# ForgeRank AI

Content quality report · 2026-11-17

CONTENT ANALYSIS

FROM YOUR DRAFT

## Instead of AI-sounding phrases, write like you're explaining something to a colleague over coffee

What this piece argues: AI writing is obvious because it is generic, and the fix is to replace filler phrases with specific, checkable detail.

# You can publish this.

One check that matters is only partly met.

**85** / 100 content quality | How-to guide | list | FAQ

Can I publish this?

**No blockers**

Nothing stops this going out. See how each area was graded.

View the three areas →

Will AI search cite it?

**Could not be assessed**

See how the source checks were graded.

View source support →

Will it read as AI-written?

**Many patterns**

Strongest signal: AI vocabulary

View sentence patterns →

Want the evidence?

**Evaluation details**

Every check, its source passage, and the bar it was graded against.

View details →

### The one change to make first

**Nothing blocking** No check blocks publishing. The details stay in the full report. View remaining fixes →

Below: the full report, in its existing sections.

### The three areas

## Purpose fulfillment

**All checks met — nothing to do here.**

### WHAT'S WORKING

#### Decision and execution support met

This asks for: A reader can act on this without asking a follow-up question.

The piece supplies the supports its own task needs. A substitution guide with concrete replacements, a three-question specificity test for verification, a fallback for when a sentence fails and named things to avoid.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from 1/4: "Here's a practical substitution guide:"*

*Where this comes from 2/4: "You can spot AI sentences by testing them against three questions: Does it name a specific entity? Does it commit to a position? Does it contain information only a practitioner would know?"*

*Where this comes from 3/4: "If not, add the tool, the number, the failure mode, or the deadline."*

*Where this comes from 4/4: "Cut every phrase that announces rather than informs — "it's important to note," "in conclusion," "it's worth mentioning.""*

#### Core question answered met

This asks for: The piece answers the question its title promises.

The title's question (which words and phrases make AI writing obvious) gets a direct, easy-to-find answer. A named list of 27 tells in a table plus a seven-category taxonomy and the reader can act on it from the substitution guide.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "Here's the full list of 27 phrases that flag AI writing:"*

#### List completeness met

This asks for: The list delivers the number its title promises, every entry carrying its own substance.

The table delivers the promised 27 entries, each with a distinct tell, a reason and a human alternative and each row is readable on its own.

▼ Hide the passages

Also cited in "Core question answered" (1).

#### Answer completeness met

This asks for: Every reply answers the question it is filed under, in its first sentences, and stands alone.

Each FAQ reply answers its own question in the first one to three sentences and names its subject explicitly. So a reader landing on any single answer understands it.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from 1/3: ""Delve" is the most-cited AI tell because it appears disproportionately in model-generated text."*

*Where this comes from 2/3: "No. AI detectors are unreliable and produce false positives, especially on text written by non-native English speakers or writers with unusual styles."*

*Where this comes from 3/3: "Google penalizes scaled content abuse (mass-producing low-value pages regardless of authorship)."*

#### Question coverage met

This asks for: The questions a reader would actually ask about this topic are all covered.

The FAQ covers the questions a reader would naturally ask. The top tell, detector reliability, Google penalties, whether a phrase is always a tell, what makes writing human and how to fix existing content.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "What is the #1 word that makes AI writing obvious?"*

▼ **What this dimension checks**

Does it give what the task needs in order to decide or act?
Does the piece answer the core question it promises?
Does each entry work on its own, or does it only make sense if the reader has already read the entries above it?
Does each reply answer the question it is filed under?
Does the FAQ cover the questions a reader would actually ask, compared to what similar FAQ pages cover?

## Reader experience

**This area is not fully met — the fix is at the top of this card.**

### WHAT'S WORKING

#### Specific information and detail met

This asks for: Numbers, names and specifics where a reader needs them, not generalities.

The load-bearing claims are stated concretely — named phrases, named categories and worked substitutions — and placeholder wording does not carry any claim that matters.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: ""The standup runs long because nobody updates the ticket before the meeting" names the meeting type, the tool, and the exact failure."*

#### Information relevance and substance met

This asks for: Every section earns its place in the argument.

Every stretch earns its place. The mechanism sections explain why the words appear, the table names specific phrases with human alternatives and the substitution guide gives usable replacements. No 50-word stretch merely restates a conclusion.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "The highest-probability continuation of "let's" is "dive in." The highest-probability continuation of "it's important to" is "note that." These are averages, not choices."*

#### Clear terms met

This asks for: Terms a reader may not know are defined where they first appear.

