

AI Reputation Analysis and Signal Evaluation - Content.com

BRAND AI REPUTATION

Media, News & Publishing Reputation: Content.com (content.com)

https://content.com

Industry: Media, News & Publishing



MEDIA, NEWS & PUBLISHING

65.3 Avg Reputation

Based on 829 businesses audited.

REPUTATION LEVEL

LOWER REPUTATION THAN AVERAGE

Content.com has 25.3 points less reputation than the average for Media, News & Publishing.

EXPERT VERDICT

Content.com is a classic 'Ghost Service' that relies on a thirty-year-old heritage claim to avoid providing modern functional proof. It advertises a searchable database utility that is entirely invisible in the data, resulting in a high distance between marketing signal and technical substance.

[See how to improve >](#)

INFO DENSITY

Power-words vs. Substance ratio.

15

50% Reputation

The Information Density score is moderated by the inclusion of specific industry nouns such as 'workers? compensation,' 'genealogy,' and 'OSHA.' However, the H2 'Content.com Provides Current Full Text Searchable Databases' is a repetitive claim that lacks any accompanying numerical data, such as record counts or database names. The body substance ratio is low, as the text describes what the site provides without offering a single specific example of a dataset or a named source.

SEMANTIC COHERENCE

Homepage promise vs. Sub-page reality.

14

70% Reputation

The homepage H1 and H2 anchor the site's identity as a 'Full Text Searchable' resource, yet the sub-page evidence (Contact Us) provides zero content to support this utility. There is a total absence of a search interface or navigational hierarchy leading to the promised databases in the crawled data. This creates a significant disconnect between the 'Signal' of a functional tool and the 'Substance' of an empty web shell.

TRUST & PROOF

Verifiable evidence vs. Trust Theatre.

6

30% Reputation

DIAGNOSIS: TRUST THEATRE

The site exhibits clear trust theatre, with a review_count of 1 but a proof_links_count of 0, which triggers the trust_theatre_flag. Claims of being in operation 'Since 1994' are unsubstantiated by any external certifications, archive links, or third-party endorsements. The 'many full text databases' mentioned in the clean_text are referenced without any verifiable proof paths or sample access.

EVIDENCE: PROOF DENSITY

The proof density is critically low, with a ratio of approximately 10 assertions for every 0.5 points of verifiable evidence. The only 'fact' provided is a founding year (1994), which remains unverified by sameAs links or legal entity schema. Every other claim, including the breadth of topics like 'politics' and 'building insurance,' is a vague assertion without a corresponding content sample.

COMMODITY FINGERPRINT

Detection of industry cliches/templates.

5

33% Reputation

The value proposition?providing info on business topics?is a generic commodity that could be copy-pasted onto any 1990s-era web directory. There is no unique content strategy or 'audience-first approach' as suggested by the industry dictionary; instead, the site uses legacy template fingerprints. The language is purely descriptive of a category rather than a specific, differentiated brand position.

IDENTITY & AUTHORITY

Expert verifiability & Schema depth.

0

0% Reputation

DIAGNOSIS: AUTHORITY GAPS

Authority is nearly non-existent due to the total absence of schema_json (null) and named editorial staff. While claiming to serve employers and interest groups, there are no 'named journalists' or 'editorial standards' as required by the industry proof expectations. The technical implementation is stale, with a broken meta description and no structured data to verify its status as an 'industry leader' or long-standing entity.

EVIDENCE: PERFORMANCE VS. CLAIMS

The site makes bold performance claims regarding being 'Current' and 'Full Text Searchable' but fails to demonstrate the technical capacity for either. There are no dated results or 'Last Updated' markers to justify the claim of providing current information. The disconnect between the promise of a searchable library and the lack of a visible search mechanism is a primary source of bullshit.

[See how to improve >](#)

INDUSTRY MATCH & SCORE SUMMARY

Media, News & Publishing Reputation: Content.com (content.com)

Reputation: 40 / 100

INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION

The site positions itself as an archival data provider and library, which fits within the broader 'Media, News & Publishing' category. However, it lacks the modern editorial or newsroom infrastructure described in the industry patterns, functioning more as a niche database aggregator.

"The score of 40 is driven by the maximum penalty in Identity and Authority (15/15) and high scores in Trust and Proof (14/20). The site avoids a higher score only because it refrains from using modern high-gloss buzzwords, opting instead for a dated, factual-sounding tone that lacks the data to back it up."

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://content.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 28, 2026

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