

THE FRANK MASOTTI

AI BUSINESS UNDERSTANDING REPORT

PREPARED EXCLUSIVELY FOR

FRANK MASOTTI / FRANKMASOTTI.COM

A comprehensive analysis of how ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude currently understand the business.

15 INDEPENDENT QUESTIONS

Three models. One analyst. One report.

Prepared by Frank Masotti
AI Business Understanding Analyst

RESEARCH REPORT

Frank Masotti AI Business Understanding Report

How ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude Currently Understand Frank Masotti and His Business

BUSINESS REVIEWED	RESEARCH DATE
Frank Masotti / FrankMasotti.com	September 1, 2026
AI SYSTEMS TESTED	QUESTIONS ASKED
ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude	15
TESTING CONDITIONS	ANALYSIS TYPE
Signed out. Fresh conversation for every question.	Manual cross model comparison

Prepared by Frank Masotti

Manual analysis. Human interpretation. One comprehensive report.

SECTION 01

About This Report

Potential customers increasingly use artificial intelligence systems to research businesses, compare providers, and decide whom to contact.

Those systems do not always describe a business the same way. One may understand the current offer accurately. Another may rely on old information. A third may recognize the product but hesitate to recommend the person providing it.

This report examines how three major AI systems currently understand Frank Masotti, FrankMasotti.com, and the Frank Masotti AI Business Understanding Report.

The purpose is not to produce a score. It is to show:

- ✓ What the systems understand correctly
- ✓ Where their answers disagree
- ✓ What outdated information continues to appear
- ✓ Whether they would naturally mention or recommend Frank Masotti
- ✓ Which alternatives they associate with the report
- ✓ What weakens their confidence
- ✓ What changed since the July 2026 baseline

The findings are a point in time record of what the systems returned under the stated testing conditions. AI answers can change as websites, public sources, retrieval behavior, and the systems themselves change.

SECTION 02

How the Research Was Conducted

The testing environment was deliberately clean and unpersonalized.

- ✓ Frank Masotti was signed out of ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude
- ✓ No account history, saved memory, or personalization was available
- ✓ Every question was asked in a separate brand new conversation
- ✓ No earlier question or answer supplied context to a later question
- ✓ The same exact structured question was asked independently across all three systems
- ✓ Every response was preserved as returned
- ✓ The answers were compared manually by Frank Masotti

The full question set is not published. The testing conditions are disclosed so the reader can understand how the findings were produced.

The models had to identify the business independently for every question. No previous conversation helped them recover when recognition failed.

This matters because the research is not testing what a model can repeat after being introduced to the business. It is testing whether the model can independently resolve the person, the current product, and the relevant public information from each question.

The ordinary signed out platform experience does not always display an exact underlying model version. This report therefore records the platform, date, testing conditions, and returned answers without claiming a model version that was not publicly shown.

SECTION 03

Executive Summary

The September 1, 2026 research produced a clearer current picture than the July baseline.

All three systems can now explain the AI Business Understanding Report when they locate the current information. They generally understand that it is manual, compares ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude, costs \$495, examines what AI believes about a business, and does not include optimization, software, or a recurring subscription.

The product is understood more consistently than the person and professional history behind it.

Gemini demonstrated the strongest current understanding. It identified Frank Masotti as an AI Business Understanding Analyst, treated the report as the primary service, and correctly described earlier projects as inactive.

ChatGPT understood the report in considerable detail and would recommend it for the correct use case. However, it continued to categorize Frank Masotti with broader and older labels such as AI Visibility Consultant, AI Search Architect, SEO professional, and digital marketing consultant.

Claude remained the most unstable. When it searched and located current material, it understood the report. In other independent conversations it said it had no reliable information about Frank Masotti or the product. It also continued to blend older ventures with the current business and questioned the lack of independent validation.

The primary issue is no longer basic product explanation. The remaining issues are identity consistency, stable recall, historical separation, and independent credibility evidence.

SECTION 04

The Central Finding

ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude understand the AI Business Understanding Report more consistently than they understand the person and professional history behind it.

The systems now generally agree about the central offer.

