

AI Visibility Audit

Corvale Storage Systems

Sample report. Prepared by Synthesis Insights. September 2026.

Corvale Storage Systems is a fictional company. It does not exist, and no number attributed to Corvale in this report is a measurement of anything. Every other figure here is real: the questions, the four assistants, the competitor names, the recommendation counts, and the cited sources all come from probes run between 18 and 24 August 2026 and published in the [Industrial AI Visibility Benchmark, Wave 1](#). You can check any of them against that study. This report exists so you can see the format and judge the depth before you ask for a quote.

The bottom line

Corvale is named zero times out of 24.

Six buying questions, four AI assistants, one run each. Corvale does not appear in a single answer. It is not ranked low and it is not mentioned then passed over. It is absent.

Two things make that less alarming than it sounds, and both change what the fix is.

The first is that Corvale is not unusual. Of the thirteen pallet racking manufacturers measured in this category, six were never recommended by any assistant, and all six of those never appeared in an answer at all. Absence is the normal condition in this category, not a mark against one company.

The second is where the assistants are getting their information. Across the six decision questions the four assistants cited 75 sources from 48 distinct domains, and the single most-cited domain was a distributor's catalogue site rather than any manufacturer. Manufacturer websites accounted for a small minority of what the assistants actually read. This is not a case of the assistants reading Corvale's website and finding it unconvincing. They are largely not reading manufacturer websites at all.

What we tested, and how

Six questions, put to ChatGPT with search, Claude, Perplexity Sonar, and Gemini with Google Search grounding. One run per question per assistant, so 24 probes in total. Probes ran between 18 and 24 August 2026.

The six questions are the decision-stage half of a ten-question set for this category, frozen and version-locked before any probe ran. In a live engagement the question set is built from your own converting search terms, which is the credibility anchor: these are the phrasings that already bring you buyers, not prompts invented for a report. For this sample the questions come from the published benchmark's frozen set.

Why these six and not all ten. The other four questions in the set are education and evaluation stage ("what is the difference between selective, drive-in and push-back racking", "should I buy new or used"). Across the whole benchmark those early-stage questions produced almost no brand mentions on any assistant, so scoring them would dilute every manufacturer's rate with questions where no company was going to be named regardless. That measures question mix rather than visibility. The early-stage result is a finding in its own right and is reported separately below.

The six decision questions, as run:

1. Is it safe to mix pallet racking brands in the same warehouse?
2. Nucor Warehouse Systems vs Interlake Mecalux, which pallet racking manufacturer is better?
3. Can anyone recommend a company to install pallet racks in my area?
4. Who are the best pallet rack manufacturers in the USA?
5. What storage rack system should I use for a new warehouse space?
6. Which pallet racking manufacturer is the largest in North America?

Point in time. AI answers are not deterministic. The same question asked twice can return different companies. Everything here is a snapshot of the third week of August 2026, and it is reported as one round per question, which is a limit of this sample rather than of the method. A live engagement runs multiple rounds so the result is a rate with a confidence range rather than a single yes or no.

The scoreboard: question by question

Corvale's column is fictional. Every competitor name in the right-hand column was actually recommended by that assistant on that question.

When a buyer asks AI...	ChatGPT	Claude	Perplexity	Gemini	Who it recommends instead
Is it safe to mix racking brands?	No	No	No	No	No manufacturer named by any assistant
Nucor vs Interlake Mecalux, which is better?	No	No	No	No	Interlake Mecalux, Nucor
Can anyone recommend a company to install pallet racks near me?	No	No	No	No	Interlake Mecalux
Who are the best pallet rack manufacturers in the USA?	No	No	No	No	Interlake Mecalux, Nucor, Steel King, Ridg-U-Rak, Frazier, Unarco, Speedrack
What storage rack system should I use for a new warehouse?	No	No	No	No	No manufacturer named by any assistant
Which racking manufacturer is largest in North America?	No	No	No	No	Nucor, Interlake Mecalux

All four assistants returned Corvale at zero. The question text above is condensed from the scenarios as they were run; the full scenarios are available on request.

The core finding: two of six questions produced no vendor at all

The two most useful rows in that table are the ones where no assistant named anybody.

On "is it safe to mix pallet racking brands in the same warehouse" and "what storage rack system should I use for a new warehouse space", not one of the four assistants

named a single manufacturer. Both are real buying moments. A warehouse operator asking either question is weeks away from a purchase order. The assistants answered both with generic guidance about standards and rack types and sent the reader nowhere in particular.

Those two questions are open. No competitor holds them, so no competitor has to be displaced to take them. In a category where the leading brand converts a third of its decision questions into recommendations, two unclaimed questions out of six is the cheapest ground available.

The third relevant finding is where the answers came from. These are the actual search queries the assistants ran while answering, taken from the probe log:

- best pallet racking companies US
- top pallet rack manufacturers in USA
- can you mix pallet rack beams and frames from different manufacturers
- mixing pallet rack brands safe RMI ANSI
- largest pallet racking manufacturer in North America
- Nucor Warehouse Systems vs Interlake Mecalux
- Interlake Mecalux pallet racking pros and cons

These are category and competitor searches, not brand searches. Nothing in this sample shows an assistant searching Corvale by name, because Corvale does not exist. On a real engagement this section is usually the most useful page in the report, because the branded fan-out queries show whether the assistants investigated the client at the decision moment and then passed, which is a very different and far more fixable problem than never being considered.