The piece makes its central concepts usable. 'AI tells' is decomposed into seven named categories with a line each and 'specificity test' is defined as three concrete questions with worked examples.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "The most common AI tells cluster into seven categories: transition fillers ("furthermore," "moreover"), throat-clearing openers ("in today's world"), hedging qualifiers ("it's worth noting"), false precision ("delve into"), summary tags ("in conclusion"), contrast pivots ("not X, but Y"), and empty intensifiers ("crucial," "essential," "paramount")."*

### Practical action and conditions met

This asks for: Advice comes with the conditions that make it work.

The piece gives executable instructions with their objects (replace phrases, cut fillers, run the specificity test) and bounds the key ones with explicit conditions such as 'if you use AI to draft content' and 'if not, add the tool, the number, the failure mode or the deadline.'

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from 1/2: "Read each sentence and ask: does this name something specific? If not, add the tool, the number, the failure mode, or the deadline."*

*Where this comes from 2/2: "The practical implication: if you use AI to draft content, your editing pass must add what the model can't — the specific numbers, the named failure modes, the operator-level detail."*

### Wording and clarity met

This asks for: Each sentence says one thing, plainly, the first time.

The points are stated with the words that mean them. The tells are named verbatim, the mechanism is described in plain terms and metaphor does not stand in for a concrete term.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "AI overuses "delve" and "crucial" because these words carry high semantic weight while requiring zero specific knowledge."*

### List consistency met

This asks for: Every entry uses the same heading level, grammatical pattern and depth.

Every table row uses the same four-column shape — category, tell, why it appears, human alternative — with comparable depth. So the reader learns the pattern once.

### List ordering met

This asks for: The order carries a logic a reader can follow.

The entries are grouped by category (openers, transitions, verbs, adjectives, qualifiers, contrasts, summaries, intensifiers). So a reader can predict where to find a given tell.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from: "Openers "In today's fast-paced world""*

▼ **What this dimension checks**

How much of this can a reader check?
Are the key points stated concretely, or only in general terms?
Does the article carry anything a reader can use, or is some of it filler?
Are key concepts explained enough to follow the argument?
Does the piece say what to do, and when it applies?
Is the point stated with a concrete term, or left as a metaphor?
Do all entries follow the same structure — heading style, grammar pattern, and depth of detail?
Are the entries in a logical order — ranked, chronological, alphabetical, or grouped — that the reader can follow?

## Claim support

> **This area is not fully met — the fix is at the top of this card.**

WHAT'S WORKING

### Argument structure met

This asks for: The claim is stated, the reason carries it, and the piece says where it stops holding.

The piece commits to a conclusion (AI writing is obvious because it lacks specific knowledge and the fix is to demand concrete detail) and the steps that carry it come with reasons that survive the test.

▼ Hide the passages

*Where this comes from 1/5: "AI writing sounds obvious because language models predict the most statistically likely next word, which produces safe, generic phrasing that avoids risk."*

*Where this comes from 2/5: "The core takeaway: AI writing is obvious because it's generic, and it's generic because it lacks specific knowledge."*

*Where this comes from 3/5: "The second mistake is assuming AI can't produce good writing."*

*Where this comes from 4/5: ""It's important to note" appears in human writing too, but it's a strong signal when it appears repeatedly or opens multiple paragraphs."*

*Where this comes from 5/5: "A paragraph full of "delve" and "crucial" that names real products, versions, prices, and failure modes is far more human than a clean paragraph that says nothing."*

### Comparison and decision value met

This asks for: Options are compared on the things that actually decide the choice.

The piece gives a decision rule that routes the reader to different actions by condition. The specificity test (name an entity, commit to a position, contain practitioner-level detail). And a substitution guide pairing each tell with a replacement.

▼ Hide the passages

Also cited in "Decision and execution support" (1) · "Argument structure" (1).

▼ What this dimension checks

Do key claims come with a reason or some support?
Where a source is needed, is one provided?
When comparing A vs B, do I get evidence I can actually use to choose?
Besides the benefits, does it say when it breaks down and what it costs?

## Changes to make

10 word-level fixes. Each fix is pinned to its exact wording in your draft.

