

EXECUTIVE BRIEF

Start with: Choose a claim the business can substantiate

The respondents largely agree on the core story: the site is understandable as a pre-audience research product using artificial respondents, and the added pages make its method, beta boundaries, and pricing structure clearer.

Decision: Pressure-test a pricing page, landing page, pitch deck, or onboarding flow before spending real buyer, investor, or traffic attention

FIRST MOVE

Before "Create one reference-worthy evidence asset", confirm these prerequisites: Choose a claim the business can substantiate; Obtain permission for customer-identifying material.

[Open the complete work instructions](#)

Complete when

Choose a claim the business can substantiate: record the supporting evidence or responsible person's approval.
Obtain permission for customer-identifying material: record the supporting evidence or responsible person's approval.

Use the following action briefs to agree ownership and inputs. The complete findings and Standard follow the working plan.

ARTIFACTS

[Open live result](#)

[Download answerworthy.md](#)

Review the retained work.

What this is

This working review contains the retained Standard findings and completed research. Plan preparation and release review remain open.

Why it matters

A business can be excluded before a visit, enquiry or purchase when its public case is difficult to encounter, explain, trust or defend against realistic alternatives.

How to use this result

Use the supported Standard findings within their stated scope. Answerworthy must finish and review the marketing preparation before delivering the complete Plan. The retained file preserves the evidence for that continuation.

Preparation status: awaiting completion and release review. Your business controls publication and implementation.

ROUTE THROUGH THIS RESULT

01Executive Brief - [Direction and the first move](#)

02Action briefs - [What to approve, prepare and change first](#)

03Decision context and alternatives - [The choice set for this run](#)

04Outside-buyer evidence - [Synthetic decision-panel evidence](#)

05Verification and artifacts - [Evidence links and re-test boundary](#)

06Scope and Standard State - [What the public evidence establishes](#)

07Complete Standard Actions - [All supported open-Standard work](#)

Create one reference-worthy evidence asset

External mentions are easier to earn when the business contributes something specific that publishers, partners and communities can verify and reuse.

Do: Package one strong first-party asset around the most valuable buyer question: a named case, benchmark, dataset, teardown, calculator, workflow template or measured implementation result. Give it a stable URL, transparent method, date, scope, limitations and quotable findings.

Complete when: The asset is live at a stable URL, a skeptical reader can inspect how its consequential claims were produced and it is useful enough to cite independently of the product pitch.

Deliverable

One canonical, attributable evidence asset with a method note, reusable material and clear citation path.

Prerequisites to confirm

- Choose a claim the business can substantiate
- Obtain permission for customer-identifying material

What to prepare

- Named source or owner
- Dated method and sample
- Specific facts or figures
- Limitations
- Reusable chart, table, template or dataset
- Stable canonical URL

Verify after delivery

- Earned links
- Unlinked mentions
- Search and AI-source appearances
- Qualified referral traffic

Estimated effort: large

Execution boundary: Do not turn anecdotal or fictional material into outcome proof. Keep first-party evidence, interpretation and illustration visibly separate.

Retained source: Not evaluated

Public page: Artificial respondents - pre-audience researchPressure-test the next versionArtificial respondents, before the real users.One thing to test goes in. A decision brief comes out.Bring the page, pitch deck, price, message, concept, image, or app flow your team can still revise. Antestrata selects respondents from an existing synthesized population and returns individual reactions before live research or launch.For founders, product teams, researchers, and agencies deciding what deserves the next investor introduction, participant session, client review, or launch slot.Request a pilotSee current beta evidence?Saved panelsTrust, pricing, onboarding, and automation-trust panels are available in th

www.antestrata.com/

Public page: Artificial respondents - pre-audience researchPressure-test the next versionArtificial respondents, before the real users.One thing to test goes in. A decision brief comes out.Bring the page, pitch deck, price, message, concept, image, or app flow your team can still revise. Antestrata selects respondents from an existing synthesized population and returns individual reactions before live research or launch.For founders, product teams, researchers, and agencies deciding what deserves the next investor introduction, participant session, client review, or launch slot.Request a pilotSee current beta evidence?Saved panelsTrust, pricing, onboarding, and automation-trust panels are available in th

www.antestrata.com/

Public page: quantifiedClaimCount=0

www.antestrata.com/

Retained source: Not evaluated

Public page: quantified=0; sourced=0; dated=0

www.antestrata.com/

Make every priority surface easy to discover and refresh

The site exposes a sitemap; the remaining need is a repeatable publication and refresh process.

