plainer sentences are appropriate.
- Use comparison to establish lack of distinction (for example, "flatter than Polar," "less character than store-brand competitors").
- A negative or indifferent verdict is valid if supported by accurate observation.

Examples and further spec on low-character products

Taste & Flavor

- ♦ Can be very short and very plain.

- ♦ Example direction:
"There's little to distinguish the flavor beyond clean carbonated water."

Carbonation & Mouthfeel

- ♦ This becomes the main differentiator by *absence*:
"Carbonation is soft and fades quickly."

Value & Context

- ♦ Example:
"It only makes sense on price or convenience."

Voice & Style Rules

Never:

- Sound like AI
 - ♦ Avoid: "In conclusion," "It's worth noting," "Ultimately," "At the end of the day"
 - ♦ Avoid: Overly formal constructions like "one may find" or "it is important to note"
 - ♦ Never use: 'dive into', 'unleash', 'game-changing', 'transformative', 'leverage', 'optimize', 'unlock potential', or 'In today's fast-paced world'.
 - ♦ Rhetorical framing questions ("So how does it stack up?")
 - ♦ Use em dashes
 - ♦ Never use em dashes or parenthetical punctuation to create emphasis
 - ♦ Use phrases like "that isn't just x. It's y."
 - ♦ Overuse of contrast constructions
 - ♦ Use excessive intensifiers or flowery language
 - ♦ Use bullet points in the review text

Always:

- Write in natural, conversational prose
- Be specific with sensory details based on well researched sentiment
- Make honest, direct comparisons
- Set clear expectations (who it's for / who it's not for)
- Use concrete examples over vague descriptors
- Prioritize evaluative judgment over neutral description

Handling Repetitive Elements Across Same-Brand Products

The Challenge

- Many brands have consistent carbonation, packaging, and value positioning across all flavors. Copying the same text creates SEO risk and feels low-effort.

The Solution: Consistency + Variation



- **Core Principle:** Describe the same reality using different words, structures, and comparisons.

For Carbonation (when consistent across brand)

Write it differently each time using:

1. **Different sentence structures**
 - "Carbonation is mid-range..." vs. "The bubbles sit in the middle..." vs. "Fizz level is moderate..."
2. **Different comparative references**
 - Review 1: "compared to competitors"
 - Review 2: "not as aggressive as Topo Chico"
 - Review 3: "gentler than Polar"
 - Review 4: "similar to Bubly"
3. **Different descriptive words** (synonyms)
 - "fine bubbles" / "small bubbles" / "delicate fizz"
 - "smooth" / "gentle" / "easy-drinking"
 - "crisp lift" / "refreshing pop" / "lively sensation"
4. **Flavor-specific context when possible**
 - "The gentle bubbles complement the citrus notes..."
 - "Moderate carbonation doesn't overpower the subtle fruit..."
5. **You can use shorthand for some brands:**
 - "Carbonation follows [Brand]'s house style: [brief description]. [1-2 flavor-specific sentences if applicable, or confirm consistency]."
 - Shorthand should be used sparingly and never as the entire carbonation section

SEO-Safe Repetition Guidelines

-  ****Safe:**** - Similar information with varied phrasing across reviews - One section (50-70 words) having overlap when others are unique - Brand-standard references ("follows LaCroix's house style")
-  ****Risk:**** - Exact copy-paste of full paragraphs across multiple reviews - Entire reviews that feel templated/samey - No unique value per page ****Target:**** Each review must contain at least one unique comparison, one unique sensory detail, and one product-specific

judgment

Post-writing check

After writing the content based on the above rules

- Review all content to confirm it follows the guidelines 100%
- Review all claims made in the content by cross checking references and sources so that only 100% factually informed content is created