### One optional change

partly met ▲

#### Source and evidence check

DIRECTION

This asks for: Facts a reader might doubt point to where they came from.

The piece makes several outside claims that owe a source. About how language models assign probabilities, about Google's 2024 and 2025 updates and the 'scaled content abuse' term and about AI detectors being unreliable. And some of these are attributed to a named party (Google's quality systems, Google's term) while others are stated bare. The reader can trace part of the piece (the Google claims name the company and the term) but has to take the model-mechanism claims and the detector claim on faith, since no study, report or

named source is given for them. The load-bearing recommendation rests partly on sourced claims and partly on bare ones.

IN YOUR TEXT

*The sentence that begins "The 2024 and 2025 Google updates targeted "scaled…"*

**The 2024 and 2025 Google updates targeted "scaled content abuse," which is Google's term for mass-producing low-value pages regardless of whether AI or humans wrote them.** ¶

ALSO IN YOUR TEXT

¶7 ↗ *"Large language models assign probabilities to word sequences based on training data."*

WHAT TO CHANGE

1. **¶148 ↗** A paragraph full of "delve" and "crucial" that … — Paragraph 7, sentence 2 (`Large language models assign probabilities to word sequences…`): Name where it comes from, inline — `According to [who or what], [the fact].` If you cannot name a source, cut the fact.

Nothing to copy — this one needs material only you have.

## Word-level (3)

cleaner wording, same meaning ▲

~~Here's~~ **Here is** a practical substitution guide

contraction expansion

~~it's~~ **it is** a strong signal

contraction expansion

~~it's~~ **it is** generic because it lacks

contraction expansion

## Diagnosis only (2)

found, but nothing here is paste-ready — none of it changes the verdict ▲

### Checkable detail vs similar pieces

DIRECTION

This asks for: The detail is specific enough to check against other pieces on the topic.

The piece does carry real, checkable quantities. A table of 27 phrases, a seven-category taxonomy and substitution examples with units like "the handoff took four minutes instead of the usual hour" and "handles 2,000 concurrent users without dropping requests". But they sit in the background and in illustrative examples rather than in the recommendation itself. The core instruction the reader is told to follow ("name the tool, the version, the price, the deadline, and the specific failure you hit") is stated without any figure, unit or executable spec attached to it. So the reader is told to be specific without being given a checkable quantity to act on. The figures that do appear are life-size background colour or example material, not the load-bearing instruction.

IN YOUR TEXT

*The sentence that begins ""Robust" → "handles 2,000 concurrent users without dropping…"*

**"Robust" → "handles 2,000 concurrent users without dropping requests"** ¶

Nothing to copy — this one needs material only you have.

▼ Hide the passages

*"Instead of AI-sounding phrases, write like you're explaining something to a colleague over coffee: name the tool, the version, the price, the deadline, and the specific failure you hit."*

*""Seamless" → "the handoff took four minutes instead of the usual hour""*

### Results and limits

DIRECTION

This asks for: What was found, and where it stops holding.

The piece commits to a verdict a reader can act on (AI writing is obvious because it lacks specific knowledge. Demand concrete detail in every sentence) and it gives a line for what counts as enough (the three-question specificity test). But the result figures the recommendation rests on — the claims about Google's updates and about model behavior — do not carry a baseline they moved from or a who/when scope. The Google claim names the years but not a measured result and the model-mechanism claim carries no figure at all. The bounded outcome is missing on the load-bearing figures.

> IN YOUR TEXT
>
> *The sentence that begins "You can spot AI sentences by testing them…"*
>
> **You can spot AI sentences by testing them against three questions: Does it name a specific entity?** ¶

Nothing to copy — this one needs material only you have.

## Word choice · 10 exact words · 53 hits

Swap the word — the sentence can stay.

| PATTERN | HITS | IN YOUR TEXT | WHAT TO CHANGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| **AI vocabulary: 'delve'.** | 18 | *"delve"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Replace with a more specific or common word. |
| **AI vocabulary (verb form): 'navigate'.** | 1 | *"navigate"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Replace with a direct verb. |
| **AI structure announcement: 'Key takeaways'.** | 1 | *"Key takeaways"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Present the content instead of narrating that you're about to. |
| **Inflated word: 'delve'.** | 15 | *"delve"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Say the plain thing. |
| **AI designation verb: 'it names the'.** | 6 | *"it names the"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Say that it specifies or references the thing, or tell the reader to state it. |
| **Inflated word: 'Leverage'.** | 4 | *"Leverage"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Use 'Use' instead of 'Leverage'. |
| **AI fingerprint: 'unlock the power'.** | 3 | *"unlock the power"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Rewrite with concrete specifics instead of this clichéd phrase. |
| **AI hedge: 'It is important to note that'.** | 2 | *"It is important to note that"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Delete this throat-clearing and state your point directly. |
| **AI overused word: 'shipped'.** | 2 | *"shipped"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | State the specific action or object. |
| **Throat-clearing: 'Here's the thing'.** | 1 | *"Here's the thing"*<br>*Ctrl+F this exact word in your draft* | Cut it and state the point. |