Do: Keep the XML sitemap canonical and current, add meaningful internal links, notify Bing-compatible engines through IndexNow after substantive changes and verify Google/Bing indexing before calling the work complete.

Complete when: Each priority surface is canonical, in the sitemap, linked from a meaningful owned page, submitted through the relevant discovery mechanism and verified as indexable.

Deliverable

Per-page publication checklist covering canonical URL, sitemap, internal links, IndexNow, indexing verification and re-crawl evidence.

Prerequisites to confirm

- Final page URL and content approved

Where this work goes

XML sitemap

www.antestrata.com/sitemap.xml

Robots policy

www.antestrata.com/robots.txt

IndexNow protocol

indexnow.org

What to prepare

- Final canonical URL
- Sitemap entry
- Internal-link source pages
- IndexNow response
- Index verification

Verify after delivery

- Sitemap status
- Index coverage
- Browser-observed appearance after publication

Estimated effort: small

Execution boundary: IndexNow is a discovery notification, not a ranking shortcut. Submit only real additions, updates and removals.

Public page: <https://www.antestrata.com/>

www.antestrata.com/

Public page: not present

www.antestrata.com/

Public page

www.antestrata.com/sitemap.xml

Public page: 20 parsed URLs

www.antestrata.com/sitemap.xml

Public page: <https://www.antestrata.com/>

www.antestrata.com/

Public page: *, OAI-SearchBot, ChatGPT-User, Claude-SearchBot, Claude-User, PerplexityBot, GPTBot, ClaudeBot, Google-Extended, Applebot-Extended, CCBot

www.antestrata.com/robots.txt

Build a consistent external identity and review footprint

Owned claims become easier to corroborate when company, offer, founder, location or product facts agree across the external surfaces buyers use.

Do: Validate buyer relevance and supporting evidence for this proposed work: Audit relevant profiles, listings, marketplaces and review sources for naming, category, URL, description, service area, credentials, boundaries and recency. Complete only the profiles real buyers use; invite authentic customers to review the real experience without incentives or scripted sentiment.

Complete when: Record the evidence and a go/no-go decision before committing to: External-profile and reputation checklist with URL, owner, corrections, review policy and last-verified date.

Deliverable

External-profile and reputation checklist with URL, owner, corrections, review policy and last-verified date.

Prerequisites to confirm

- Canonical facts approved
- Platforms real buyers use identified

Where this work goes

Google Merchant Center
 Bing Merchant Center
 Relevant marketplaces and product directories
 Product-review and comparison publishers
 Creator, video and community evidence

What to prepare

- Canonical entity description
- Founder or legal identity
- Canonical URL
- Market or service area
- Current proof
- Review-request process

Verify after delivery

- Profile completeness
- Fact consistency
- Review recency
- Referral traffic
- Repeated source appearance

Estimated effort: medium

Execution boundary: Never create fake profiles, reviews or locations. Do not incentivise positive sentiment or suppress legitimate negative feedback.

Distribute the evidence where buyer questions are already discussed

Publishing on the company site is only the first step; qualified distribution should follow real buyer-question communities rather than a generic press-release list.

Do: Validate buyer relevance and supporting evidence for this proposed work: For the strongest buyer-question cluster, prepare one useful finding, one visual or reusable asset, one founder point of view, one canonical source page and three audience-specific contributions. Prioritise contribution, discussion and co-created proof over promotional posting.

Complete when: Record the evidence and a go/no-go decision before committing to: Channel-by-channel distribution checklist with message, audience, format, owner, date and desired outcome.

Deliverable

Channel-by-channel distribution checklist with message, audience, format, owner, date and desired outcome.

Prerequisites to confirm

- Evidence asset is publishable
- Founder position approved
- Each channel has real audience fit

What to prepare

- Original evidence asset
- Attributable founder commentary
- One chart, screenshot or template
- Canonical source URL
- Audience-specific contribution

Verify after delivery

- Accepted contributions
- Mentions
- Qualified discussions
- Referral traffic
- New source appearances

Estimated effort: medium

Execution boundary: Do not astroturf, mass-post the same message or disguise commercial affiliation. Participate under a real identity and lead with useful evidence.

