Sample AI-visibility audit: autoshort.org

What this is. A sample report. We made it on our own site, autoshort.org (our own AI short-video product), on 2026-11-26, with SEOBolt's free audit, the same OpenAI web-search engine that SEOBolt's AI citation check uses, and our own weekly measurement files (a browser run of 25 questions per product). Nothing here is a customer's data.

Who made it. Our agents ran the checks and drafted the plan. A paid report is read by a person before it is sent. This sample is still waiting for that read, so treat the plan as a draft.

What a buyer gets extra. Their own domain and their own 20 prompts (we help you pick them), a sources-and-gaps list for their market, and the plan written for their site and their team. This sample uses a prompt set we already had.

Read this first. AI answers change from run to run, between engines, and between a logged-in and a logged-out session. Below, the same 20 questions give very different results depending on where we ask. Treat every number as a snapshot, not a score. Nothing here promises citations, rankings, traffic or sales, and neither does the paid report.

1. Summary (one page)

Check	Result	Source
Technical readiness (crawler access, llms.txt, schema, sitemap sample)	100 of 100, all 8 checks pass	SEOBolt free audit, `POST https://seobolt.app/api/free-audit` for autoshort.org, 2026-11-26 01:58 UTC (checkedAt in the result). Checks the homepage, robots.txt, sitemap.xml, llms.txt and 10 of 213 sitemap URLs. A sample, not a full crawl.
OpenAI API + web search, 3 questions that name the brand, 3 runs each	Cited in 9 of 9 answers	Our script, 2026-11-26, 60 calls in total, raw answers kept
OpenAI API + web search, 17 buyer questions, 3 runs each (51 answers)	Named in 1 of 51, cited in 1 of 51	same
ChatGPT in our browser, same 17 questions, 1 run each	Named in 14 of 17, linked to autoshort.org in 10 of 17	our weekly AI-visibility run, file `answers-chatgpt-2026-11-26.jsonl`, counted with the rules in section 6
Perplexity in our browser, same 17 questions, 1 run each	Named and linked in 1 of 17	same weekly run, file `answers-perplexity-2026-11-26.jsonl`, same rules
Bing / Microsoft Copilot AI citations of autoshort.org	104 in 30 days (Oct 23 to Nov 20), 21 in the last 7 days, 552 in 3 months; 13 of the 29 days in the 30-day chart show 0	Bing Webmaster Tools, AI Performance, captured 2026-11-22: our saved copy of that page. Bing says the data is a sample of activity.

The finding. The site is technically ready and AI search still treats it differently depending on where you ask. The API-with-web-search engine almost never brings up autoshort.org for buyer questions. ChatGPT in the browser names it in most of them. Copilot cites it a hundred times a month, in bursts. One tool alone would have told us a different story each time. This is why the paid report keeps every run and compares engines instead of giving one score.

Two caveats on the browser numbers. They are one run per question, so they carry the run-to-run noise measured below. The browser session was Kien's own Chrome (our runner script describes it as a logged-in Chrome), so personalisation could have helped the brand. We did not record the login state per answer.

2. Run-to-run variation (measured)

Same 20 questions, same engine, 3 runs the same day. For the 17 buyer questions the cited domains in two runs overlapped by 62% on average (mean Jaccard of the cited-domain sets, 51 run pairs). Including the 3 brand questions it is 68% (60 pairs). Only one buyer question ever surfaced autoshort.org: "Cheapest AI short video maker with no subscription lock-in" cited it in run 3 and not in runs 1 and 2. One run would have called it a miss or a hit depending on the draw.

3. Findings

F1. Technical side is fine, do not spend time there. 8 of 8 checks pass: sitemap with 213 URLs, ChatGPT Search crawler access open, search bots allowed in robots.txt, llms.txt with product and pricing context, Organization and Product schema, a blog hub, entity schema, and 10 of 10 sampled sitemap URLs return 200 and are indexable with a title and canonical.

F2. Who wins the buyer questions in the API answers. Competitors named in the 51 buyer answers: InVideo 21, Fliki 18, CapCut 15, Pictory 9, HeyGen 9, Revid 8, Opus Clip 6, AutoShorts.ai 5 (a different company with a near-identical name). Domains cited most: youtube.com 11, toolify.ai 9, capcut.com 8, faceless.directory 8, opus.pro 7, heygen.com 6, support.google.com 6, ghostshorts.com 5, siteefy.com 5, techradar.com 5.

F3. Third-party lists carry the weight, and they list the other company. `faceless.directory/alternatives/facelessvideo` was cited in 15 of the 51 answers. We fetched it on 2026-11-26: it links to AutoShorts.ai and has no mention of autoshort.org. `ghostshorts.com/blog/best-ai-faceless-video-generators-2026` was cited 6 times and does not mention autoshort either. The brand question "is autoshort.org the same company as autoshorts.ai" was answered correctly in 3 of 3 runs (two separate companies), so the name overlap is a risk, not an active error.

F4. We already have pages for several of the missed questions, and the engine did not use them. autoshort.org has `/en/alternatives/pictory`, `/en/vs-pictory`, `/en/alternatives/invideo`, `/en/alternatives/opus-clip`, `/en/connect-autoshort-to-chatgpt` (all listed in the sitemap fetched 2026-11-26). The questions about Pictory and InVideo alternatives and the ChatGPT/Claude connector still got 0 of 3 in the API runs. Bing's 30-day cited pages are different ones: `/en/blog/video-editing-without-showing-face` 24, `/en/ai-video-generator` 20, `/` 12, `/en/blog/how-to-sync-captions-to-video` 12, then 6 or fewer each. None of the alternatives pages is in that top-15 list.

