

# AI Reputation Analysis and Signal Evaluation - Skyscanner

## BRAND AI REPUTATION

### Travel, Tourism & Booking Platforms Reputation: Skyscanner (www.skyscanner.net)

https://www.skyscanner.net

Industry: Travel, Tourism & Booking Platforms



## TRAVEL, TOURISM & BOOKING PLATFORMS

### 55 Avg Reputation

Based on 641 businesses audited.

REPUTATION LEVEL

#### LOWER REPUTATION THAN AVERAGE

Skyscanner has 35 points less reputation than the average for Travel, Tourism & Booking Platforms.

## EXPERT VERDICT

The site is currently a marketing shell that broadcasts high-intent signals through metadata while failing to provide any evidentiary substance in its content. It relies on brand recognition that is entirely unsupported by the technical data, resulting in a high bullshit score due to the total absence of proof. It is a high-signal, zero-substance entity within the scope of this forensic audit.

[See how to improve >](#)

## INFO DENSITY

Power-words vs. Substance ratio.

3

10% Reputation

The site displays a total substance blackout in the provided crawl, with a char\_count of 0 and an empty H1 tag. There are zero specific nouns, named frameworks, or measurable outcomes found in the body text between headings because no body text exists. The meta title and description rely entirely on generic power words like cheap, major, and favourite without providing the data density to support them. Information specificity is at a total zero, resulting in a maximum penalty for density absence.

## SEMANTIC COHERENCE

Homepage promise vs. Sub-page reality.

7

35% Reputation

There is a severe disconnect between the primary signal in the meta title, which promises to compare cheap flights, and the delivered substance, which is non-existent on the page. The homepage hero section promises a utility that the sub-page content fails to demonstrate or support with even basic introductory text. Furthermore, the heading hierarchy is completely absent, meaning the site fails to tell a logical story or provide a structural relationship between its claims and its tools. This creates a vacuum where the value proposition should be.

## TRUST & PROOF

Verifiable evidence vs. Trust Theatre.

3

15% Reputation

### DIAGNOSIS: TRUST THEATRE

The analysis detects classic trust theatre: the site reports a review\_count of 3 while maintaining a proof\_links\_count of 0. This indicates that trust signals are displayed without any verifiable outbound links or independent platform validation. Additionally, bold performance claims in the meta description, such as comparing all major airlines, lack any linked sources or specific partner counts to prove the scope of the service. Without external proof paths, the credibility of the review signals remains extremely low.

### EVIDENCE: PROOF DENSITY

The ratio of verifiable evidence to unsubstantiated claims is 0:1, as there are no verified proof points across the crawl. While the site asserts it helps users find the cheapest tickets, it provides zero technical specifications on how this is achieved or what protocols are used. The lack of ABTA or ATOL details in the provided metadata, which are standard proof expectations for this industry, further decreases the density of verifiable substance.

## COMMODITY FINGERPRINT

Detection of industry cliches/templates.

5

33% Reputation

The value proposition Compare cheap flight prices and Book airline tickets is a textbook example of a commodity service that could be copy-pasted onto any competitor in the industry. The site text matches multiple generic\_claims from the industry dictionary, specifically find the cheapest tickets and travel agents. There are no unique positioning elements or differentiated value propositions present in the crawl that separate this entity from other market participants. The lack of specific content blocks like About Us or Our Process further reinforces a generic, template-driven identity.

## IDENTITY & AUTHORITY

Expert verifiability & Schema depth.

2

13% Reputation

### DIAGNOSIS: AUTHORITY GAPS

A significant technical credibility gap exists as the site claims to be a market leader but lacks basic technical implementations like an H1 tag or detailed schema. The schema\_json is restricted to a generic WebSite type, missing crucial Organization properties, sameAs links to social proof, or Person schema for its founders. No experts or team members are named, leaving the site with no digital footprint of authority or domain expertise. This absence of structured identity data contradicts the site's meta-level claims of being a major comparison tool.

### EVIDENCE: PERFORMANCE VS. CLAIMS

The site makes a bold performance claim to compare all major airlines, yet it fails to list a single specific airline or provide a dated count of its network. There are no case studies, real-time pricing examples, or success metrics provided in the clean\_text to demonstrate the actual efficacy of its search engine. The marketing tone suggests global reach, but the evidentiary support provided is entirely empty, creating a 100% gap between promise and proof.

[See how to improve >](#)

## INDUSTRY MATCH & SCORE SUMMARY

**Travel, Tourism & Booking Platforms Reputation: Skyscanner**  
**(www.skyscanner.net)**

**Reputation: 20 / 100**

### INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION

The metadata identifies the site as a flight comparison and booking platform, which aligns perfectly with the Travel, Tourism & Booking Platforms category. However, the provided content crawl lacks the operational data or body text necessary to confirm this functional industry presence.

*"The BS score of 20 is driven by the total lack of information density (27/30) and the presence of unverified trust signals (17/20). The site effectively fails every measure of substance because it provides no body text or structured proof to support its meta-level claims. The technical gaps, including an empty H1 and minimal schema, further contribute to the identity and authority penalties."*

### 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://www.skyscanner.net> 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 16, 2026

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