- ✓ One business is examined at a time
- ✓ ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude are compared
- ✓ The analysis is performed manually
- ✓ The report examines accuracy, consistency, completeness, classification, recommendation behavior, and information gaps
- ✓ The report is a diagnosis rather than an optimization service
- ✓ The service is sold for a one time fee rather than a subscription

The confusion appears around the identity surrounding the product.

- ✓ Is Frank Masotti an AI Business Understanding Analyst or an AI visibility consultant?
- ✓ Are Masotti AI, Business Visibility Group, and Generative Search Visibility active businesses or historical projects?
- ✓ Does Frank currently provide SEO, GEO, implementation, consulting, and other marketing services?
- ✓ Is the current report independently validated strongly enough to recommend without qualification?

A potential customer can therefore receive an accurate explanation of the report and an inaccurate explanation of the business behind it in the same answer.

SECTION 05

What the AI Systems Understand Correctly

The Current Product Name Has Taken Hold

All three systems used the name AI Business Understanding Report. Older names still appeared, but the current name was no longer difficult to find.

The Report Is Manually Prepared

The systems recognized that Frank Masotti personally conducts the analysis rather than producing an automated score or dashboard output.

Three Major Systems Are Compared

ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude all understood that the comparison across the three platforms is central to the service.

The Report Examines Understanding, Not Only Visibility

The systems understood that the analysis goes beyond whether a business name appears. It examines what the models conclude, where they disagree, what they omit, and how they classify the business.

The Service Boundary Is Clear

The current report does not sell SEO implementation, GEO optimization, ranking promises, automated tracking software, or a monthly retainer.

The Price and Delivery Are Understood

The answers repeatedly identified the \$495 one time price, the written report format, and the next business day delivery position.

SECTION 06

What the AI Systems Get Wrong or Leave Unclear

The current product is clear, but the wider identity remains mixed.

Older Ventures Still Appear Current

ChatGPT and Claude repeatedly connected the current report with Masotti AI, Business Visibility Group, Generative Search Visibility, Frank the Local SEO Guy, and the Blended Dominance Method.

Gemini was the only system that consistently described key earlier projects as inactive.

Current and Historical Titles Are Blended

AI Business Understanding Analyst appears, but so do AI Visibility Consultant, AI Search Architect, AI Visibility Strategist, SEO professional, and digital marketing consultant.

Services That Are No Longer Offered Reappear

The systems attributed AI visibility implementation, GEO consulting, local SEO, Google Business Profile work, branding, marketing consulting, and other services to the current business.

Location Signals Remain Mixed

The answers referred to Phoenix, Tucson, or the Phoenix and Tucson area. The systems understand the Arizona connection but do not hold one clean city level association.

Recognition Changes With the Question

Claude could describe the business in detail in one fresh conversation and then claim it had no reliable information in another. ChatGPT also showed weaker recognition on questions that did not strongly identify the product.

SECTION 07

How the Systems Currently Categorize Frank Masotti

There is still no single agreed professional category across the three systems.

- ✓ AI Business Understanding Analyst
- ✓ AI Visibility Consultant
- ✓ AI Search Architect
- ✓ AI Visibility Strategist
- ✓ AI search consultant
- ✓ SEO and digital marketing professional
- ✓ Generative search specialist
- ✓ Business visibility consultant

Gemini used the current title most consistently. ChatGPT and Claude continued to fall back on broader categories that already exist in their public information environment.

The fallback is understandable. AI business understanding is a narrower and less established category than SEO, GEO, AI visibility, or marketing consulting.

The desired current identity is simple: Frank Masotti is an AI Business Understanding Analyst and the creator of the AI Business Understanding Report.

Earlier SEO and digital marketing work supports the background behind the report. It should not lead the current category.

SECTION 08

How the Systems Understand the Report

This was one of the strongest parts of the research.

The systems generally described the report as a point in time, human prepared comparison of how ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude respond to structured questions about one business.

- ✓ Documents what each system says about the business
- ✓ Compares agreement and disagreement across the models
- ✓ Identifies outdated or incorrect statements
- ✓ Shows what important information was not surfaced
- ✓ Examines category clarity and customer fit
- ✓ Tests recommendation behavior and competitive perception
- ✓ Provides strategic observations and recommended next steps
- ✓ Avoids reducing the findings to one visibility score

ChatGPT gave the most detailed conceptual explanation of the report. Gemini gave the most consistent operational explanation. Claude understood the structure when it located the current sources.