## What we read this as

**PURPOSE** Teaches the reader to recognise and replace overused AI-sounding words and phrases with specific, concrete writing.

**WRITTEN FOR** Writers, editors and content marketers who want their drafts to read less like machine output.

▼ View classification evidence

The piece mainly teaches the reader how to spot and fix AI-sounding prose, giving substitution rules, a phrase table and a specificity test to apply. That makes it a how-to. The closest other type is an explanation, because it also defines what AI tells are and why they occur, but the defining job is practical instruction rather than neutral reference. The format is a listicle: the core is a categorised table of 27 phrases, with FAQ and takeaway sections around it.

**Why this type**"Here's a practical substitution guide: "Delve into" → "trace," "walk through," "look at""

**Why this format**"A table of 27 phrases under category headings, followed by question-style subheadings and a Frequently asked questions section."

**Why it reads as a how-to**"Instead of AI-sounding phrases, write like you're explaining something to a colleague over coffee"

**Why it explains something**"The most common AI tells cluster into seven categories: transition fillers ("furthermore," "moreover"), throat-clearing openers"

**Why it reads as a landing page**"You can run any piece through the same 4-dimension quality read before it ships — free, no signup"

**Why it reads as a landing page**"Run one paragraph of your own writing through the specificity test tonight and rewrite every sentence that fails."

## Will AI search cite it?

Could not be assessed

Source checks did not run for this analysis.

### Source support

Are important claims attributed and verifiable?

Source checks did not run for this analysis.

### Citation signals

What AI search looks for before it can lift a passage and credit you.

✗ Quotation with no named source

> "These are averages, not choices. Human writing, by contrast, carries fingerprints: regional idioms, pet phrases, inside jokes, and the rhythm of someone who…"
>
> "It is important to note that we must address our quarterly objectives"

✓ Price or version claim with no date

✗ Vague reference (This is… says nothing)

> "These are"
>
> "This is"

✓ Meta-discourse (In this article…)

## Will it read as AI-written?

Many patterns — top: AI vocabulary

Strongest signal: AI vocabulary: 'delve'. — 18 hits

## Wording & meaning

### SENTENCE PATTERNS

One row per sentence shape; recast it in your own words.

| PATTERN | HITS | IN YOUR TEXT | WHAT TO CHANGE |
|---|---|---|---|
| **AI tricolon: 'they name specifics, break grammar rules...'.** | 8 | *"they name specifics, break grammar rules, and let personality show"* | Exactly three parallel verbs in series. Restructure or vary the count. |
| **'At the end of the day' is a cliche.** | 1 | *"At the end of the day"* | Say what you mean directly. |
| **AI opening: 'in today's fast-paced'.** | 4 | *"in today's fast-paced"* | Start with your actual point instead of this generic lead-in. |
| **AI stilted negation: 'requiring zero specific'.** | 3 | *"requiring zero specific"* | Negate the verb with 'doesn't' instead of shifting 'no' onto the object. |
| **Colon reveal: 'The practical implication: i'.** | 2 | *"The practical implication: i"* | Rewrite as a plain sentence. |
| **AI contrast: 'These are averages, not choices'.** | 2 | *"These are averages, not choices"* | State the positive claim directly without the 'not X, but Y' formula. |
| **AI motion metaphor: 'crowd out'.** | 2 | *"crowd out"* | Use the literal operation: is passed to, or depends on. |
| **Binary contrast: 'It's not about X, it's'.** | 1 | *"It's not about X, it's"* | State the second half directly. |

## Evaluation details

Full report

### 1. Summary

| 29 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Audit checks run | Needs a change | Partly met | Passed | Not applicable |