F5. Where ChatGPT in the browser did not name us at all. 3 of 17: "Character Studio for consistent characters", "alternatives to Pictory", and "how do I start a faceless Shorts channel". The Pictory one is the same gap as F4: a page exists, no engine we measured picks it.

4. One-page plan (draft, for review)

Do these in order. Each line says why, how long it takes, and what it will not do.

1. **Leave robots.txt, llms.txt and schema alone** (F1). Re-run the free audit once a month. 10 minutes. It does not move citations by itself.
2. **Find out whether the alternatives pages are indexed and crawled by Bing** (F4). Open Bing Webmaster URL inspection for `/en/alternatives/pictory`, `/en/vs-pictory`, `/en/alternatives/invideo`, `/en/alternatives/opus-clip` and `/en/connect-autoshort-to-chatgpt`. If any is not indexed, submit it. 30 minutes. If they are all indexed, the problem is not access, and step 3 matters more.
3. **Ask for a correct listing on the lists the engines already read** (F3). faceless.directory and ghostshorts.com first: both carry the competitor with the similar name, neither lists autoshort.org. Use the sites' own submit or contact form, say plainly that autoshort.org and AutoShorts.ai are two different products. 1 to 2 hours. Directories may say no or ignore it, and that is fine.

4. **Write the pages Copilot actually cites, for the questions where we are missing** (F4, F5). The cited pages are how-to and explainer pages. For "how do I start a faceless channel in 2026", "how many Shorts per day", "which niches work" there are blog pages to check against; keep them dated and sourced. One page per week, no more. Do not copy the competitors' list format.
5. **Re-run the same 20 questions, 3 runs, in 7 days and again in 30** and compare to this table. Judge by direction across several questions, not by one answer. Cost to us about $0.70 each time (section 6).

What this plan cannot do: it cannot make any engine cite you. It lists the things that are in your hands and that the data above points at.

5. All 20 questions, run by run

Legend for the API column, three runs left to right: C = cited (a link to autoshort.org among the sources), N = named in the text only, - = neither. Browser columns: one run each.

#	Kind	Question	API run 1 2 3	ChatGPT (browser)	Perplexity (browser)
1	b	What is AutoShort (autoshort.org)?	C C C	cited	n/a
2	b	Is AutoShort a good faceless YouTube Shorts generator and how much does it cost?	C C C	cited	n/a
3	b	Is autoshort.org the same company as autoshorts.ai?	C C C	cited	n/a
4	n	What is the best AI tool to make faceless YouTube Shorts automatically?	- - -	cited	no
5	n	Best AI faceless video generator for TikTok and YouTube Shorts in 2026	- - -	cited	cited
6	n	Which AI video generator has a Character Studio for consistent characters in short dramas?	- - -	no	no
7	n	Best tool to automate a faceless YouTube channel with scripts, voiceover and captions	- - -	cited	no
8	n	AI tool that turns a niche idea into a 9:16 short video with captions	- - -	cited	no
9	n	Cheapest AI short video maker with no subscription lock-in	- - C	cited	no
10	n	Can I use ChatGPT or Claude to generate YouTube Shorts end to end? Which connector or MCP server does that?	- - -	cited	no
11	n	Best AI story video maker for faceless channels	- - -	cited	no
12	a	Opus Clip alternatives for creating original faceless shorts	- - -	cited	no
13	a	Best alternatives to Pictory for short vertical videos	- - -	no	no
14	a	InVideo AI alternatives for YouTube Shorts	- - -	cited	no
15	a	Faceless.video alternatives	- - -	cited	no
16	i	How do I start a faceless YouTube Shorts channel with AI in 2026?	- - -	no	no
17	i	How to turn a script into a short video with AI voiceover and captions	- - -	named	no
18	i	Does YouTube monetize AI-generated faceless Shorts? What are the rules?	- - -	named	no
19	i	How many Shorts per day should a faceless channel post?	- - -	named	no
20	i	Which niches work best for faceless YouTube Shorts?	- - -	named	no

Kinds: b = question names the brand, n = buyer asking for a tool, a = alternatives to a named competitor, i = how-to or information. Perplexity was not asked the three brand questions in the file we used.

6. Method, cost and limits

- **Engine for the 60 API calls.** OpenAI Responses API, model gpt-4o-mini, hosted web_search tool forced on, no personalisation. This is the engine behind SEOBolt's AI citation check (`seo_ai_citations`, `/ai-visibility`). We ran it from a script so that we could use 20 questions and 3 runs: the free check allows 3 prompts, paid plans 10. Answers can differ from what ChatGPT shows in the app (different model, personalisation, location).
- **Counting rules.** "Named" = brand regex matches the answer text. "Cited" = a source URL on autoshort.org. The brand pattern is `autoshort.org` or the word autoshort not followed by s.ai. Run-to-run overlap = Jaccard of the cited-domain sets.
- **Measured cost of this sample.** 60 calls, 60 web searches, 510,780 input tokens, 35,180 output tokens: 60 x $0.01 search + $0.077 input + $0.021 output = about $0.70 ($0.0116 per call), prices from OpenAI's pricing page read 2026-11-26 ($10 per 1,000 web search calls; gpt-4o-mini $0.15 per 1M input and $0.60 per 1M output tokens). The free audit costs no paid API. Wall time for the 3 runs: under 2 minutes.
- **Not done in this sample.** No Claude or Gemini API runs, no Google AI Overviews, no Bing Copilot answers by hand (only Bing's own citation counts). A paid report says in its first lines which of these it covers.
- **Raw answers** for all 60 API calls are kept by us (JSONL, with every cited URL and the search queries the engine sent). A buyer gets theirs.
- **No guarantee.** Answers vary run to run. Citation counts, engine behaviour and our reading of them can be wrong or out of date next week. We do not promise rankings, citations, traffic or revenue.