INTERVENTION / LATER / VALIDATE FIRST

Measure discovery, source use and commercial response separately

A page can be indexed without being retrieved, retrieved without being cited, cited without naming the brand and mentioned without producing a qualified visit. One visibility number hides those stages.

Do: Validate buyer relevance and supporting evidence for this proposed work: Freeze a dated baseline, re-run the same buyer-question clusters after implementation and record indexing, position, source set, citations or mentions, target presence, qualified referrals and commercial outcomes separately. Supplement browser evidence with free Search Console and Bing Webmaster exports where available.

Complete when: Record the evidence and a go/no-go decision before committing to: Before/after measurement sheet with separate discovery, source, mention, recommendation, referral and conversion columns.

Deliverable

Before/after measurement sheet with separate discovery, source, mention, recommendation, referral and conversion columns.

Prerequisites to confirm

- Priority changes published
- Stable query-cluster list
- Analytics and lead-source fields agreed

What to prepare

- Frozen website screenshots
- Frozen search-result screenshots
- Result URL exports

- Search Console and Bing Webmaster exports
- Referral evidence
- CRM or order-source evidence

Verify after delivery

- Indexing
- Position
- Retrieved sources
- Brand mention
- Referral visit
- Qualified lead or sale

Estimated effort: medium

Execution boundary: Treat browser-observed results as dated samples. Do not present one location, engine or run as a stable market-wide ranking.

DECISION CONTEXT AND ALTERNATIVES

What must be decided before the next commitment.

Realistic alternatives

- Do nothing and launch as-is
- Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review
- Run real-user interviews or usability tests
- Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later
- Internal review only
- Ask one colleague or advisor
- Wait for live feedback
- Use ordinary qualitative research
- Live pricing test later
- Internal debate and intuition
- Customer interviews
- Advisor or consultant review
- Do nothing
- Ask a human reviewer
- Recruit real users directly
- Wait until live behavior reveals the problem

DECISION JOB / NEXT

Pressure-test a pricing page, landing page, pitch deck, or onboarding flow before spending real buyer, investor, or traffic attention

Outside-buyer evidence produced a strong pre-encounter decision job. Use this language within the evidence boundary of this run.

Do: Serve this decision job directly in the language people used before encountering the site, then connect it to the relevant offer, action, proof and non-fit boundary.

Complete when: A person can reach and complete this job from the public evidence without inventing missing facts.

DECISION JOB / NEXT

Sanity-check pricing logic or price messaging before a real pricing test

Outside-buyer evidence produced a strong pre-encounter decision job. Use this language within the evidence boundary of this run.

Do: Serve this decision job directly in the language people used before encountering the site, then connect it to the relevant offer, action, proof and non-fit boundary.

Complete when: A person can reach and complete this job from the public evidence without inventing missing facts.

DECISION JOB / NEXT

Get a low-risk second opinion on clarity, trust, and proof before changing something that is still cheap to revise

Outside-buyer evidence produced a strong pre-encounter decision job. Use this language within the evidence boundary of this run.

Do: Serve this decision job directly in the language people used before encountering the site, then connect it to the relevant offer, action, proof and non-fit boundary.

Complete when: A person can reach and complete this job from the public evidence without inventing missing facts.

DECISION JOB / NEXT

Validate a page, offer, or deck before committing reputation or spend to live exposure

Outside-buyer evidence produced a moderate pre-encounter decision job. Use this language within the evidence boundary of this run.

Do: Serve this decision job directly in the language people used before encountering the site, then connect it to the relevant offer, action, proof and non-fit boundary.

Complete when: A person can reach and complete this job from the public evidence without inventing missing facts.

ALTERNATIVE ASYMMETRY / NEXT

A realistic alternative: Do nothing and launch as-is

Do nothing and launch as-is is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Do nothing and launch as-is.

Complete when: The public comparison with Do nothing and launch as-is is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Do nothing and launch as-is.

A realistic alternative: Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review

Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review.

Complete when: The public comparison with Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review.