Why the assistants pass, and why the usual answer is wrong

The reflex explanation for a zero is that the website is not machine-readable: missing schema, no FAQ markup, no `llms.txt`. In this category the evidence does not support it.

We checked the sites of the brands at the top and the bottom of the table. Husky Rack & Wire, which was recommended zero times out of 24, publishes more structured data on its homepage than Nucor Warehouse Systems does, including an **Organization** node that Nucor's homepage does not carry. Nucor was recommended five times. Interlake Mecalux, the category leader at eight recommendations, does not return structured data on a plain fetch of its homepage at all. If on-site markup were the deciding factor, this table would be close to upside down.

What separates the top of the table from the bottom is where the brand appears when the assistant goes looking, and the citation data shows where that is:

The assistants cited...	Times	What it is
sourceequipment.com	6	Distributor catalogue
nucorwarehousesystems.com	5	Manufacturer
linquip.com	4	Industrial equipment directory
hedashelving.com	4	Distributor
acerackingsystem.com	4	Distributor
thomasnet.com	2	Industrial directory
palletrackfinder.com	2	Category aggregator
fortunebusinessinsights.com	2	Market research publisher
interlakemecalux.com	2	Manufacturer

Seventy-five citations across 48 domains, and manufacturer sites are a minority of them. Distributors, industrial directories, category aggregators and market research firms are the reading list. A manufacturer that is well represented on those surfaces gets named. A manufacturer whose own website is immaculate and whose distributor and directory footprint is thin does not.

The left column above is observed: it is what the probe log recorded. The reading of it in the paragraphs around it is inference, and is labelled as such. Nobody outside OpenAI, Anthropic, Google and Perplexity knows the weighting behind an answer, and any report that tells you otherwise is selling.

How the winners are set up differently

The reflex fix for a zero score is a schema checklist. This category disproves it in one table, which forces the real fix somewhere else.

We took the six roundup and directory pages the four assistants actually cited while answering, the ones in the source table above, and checked which of the thirteen manufacturers each page lists. The split is close to total.

Group	Appears on the six cited roundups
The seven recommended brands	3 to 5 pages each, an average of 3.9
The six never-recommended brands	0 to 1 page each, an average of 0.3

Not one recommended brand is missing from these pages, and not one never-recommended brand appears on more than one of them. The line between getting named by an assistant and being invisible sits almost exactly on the line between being on these third-party lists and not being on them.

This is why the schema explanation falls apart here. Husky Rack & Wire, recommended zero times, publishes more structured data than Nucor, recommended five times. What separates the two groups is not on their own websites at all. It is whether the distributor catalogues, the industrial directories, and the "top pallet rack manufacturers" roundups the assistants read carry them on the page.

One more surface is worth checking, because it is the other place assistants ground themselves: the encyclopedia layer. No manufacturer in this category has a Wikipedia page, the recommended brands included. So the absence of one is category-normal rather than a Corvale gap, and it is not the lever here. In another category it can be. In this one, the roundups and directories are.

The game plan

Ordered by what the evidence above supports, not by an optimization checklist.

First, get onto the lists the assistants already read. The six pages in the citation table are not obscure. They are distributor catalogues and industry roundups that add and update manufacturers regularly. Getting Corvale correctly listed, categorised, and described on them is the single change most likely to move a zero, because it puts

the brand where the assistants are already looking. A live engagement names each target page and what it takes to get on it.

Second, build the distributor and directory footprint underneath them. The roundups draw from a wider base of distributor pages, spec directories, and industry associations. A brand that shows up consistently across that base becomes the one the next roundup includes without being asked. This is the slow, compounding half, and it is where most of the durable movement comes from.

Third, make the on-site content legible, as hygiene rather than as the fix. Clear product pages, consistent naming, and structured data still matter, because once an assistant is pointed at the site it has to be able to read it. But the evidence is that this is the supporting move, not the one that changes the answer. Doing it first, which is what most AI SEO advice recommends, means optimizing the one surface the data says matters least.

Then re-measure. The same six questions, the same four assistants, run again against this baseline, so movement reads as real change rather than the run-to-run variation every AI answer carries.

What a real engagement adds

Three parts of a live audit cannot be shown on a fictional company, and they are where the ten business days go. A verified account of what the client already does well, so the plan builds on real strengths rather than assumed ones. A fact ledger of what the assistants get wrong about them, checked line by line against the public record. And the brand's footprint mapped against the two or three specific competitors taking its answers, on each of the surfaces above. Corvale has none of these, because Corvale is not real. Everything above this section is.

Notes and caveats

Wave 1 measured one round per question. Assistant answers vary between runs, and that variance is not captured here. A live engagement runs multiple rounds per question and reports a rate with a range.

The brand list for this category came from public trade directories and association listings, which skew toward companies with a findable public presence. A

manufacturer that buyers know but directories miss would not be on the list, and would show as absent for a reason that has nothing to do with AI.

Absence in an answer means the brand did not appear. It does not mean an assistant judged it inferior.

No claim is made here about revenue, traffic or ranking. This measures whether AI assistants name a company when buyers ask, and nothing else.

Nobody can guarantee that an AI assistant will recommend a company. What is guaranteed is the measurement: a documented baseline, a specific account of what is holding you back, and a re-run of the identical question set so you can see what actually moved.

Corvale Storage Systems is fictional. Competitor names, recommendation counts, citation counts and search queries are real and come from the [Industrial AI Visibility Benchmark, Wave 1](#), published under CC BY 4.0. Probes ran 18 to 24 August 2026.