

# AI Reputation Analysis and Signal Evaluation - iShares by BlackRock

## BRAND AI REPUTATION

### Financial Services, Banking & Insurance Reputation: iShares by BlackRock (ishares.com)

<https://ishares.com>

Industry: Financial Services, Banking & Insurance



REPUTATION LEVEL

## FINANCIAL SERVICES, BANKING & INSURANCE

### 56.3 Avg Reputation

Based on 1229 businesses audited.

#### HIGHER REPUTATION THAN AVERAGE

iShares by BlackRock has 17.7 points more reputation than the average for Financial Services, Banking & Insurance.

## EXPERT VERDICT

This is a high-substance, low-fluff institutional site that suffers from 'legal-bloat' and minor technical rot. It avoids typical financial service bullshit by leading with tickers and risks rather than lifestyle imagery, though the broken 'ETF Investments' link is a significant credibility leak.

[See how to improve >](#)

## INFO DENSITY

Power-words vs. Substance ratio.

20

67% Reputation

The information density is bifurcated: headings are highly substantive, utilizing specific financial tickers such as SWDA (iShares MSCI World) and SGLN (iShares Physical Gold), which provide immediate product-level specificity. However, the body substance ratio is skewed by a massive 15,000-character repetition of regulatory terms and conditions across three separate pages (URLs 0, 2, and 3). While legally necessary, this massive wall of text results in a high concept repetition score as it provides no incremental value to the user after the first encounter. The specificity absence is low (0 points) due to the inclusion of exact regulatory addresses, VAT numbers (243852262), and FCA registration details (00796793).

## SEMANTIC COHERENCE

Homepage promise vs. Sub-page reality.

16

80% Reputation

The homepage H1 'Start investing with ETFs and make the most of your ISA' is directly supported by the featured ETF tickers and the presence of an ETF savings calculator. However, a significant semantic drift occurs in slot 1 (URL: /products/etf-investments/), which returns an error page ('Page not found') despite being a primary navigation signal. This technical failure creates a gap between the brand's 'largest provider' claim and the actual user experience. Aside from this technical disconnect, the investor type segmentation (Individual vs. Professional) is consistently maintained across the successful sub-pages.

## TRUST & PROOF

Verifiable evidence vs. Trust Theatre.

12

60% Reputation

### DIAGNOSIS: TRUST THEATRE

The site triggers the trust\_theatre\_flag across all primary pages, indicating a high reliance on regulatory authority as a trust signal. While the site references 1 review in the metadata, the proof\_links\_count is 0 across all pages, meaning there are no outbound links to third-party review platforms or independent verification of performance in the provided crawl. The site compensates for this with heavy 'regulatory theatre,' citing FCA registration and MiFID compliance in exhaustive detail, though these are legal requirements rather than voluntary proof of excellence.

### EVIDENCE: PROOF DENSITY

Proof density is high regarding regulatory and identity markers but low regarding social proof. The site provides a verifiable FCA registration number and physical corporate location, which are primary BS-reducers in finance. However, it lacks the 'Expert guidance' substantiation promised in the meta description; the team members and specific fund managers are not listed or linked via Person schema, leaving the 'expert' claim partially unsubstantiated at the human level.

## COMMODITY FINGERPRINT

Detection of industry cliches/templates.

11

73% Reputation

The site avoids most value\_prop\_cliches but does fall into some generic\_claims such as 'meet your investment goals' and 'engineered to help you.' The positioning is largely unique to the ETF market, distinguishing it from generic 'personalized financial solutions' banks. However, the template language used in the meta descriptions ('largest provider of exchange-traded-funds in the world') is a standard industry-leader boilerplate. The commodity footprint is low because the site focuses on technical fund attributes rather than lifestyle-oriented marketing fluff.

## IDENTITY & AUTHORITY

Expert verifiability & Schema depth.

15

100% Reputation

### DIAGNOSIS: AUTHORITY GAPS

There are zero authority gaps. The schema\_json is exceptionally robust, providing a foundingDate (2001), a named founder (Lee Thomas Kranefuss), and a specific physical address at Drapers Gardens, London. The inclusion of sameAs links to Wikipedia, LinkedIn, and Twitter provides a complete digital footprint that validates the brand's global authority. The connection to BlackRock Advisors (UK) Limited is explicitly stated and supported by regulatory registration numbers.

### EVIDENCE: PERFORMANCE VS. CLAIMS

The marketing tone is surprisingly conservative, overshadowed by extensive risk warnings ('Past performance is not a reliable indicator...'). There is no disconnect between claims and evidence because the 'performance' claims are tied to specific, searchable fund tickers rather than vague promises of wealth. The only disconnect is the technical failure of the 'ETF Investments' sub-page, which undermines the claim of being a seamless digital investment partner.

[See how to improve >](#)

## INDUSTRY MATCH & SCORE SUMMARY

**Financial Services, Banking & Insurance Reputation: iShares by BlackRock (ishares.com)**

**Reputation: 74 / 100**

### INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION

The site content perfectly aligns with the Financial Services category, specifically targeting the ETF (Exchange-Traded Funds) and ISA investment market. The presence of specific tickers like SWDA and CSPX confirms it is a legitimate investment platform rather than a generic wealth management brochure.

*"The score of 74 is driven primarily by the 'Trust Theatre' of regulatory flags without third-party review links and the high 'Information Density' penalty for repetitive legal text. The broken sub-page also contributed a penalty to 'Semantic Coherence,' while the 'Identity and Authority' pillar achieved a perfect 0 due to exemplary schema implementation."*

### ANALYSIS DISCLOSURE & SOURCE ATTRIBUTION

This analysis is part of a non-adversarial audit conducted by 1 Euro SEO. The results are intended as professional feedback to help improve any website's machine-readability and authority signals. The evaluation is free, and any company can request a fresh audit at any time.

Any company can use the insights for free and improve its voice. When a company has updated its content, it can always submit a new audit request, which will be reflected in a new current score.

You are encouraged to visit the live site at <https://ishares.com> to view the most current version of its content and see directly what this company is about and what it offers.

Verified Analysis Date: May 30, 2026

**(c) 1EuroSEO Independent Evaluator - Non-Sponsored Result**