A realistic alternative: Run real-user interviews or usability tests

Run real-user interviews or usability tests is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Run real-user interviews or usability tests.

Complete when: The public comparison with Run real-user interviews or usability tests is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Run real-user interviews or usability tests.

A realistic alternative: Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later

Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later.

Complete when: The public comparison with Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later.

A realistic alternative: Internal review only

Internal review only is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Internal review only.

Complete when: The public comparison with Internal review only is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Internal review only.

A realistic alternative: Ask one colleague or advisor

Ask one colleague or advisor is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Ask one colleague or advisor.

Complete when: The public comparison with Ask one colleague or advisor is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Ask one colleague or advisor.

A realistic alternative: Wait for live feedback

Wait for live feedback is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Wait for live feedback.

Complete when: The public comparison with Wait for live feedback is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Wait for live feedback.

A realistic alternative: Use ordinary qualitative research

Use ordinary qualitative research is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Use ordinary qualitative research.

Complete when: The public comparison with Use ordinary qualitative research is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Use ordinary qualitative research.

A realistic alternative: Live pricing test later

Live pricing test later is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Live pricing test later.

Complete when: The public comparison with Live pricing test later is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Live pricing test later.

A realistic alternative: Internal debate and intuition

Internal debate and intuition is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Internal debate and intuition.

Complete when: The public comparison with Internal debate and intuition is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Internal debate and intuition.

A realistic alternative: Customer interviews

Customer interviews is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Customer interviews.

Complete when: The public comparison with Customer interviews is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Customer interviews.

A realistic alternative: Advisor or consultant review

Advisor or consultant review is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Advisor or consultant review.

Complete when: The public comparison with Advisor or consultant review is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Advisor or consultant review.

A realistic alternative: Do nothing

Do nothing is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Do nothing.

Complete when: The public comparison with Do nothing is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Do nothing.

A realistic alternative: Ask a human reviewer

Ask a human reviewer is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Ask a human reviewer.

Complete when: The public comparison with Ask a human reviewer is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Ask a human reviewer.

A realistic alternative: Recruit real users directly

Recruit real users directly is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Recruit real users directly.

Complete when: The public comparison with Recruit real users directly is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Recruit real users directly.

A realistic alternative: Wait until live behavior reveals the problem

Wait until live behavior reveals the problem is already inside the declared decision set. If the public evidence does not explain the decisive difference, people must invent it or choose the easier-to-defend option.

Do: State where this option wins, loses, and is not the right choice compared with Wait until live behavior reveals the problem.

Complete when: The public comparison with Wait until live behavior reveals the problem is specific, evidenced, and honest about non-fit.

Supplied context - 2026-09-03: Retained alternative in this decision Scope: Wait until live behavior reveals the problem.

How buyers met the decision.

The outside-buyer synthetic panel tests how the public offer holds up under different buying situations. These are simulated reactions to the retained material.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the top-level offer is clear

Strong agreement that the top-level offer is clear: Antestrata is consistently understood as pre-audience research using artificial respondents, with one bounded test producing individual reactions plus a decision brief.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the site repeatedly and clearly separates product description from proof

Strong agreement that the site repeatedly and clearly separates product description from proof: respondents distinguish current beta facts, illustrative specimen material, and unpublished or pending public proof.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the public boundary claims are explicit and stable across respondents

Strong agreement that the public boundary claims are explicit and stable across respondents: no real person is copied, no real identity is reconstructed, and artificial reads are not a replacement for real-user validation.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the deeper pages improve clarity by adding a consistent method model

Strong agreement that the deeper pages improve clarity by adding a consistent method model: population first, then selection, then research, with clear distinctions among personas, respondents, and reusable panel respondents.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the pricing page is readable and bounded

Strong agreement that the pricing page is readable and bounded: respondents consistently understand the intended pricing-research use case, the starter panel, the workflow, and the explicit exclusion of market-level willingness-to-pay forecasting.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Strong agreement that the strongest unresolved issue is evidentiary depth, not basic comprehension

Strong agreement that the strongest unresolved issue is evidentiary depth, not basic comprehension: respondents understand the concept and boundaries, but they do not see a public run that would let them judge outcome quality or reliability.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Agreement that the discovery problem is plausibly pre-launch or pre-purchase pressure-testing of a page, deck, price, or flow before...