### 2. By dimension

*Graded checks — these are the ones that decide publishing.*

| | |
|---|---|
| Purpose fulfillment | 5 criteria · 5 passed |
| Reader experience | 8 criteria · 7 passed |
| Claim support | 4 criteria · 2 passed |

### 3. Individual check

**NEEDS A CHANGE · 2 CHECKS**

- First count the claims that owe an outside source (expected), then count how many name one a reader could check (present). Do the claims the piece's own recommendation rests on name one? Quote the sentence making the outside claim; a source named elsewhere does not cover it.

the mechanism sections, the Google-updates section, and the FAQ

- Do the result figures the recommendation rests on come with the baseline they changed from? Quote the movement figure; a rate, share, price or dose is a level, not a movement.

the 'How does AI writing affect readers and search rankings' section

**PARTLY MET · 2 CHECKS**

- Where a reasonable reader could hold the opposite view, does the piece state that view at its strongest and answer it on its own terms? Quote the objection as its holder would state it, or the answer engaging it; a trade-off is neither.

"The second mistake is assuming AI can't produce good writing."

the 'What do people get wrong' section and the FAQ

- Is there a contrast with all three parts -- the default practice, where it fails, and what to use instead? Quote the passage that spells out the parts, not one part of it.

"A paragraph full of "delve" and "crucial" that names real products, versions, prices, and failure modes is far more human than a clean paragraph that says nothing."

the specificity-test section and the substitution guide

**NOT APPLICABLE · 4 CHECKS**

- Does each entry work on its own, or does it only make sense if the reader has already read the entries above it? Quote the entry that depends on an earlier one, or the most self-contained entry when answering `met`.

Counted all rows of the 27-phrase table across the seven category groups.

- Is every entry there because it carries something, rather than to make the list longer? Quote the entry with no usable point, or the easiest-to-pad entry when answering `met`.

Reviewed every row of the table for entries lacking a usable point.

- Do all entries follow the same structure — heading style, grammar pattern, and depth of detail? Quote the entry that breaks the pattern; a typical entry does not show the break.

Compared all rows of the 27-phrase table for heading style, grammar, and depth.

- Does the figure sit in what the reader is told to do or believe, rather than in background colour? A figure that appears only in an example or the author's own aside is partial, not met. Quote the sentence carrying both the figure and the instruction; a figure in an example is not `met`.

the 'What should I write instead' section and the substitution guide

▼ 21 automated checks passed (open to see which)

- "Read each sentence and ask: does this name something specific? If not, add the tool, the number, the failure mode, or the deadline."

Sections 'What should I write instead of AI-sounding phrases?', 'How do I fix AI-sounding content I already wrote?', and the closing takeaway paragraph.

- "The practical implication: if you use AI to draft content, your editing pass must add what the model can't — the specific numbers, the named failure modes, the operator-level detail."

Swept the substitution guide, the 'How do I fix AI-sounding content' answer, and the closing takeaway for conditional bounds on actions.

- "Here's a practical substitution guide:"

The 'What should I write instead of AI-sounding phrases?' section, substitution guide block.

- The 'How can I tell if a sentence was written by AI?' section.

-

“If not, add the tool, the number, the failure mode, or the deadline.”

The 'How do I fix AI-sounding content I already wrote?' answer.

“Cut every phrase that announces rather than informs — "it's important to note," "in conclusion," "it's worth mentioning."”

The 'How do I fix AI-sounding content I already wrote?' answer.

“The most common AI tells cluster into seven categories: transition fillers ("furthermore," "moreover"), throat-clearing openers ("in today's world"), hedging qualifiers ("it's worth noting"), false precision ("delve into"), summary tags ("in conclusion"), contrast pivots ("not X, but Y"), and empty intensifiers ("crucial," "essential," "paramount").”

The 'What are the most common AI tell words and phrases?' section and the specificity-test section.

“Here's the full list of 27 phrases that flag AI writing:”

Counted the table rows against the title's '27 Words and Phrases' claim.

“Openers "In today's fast-paced world"”

Walked the table's category column from openers through intensifiers.

“"Delve" is the most-cited AI tell because it appears disproportionately in model-generated text.”

Read all six FAQ entries under 'Frequently asked questions.'

“No. AI detectors are unreliable and produce false positives, especially on text written by non-native English speakers or writers with unusual styles.”

The 'Can AI detectors reliably identify AI writing?' answer.

“Google penalizes scaled content abuse (mass-producing low-value pages regardless of authorship).”

