

CiteLab Website Audit — Sample Report

Website: <https://citelab.uk>

CiteLab's services, case-study, and browser GEO Auditor pages, reviewed from the project's source snapshot and local browser preview.

This is a review of CiteLab's own website, not a customer testimonial. It shows the report format and actual findings. No increase in traffic, rankings, AI citations, or sales has been measured. Prepared changes may differ from the live website until publication.

PRIORITY 1 · [/services](#)

Make the \$99 offer specific

Observed

The services page leads with a general description of manual SEO, GEO, and AI citation services. The entry audit lists broad recommendations without a page limit or a defined report format.

Why it matters

A visitor needs to understand exactly what the entry service includes before deciding whether to request it. Clear scope also keeps the review manageable for both parties.

Before

Manual SEO, GEO, and AI citation services.

Recommended change

A clear improvement plan for your website — \$99. One website, up to three selected pages, five prioritized fixes, and concrete before-and-after examples.

Action: Lead with the entry audit, state its deliverables, and confirm the selected pages and delivery date before payment.

Verification: Offer copy prepared for publication; customer response has not been measured.

Show a real sample of the deliverable

Observed

The case-study page contains three labeled placeholder workflows. None shows the actual format of a completed website audit.

Why it matters

A sample helps a visitor assess the specificity of the review and the type of actions they would receive.

Before

A placeholder case study showing how a guide can become a source-backed article.

Recommended change

A dated sample audit with five observed issues, their implications, recommended changes, and verification notes.

Action: Publish this sample and link it beside the \$99 offer and the audit-request form.

Verification: This self-audit sample is prepared; no client outcomes or testimonials are claimed.

Count internal links using the page's origin

Observed

The original browser checker treats every absolute HTTP link as external, including links to another page on the same website.

Why it matters

That can produce misleading recommendations to add internal links when relevant same-site links are already present.

Before

An absolute link to another page on the same site is counted as external.

Recommended change

Absolute, relative, and protocol-relative links are resolved against the supplied page URL or canonical and compared by origin.

Action: Use the correct link classification and restrict the content checks to the article or main content when available.

Verification: Verified in the local browser update: a test page with three same-site links and one off-site link returns the correct counts.

Explain what the browser score actually checks

Observed

The original methodology table lists llms.txt as a weighted signal, but the browser implementation does not request or score it. The Python CLI and browser also use different checklists.

Why it matters

Readers need a method that matches the result they receive, especially when comparing reports from different versions of a tool.

Before

The browser methodology table includes an llms.txt check that is absent from its score.

Recommended change

The browser table lists its 14 implemented checks and explains that the separate Python CLI may return a different score.

Action: Keep the visible methodology aligned with the implemented checklist and describe editorial weights as heuristics.

Verification: Verified in the local update: the exported browser report contains 14 checks and a methodology note.

Remove an unsupported statistic from sample content

Observed

The original sample HTML claims that 60% of searches show an AI answer in 2026, without a supporting citation for that number.

Why it matters

Sample material is still part of the visitor experience. An unverified number weakens the site's source-backed positioning.

Before

An uncited 60% search statistic appears in the tool's sample article.

Recommended change

The sample describes a publishing workflow and links to official Google and Schema.org guidance without inventing a numerical claim.

Action: Use verifiable statements in examples and review numerical claims against their sources before publishing.

Verification: Removed from the prepared sample. This correction does not establish any change in search performance.

Suggested order of work

1. First: make the entry offer and sample report available, then verify the request form and payment process.
2. Next: apply and check the auditor's link-counting and methodology corrections.
3. After publication: record visits, audit inquiries, paid orders, delivery time, and customer feedback. Review actual results before expanding the offer.

Your website audit — \$99

One website, up to three selected pages, five prioritized fixes, examples, and an action checklist. Scope and delivery date are agreed before payment.

Request: <https://citelab.uk/request-audit?service=blog-geo-audit>