Agreement that the discovery problem is plausibly pre-launch or pre-purchase pressure-testing of a page, deck, price, or flow before spending real attention, traffic, or recruitment budget.

OUTSIDE-BUYER EVIDENCE

Agreement that the most natural prior language before the encounter would have been generic and task-focused, such as testing a page...

Agreement that the most natural prior language before the encounter would have been generic and task-focused, such as testing a page, checking a price, or getting early feedback, with product-specific vocabulary learned only from the site.

VERIFICATION AND ARTIFACTS

How to know the work changed the decision.

Verification rule

After each intervention, repeat the same scoped public observation and the relevant normal-encounter decision question. Keep fixed, unresolved, regressed, new and unreached conditions separate.

EVIDENCE BOUNDARY

- Coverage: the sampled public pages and supplied public evidence.
- Search and browser evidence is a dated snapshot. Blocked or unavailable captures remain unreached.
- Performance evidence is a dated lab snapshot and may differ from real-user conditions.
- Specialist accessibility, security and legal review remain separate workstreams.
- Judgment calls should be reviewed by a responsible person before implementation.
- Each external source requires a relevance check before outreach. Competitor domains serve as comparison evidence.
- The report identifies evidence and decision gaps. Ranking, citation, traffic and sales require subsequent observation.

ARTIFACTS

[Open live result](#)

[Download answerworthy.md](#)

What this result covers.

Coverage is bounded. The declared buyer, market, question, alternatives, constraints and non-fit boundary define this result.

Technical access was inspected; no retained technical issue affected the current Outcomes.

BUYERS

- Founders, product teams, researchers and agencies evaluating pages, pricing, onboarding, concepts and launch decisions

MARKETS

- Worldwide English-language B2B market

LANGUAGES

- en

REALISTIC ALTERNATIVES

- Do nothing and launch as-is
- Ask colleagues or trusted contacts for review
- Run real-user interviews or usability tests
- Use a live A/B test or traffic experiment later
- Internal review only
- Ask one colleague or advisor
- Wait for live feedback
- Use ordinary qualitative research
- Live pricing test later
- Internal debate and intuition
- Customer interviews
- Advisor or consultant review
- Do nothing
- Ask a human reviewer
- Recruit real users directly
- Wait until live behavior reveals the problem

DECISION CRITERIA

- price and total cost
- risk, security and compliance
- strength and inspectability of evidence

NON - FIT

- the realistic alternative "Do nothing and launch as-is" remains sufficient or the retained buyer need is absent

BUYER DECISIONS IN SCOPE

- Pressure-test a pricing page, landing page, pitch deck, or onboarding flow before spending real buyer, investor, or traffic attention
- Get a low-risk second opinion on clarity, trust, and proof before changing something that is still cheap to revise
- Sanity-check pricing logic or price messaging before a real pricing test
- Validate a page, offer, or deck before committing reputation or spend to live exposure

OUTCOMES

A buyer considering Antestrata for "Pressure-test a pricing page, landing page, pitch deck, or onboarding flow before spending real buyer, investor, or traffic attention" can determine fit, material constraints and the evidence-backed difference from a realistic alternative using the public decision corpus.

A buyer considering Antestrata for "Get a low-risk second opinion on clarity, trust, and proof before changing something that is still cheap to revise" can determine fit, material constraints and the evidence-backed difference from a realistic alternative using the public decision corpus.

A buyer considering Antestrata for "Sanity-check pricing logic or price messaging before a real pricing test" can determine fit, material constraints and the evidence-backed difference from a realistic alternative using the public decision corpus.

A buyer can determine that Antestrata is not the right choice when the realistic alternative "Do nothing and launch as-is" remains sufficient or the retained buyer need is absent, without relying on sales-only clarification.

This is an explicit non-fit Outcome.

THE EIGHT STANDARD CONDITIONS

What the public evidence currently supports.