Checked all six FAQ answers for back-references to other answers.

“What is the #1 word that makes AI writing obvious?”

Reviewed the full FAQ question list against the topic's key aspects.

substitution guide and table

substitution guide

“The highest-probability continuation of "let's" is "dive in." The highest-probability continuation of "it's important to" is "note that." These are averages, not choices.”

whole piece, including the mechanism sections, the table, the substitution guide, and the FAQ

“"The standup runs long because nobody updates the ticket before the meeting" names the meeting type, the tool, and the exact failure.”

the mechanism sections, the table, and the specificity-test section

"AI overuses "delve" and "crucial" because these words carry high semantic weight while requiring zero specific knowledge."

the 'Why does AI overuse' section

- "AI writing sounds obvious because language models predict the most statistically likely next word, which produces safe, generic phrasing that avoids risk."

the 'Why does AI writing sound so obvious' section

- ""It's important to note" appears in human writing too, but it's a strong signal when it appears repeatedly or opens multiple paragraphs."

the FAQ and the table

- "The core takeaway: AI writing is obvious because it's generic, and it's generic because it lacks specific knowledge."

the closing takeaway

### 4. Evaluation standard

*The full wording of the bar each check is graded against — verbatim, unchanged.*

**Checkable detail vs similar pieces**

the places that carry the argument carry a quantity a reader could recompute, reproduce or hold against the piece's own claim: a figure with its unit, or an executable spec (sizes, intervals, page counts, ratios), sitting where the reader is told what to do or believe. Grade this one axis only -- who says it, and mere concreteness, are graded elsewhere.

**Specific information and detail**

the points that do the work are stated concretely -- which thing, how much, in what case -- and placeholder wording ('many experts agree', 'the best tools', 'significant results', 'a certain amount') is not carrying any load-bearing claim.

**Information relevance and substance**

no stretch of 50 or more words only restates a conclusion: each one says why something happens, gives a figure, or names something specific, or otherwise earns its place -- and deleting it would change what a reader does.

**Decision and execution support**

Judge only the supports this piece's own task requires -- a piece is not downgraded for omitting one its task never needed. Grade 2 = those are all there: cost in money / time / tools, how to tell it worked, what to do when it does not, what to avoid. The list is closed: no further sub-case may be demanded on top.

**Argument structure**

the piece commits to a conclusion the reader is asked to accept, AND the steps that carry that recommendation come with a reason that survives the join test ('<claim>, because <the reason given>' must say why, not restate). Counter, qualifier and consistency are recorded separately and do not decide this grade.

**Clear terms**

at least one concept the piece leans on is made usable for the reader by ONE of: an explicit definition a reader can act on, an explanation carried by a concrete example, a boundary or counter-example that pins its meaning, or an explicit decomposition into named parts with a line for each. Decomposition is the strongest form, not the only one.

**Practical action and conditions**

the piece tells the reader what to do, in executable form (an imperative with its object, or 'you should X'), and the actions that need bounding say when they apply -- if / when / unless / only if.

**Core question answered**

there is a sentence (or a short run of them) that answers the question the title promises, and the body's substance is usable for that question -- a reader closes the piece with the answer.

**Wording and clarity**

the points are stated with the words that mean them; where a concrete term belongs, the concrete term is there, and metaphor or hype is not standing in for it.

**Source and evidence check**

the claims the piece's own recommendation rests on all name a source a reader could check (a person, institution, report, study, date or URL), and no load-bearing claim is left bare. Claims that owe nothing (the author's own advice, definitions, common sense) do not count against this grade.

**Comparison and decision value**

the piece either spells out a full three-part contrast (the common/default practice is written out, it is said where that practice FAILS and at what cost, and the alternative is given), or it gives at least one rule that routes the reader to different actions by condition.

**Results and limits**

the piece commits to a verdict a reader can act on or check, and the result figures the recommendation rests on carry BOTH the baseline they moved from AND who or when they apply to. A line for what counts as enough is a plus, not a requirement for this grade.

## Edits you can paste

3 edits

~~Here's~~ **Here is** a practical substitution guide:

"It's important to note" appears in human writing too, but ~~it's~~ **it is** a strong signal when it appears repeatedly or opens multiple paragraphs.

The core takeaway: AI writing is obvious because it's generic, and ~~it's~~ **it is** generic because it lacks specific knowledge.