

# 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