Reachable

VERIFIED / BOUNDED

Homepage responds successfully

Public page - 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/

Canonical transport uses HTTPS

Public page - 2026-09-03: <https://www.antestrata.com/>
www.antestrata.com/

Homepage is not marked noindex

Public page - 2026-09-03: not present
www.antestrata.com/

Robots does not block the whole site

Public page - 2026-09-03: User-Agent: * Allow: / User-Agent: OAI-SearchBot User-Agent: ChatGPT-User User-Agent: Claude-SearchBot User-Agent: Claude-User User-Agent: PerplexityBot Allow: / User-Agent: GPTBot User-Agent: ClaudeBot User-Agent: Google-Extended User-Agent: Applebot-Extended User-Agent: CCBot Disallow: / Host: <https://www.antestrata.com/sitemap.xml>
www.antestrata.com/robots.txt

Redirect path is deliberate

Public page - 2026-09-03: no redirects
www.antestrata.com/

Homepage is not a soft 404

Public page - 2026-09-03: Artificial Respondents for Pre-Audience Research - Skip to contentantestrata?powered by LifecoreMLBeta evidenceArtificial respondentsPilotsPricingMethodologyRequest a pilot ?Beta evidenceArtificial respondentsPilotsPricingMethodologyRequest a pilot ?Artificial respondent
www.antestrata.com/

No bot challenge replaces the page

Public page - 2026-09-03: Skip to contentantestrata?powered by LifecoreMLBeta evidenceArtificial respondentsPilotsPricingMethodologyRequest a pilot ?Beta evidenceArtificial respondentsPilotsPricingMethodologyRequest a pilot ?Artificial respondents - pre-audience researchPress
www.antestrata.com/

Identified

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

identified was not measured in this run

Needed: Collect evidence that directly measures the Answerworthy identified condition.

Understood

VERIFIED / BOUNDED

Contact route is findable

Public page - 2026-09-03: Contact ? <mailto:hello@antestrata.com>
www.antestrata.com/

Public page - 2026-09-03: users.hello@antestrata.com
www.antestrata.com/

Answering

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

The retained Scope questions were not directly adjudicated against the sampled public corpus

Needed: Review each retained decision question against the sampled public pages and record the exact answer, material gap or contradiction.

Evidenced

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

evidenced was not measured in this run

Needed: Collect evidence that directly measures the Answerworthy evidenced condition.

Corroborated

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

Independent corroboration was outside this audit's measured coverage

Needed: Inspect independent reviews, directories, editorial, institutional and expert sources that actually establish a consequential fact.

Distributed

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

Relevant public-surface distribution was outside this audit's measured coverage

Needed: Run dated buyer-question observations across relevant search and public-web surfaces.

Observed

UNREACHED / UNCOVERED

Assistant answers were outside this audit's measured coverage

Needed: Run dated, provider- and locale-labelled assistant answer probes for real pre-brand buyer questions.

STANDARD ACTIONS

What to change, and how to know it is done.

The current State is carried forward through its verification and recheck instructions.

SOURCES AND MAINTENANCE

Keep the evidence useful as the business changes.

Submitted website

public / inspected 2026-09-03

www.antestrata.com/

Owned page 2

public / inspected 2026-09-03

www.antestrata.com/evidence

Owned page 3

public / inspected 2026-09-03

www.antestrata.com/artificial-responses

Owned page 4

public / inspected 2026-09-03

www.antestrata.com/pilots

Owned page 5

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/pricing

Owned page 6

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/method

Owned page 7

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-personas-vs-artificial-respondents

Owned page 8

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-panel-respondents

Owned page 9

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-respondents-for-pitch-decks

Owned page 10

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-respondents-for-ux-research

Owned page 11

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-respondents-for-landing-pages

Owned page 12

public / inspected 2026-09-03
www.antestrata.com/artificial-respondents-for-pricing

Supplied business context

private

Business-side audience, market, alternatives or buyer questions supplied with this run. These premises do not by themselves satisfy public State. Supplied planning direction; preserve its stated approval boundary: Give a qualified buyer defensible grounds to choose or reject an Antestrata pilot and understand where artificial respondents fit beside live research

Bounded buyer-question synthesis

private

Used to bootstrap candidate Scope from the observed public material. It does not satisfy public State and is not evidence of demand.

Recheck when

- the offer, public decision corpus, declared market or evidence changes materially
- a completed Action is about to be relied on again

Review the evidence after 30 days, or sooner when a trigger above occurs.

- Re-read the current Standard whenever work resumes.
- Preserve superseded history when it is useful and remove stale instructions that no longer describe the business.