

MadeInRed Website Action Brief

Website reviewed: <https://madeinred.com/>

Source snapshot: 30 October 2026, before the public-site redesign.

This is an English edition of the saved self-use website action brief. It demonstrates the delivery format: a location, an observed issue, a proposed change and a completion check. It describes the historical snapshot, not the current live website. Producing this report does not modify the site. Publication and subsequent validation are recorded separately.

Source wording below is rendered in English for this edition. It is not presented as a verbatim English quotation from the original Chinese page.

1. Make the service visible in the navigation [P0]

Location: Header navigation.

Observation: The original navigation presented tools without making the ecommerce, B2B and content-delivery uses clear.

Source wording, rendered in English: AI citation audit / AI referral monitoring / GEO Skills.

Why it matters: A buyer needs to recognise a relevant problem and a useful result before learning the internal workflow. This is an information architecture issue, not evidence of a crawl failure.

Proposed action: Keep the free audit. Add dedicated ecommerce, B2B, example and blog destinations, while retaining existing tutorials in the footer. Each destination should have a complete body and a distinct purpose.

Suggested wording: Free AI Search Audit / Ecommerce GEO / B2B GEO / Content Examples / Blog. This reflects the five-destination proposal recorded at the time; the extension was added later.

Completion checks:

- Each destination opens the corresponding complete page, with no placeholder content.
- A 390 px mobile menu exposes working links and does not create horizontal page overflow.
- Existing tutorial URLs remain available through useful contextual links.

Intent: Help an ecommerce brand or B2B supplier decide whether MadeInRed addresses its content problem.

2. Explain the score as a technical checklist [P0]

Location: Homepage introduction, next to the audit input.

Observation: The original wording around a three-layer "pin" model and citation readiness could be interpreted as a platform submission or a probability of citation.

Source wording, rendered in English: Paste a URL and receive a 0-100 citation-readiness score from the three-layer pin model.

Why it matters: Technical access, indexing and actual AI citations are separate observations. A proprietary score does not establish that an AI platform has seen, indexed or cited a page.

Proposed action: Preserve the inspection algorithm and replace the explanation with a clear description of what is actually tested. Make the limitation visible alongside the score and in the FAQ.

Suggested wording: Check public-page crawl access, content discovery and answer structure. The 0-100 score is MadelInRed's technical checklist, not the probability of an AI citation.

Completion checks:

- The introduction and FAQ do not promise a fixed citation time or a citation probability.
- The audit input still accepts a valid public website and produces a usable preview.
- A complete report can still be saved and downloaded after sign-in.

Intent: Help a website owner understand the meaning and limits of an audit result.

3. Remove unsupported fixed-length citation rules [P0]

Location: Explanation of answer structure and direct answer passages.

Observation: A writing heuristic was expressed as though it were a platform requirement.

Source wording, rendered in English: A direct conclusion of 40-80 words immediately after the heading.

Why it matters: A useful answer must cover its reader's question with accurate facts and appropriate depth. A fixed word range is not an official condition for AI citation. Google's documentation says its AI search features have no additional technical requirements beyond the relevant search fundamentals.

Proposed action: Explain direct answers, sufficient depth, factual support and source links. If a length check remains in the algorithm, identify it as an internal heuristic.

Suggested wording: Answer a clear question directly, then provide the explanation and verifiable evidence needed to make the answer useful. Headings, word counts and structured data do not guarantee citation.

Completion checks:

- The homepage no longer describes 40-80 words as a requirement for citation.
- The methodology distinguishes local heuristics from official platform guidance.
- A source supports the adjacent factual claim, rather than a broader promise.

Reference: <https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/ai-features>

Intent: Help an editor improve answer quality without treating a writing guideline as a ranking formula.

4. Let buyers open real deliverables [P1]

Location: Service explanation following the free audit.

Observation: The earlier page explained tools but did not demonstrate a complete delivery package.

Source wording, rendered in English: After the audit, would you like to know whether AI brought visitors to your website?

Why it matters: Buyers need to inspect what they receive and where they can use it. A description of backend stages does not provide the same evidence as opening the actual files.

Proposed action: Add an accessible self-use example with an FAQ, comparison, illustrated article, website action PDF, video production script and community answer draft. Keep the distinction between files delivered and content published.

Suggested wording: From buyer questions to usable content. Explore MadelnRed's own example package.

Completion checks:

- Anonymous HTML, Markdown, PDF and ZIP downloads return valid files.
- Media needed by the HTML or Markdown is included and uses working paths.
- The demonstration is labelled as self-use, not a paid customer result or evidence of growth.
- The video script is described as production material, not a finished or published video.

Intent: Help a prospective customer assess the usefulness and quality of the content before starting.

5. Align the footer with the service [P1]

Location: Site footer.

Observation: The earlier footer described only a read-only inspection and did not cover GEO research or content delivery.

Source wording, rendered in English: Is Cited only performs a read-only audit and does not change your website.

Why it matters: The operator's description, navigation and service body should agree. The free audit should still be clearly distinguished from the broader content workflow.

Proposed action: Use one concise statement covering research, goals and downloadable content. Keep the read-only boundary explicit for public audits.

Suggested wording: Buyer research, content goals and downloadable assets. Public audits inspect your site without changing it.

Completion checks:

- Chinese and English pages accurately describe the same service scope.
- Account, pricing, privacy and existing reference links remain usable.
- The English language switch leads to the corresponding complete English page.

Intent: Help visitors understand who provides the service and what the product delivers.

Using this brief

Assign each action to a website owner, editor or developer. Review the affected page and the recorded context, publish the appropriate change, then perform the completion checks. A completed document is not proof that a change was published, indexed or cited.

This is a dated self-use demonstration. Its recommendations are not a new assessment of the current production website.