The report itself is therefore not suffering from a basic explanation problem.

SECTION 09

Who the Systems Believe the Service Is For

Gemini and ChatGPT produced strong descriptions of the intended customer.

- ✓ Established businesses with a real public footprint
- ✓ Business owners who want to know what AI currently says about their company
- ✓ Companies concerned about outdated or conflicting information
- ✓ Businesses changing services, positioning, ownership, or markets
- ✓ Companies whose customers may use AI when deciding whom to contact
- ✓ Owners who want an independent diagnosis before paying for implementation
- ✓ Businesses that prefer manual interpretation over automated scores

The models also understood who the report is not for.

- ✓ Someone seeking guaranteed AI recommendations
- ✓ A buyer looking for traditional SEO or paid advertising
- ✓ A company seeking a continuous monitoring dashboard
- ✓ A buyer who wants the same provider to diagnose and implement every change
- ✓ A brand new business with almost no public information to examine

Claude described reasonable customer groups when it recognized the service, but its recommendations were limited by its trust concerns.

SECTION 10

How the Systems Understand the Difference From Similar Providers

The systems identified four primary distinctions.

Diagnosis Before Treatment

The report establishes what AI currently believes before the business decides whether anything should change.

Manual Analysis

Frank personally reads, compares, and interprets the responses instead of relying on an automated report generator.

Cross Model Comparison

The report compares ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude instead of treating one platform as the complete AI picture.

No Implementation Upsell

The report is not a loss leader for SEO, GEO, content, reputation management, or a monthly software subscription.

The systems understood these differences even when they placed the business inside the broader AI visibility or GEO market.

SECTION 11

Would the Systems Recommend Frank Masotti?

This question produced the most commercially important split in the report.

Gemini: Yes

Gemini would recommend the report to a business owner seeking an independent, manual baseline of how ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude currently understand a company.

It would suggest a different provider if the buyer wanted an all in one agency, continuous software monitoring, or direct implementation.

ChatGPT: Yes, for the Correct Use Case

ChatGPT would recommend the report when an AI visibility audit means examining perception, classification, accuracy, omissions, and recommendation behavior.

It would not present the report as a technical GEO implementation audit or an optimization service.

Claude: Not Outright

Claude understood the offer but would not recommend it without stronger independent evidence.

Its concerns centered on the newness of the service, the one person structure, the dominance of first party and press release sources, and the lack of independently visible reviews or validated client outcomes.

Claude's objection is not primarily a visibility problem. It is a credibility evidence problem.

SECTION 12

When Would the Systems Naturally Mention Frank Masotti?

This question tested whether the systems would connect the name with the subject area without earlier conversation context.

Gemini Demonstrated Natural Association

Gemini said it would mention Frank Masotti in discussions about AI business understanding, entity clarity, generative search visibility, and the analysis of how AI systems perceive companies.

ChatGPT Gave a Generic Answer

ChatGPT said it would mention Frank when his work, background, or professional history was directly relevant. It did not independently establish the strongest customer situations for the report.

Claude Did Not Demonstrate Stable Recall

Claude said it had no reliable information about a specific person named Frank Masotti and would need more context or a live search.

Recognition and natural recall are not the same thing. A model may explain a product accurately when asked by its complete name without naturally introducing that product during a broader customer conversation.

SECTION 13

Which Competitors or Similar Businesses Appear First?

The exact question was: Which competitors or similar businesses would you mention before Frank Masotti and his AI Business Understanding Report?

ChatGPT named:

- ✓ Profound
- ✓ Scrunch AI
- ✓ Peec AI
- ✓ Otterly.AI
- ✓ AthenaHQ
- ✓ Traditional SEO and digital marketing agencies

Claude named several of the same automated platforms and also included the option of testing the models internally without hiring an analyst.

Gemini answered mainly in categories rather than naming direct competitors:

- ✓ Automated GEO and AI visibility platforms
- ✓ Traditional SEO and brand monitoring suites
- ✓ Digital brand auditing consultants
- ✓ Reputation firms
- ✓ Internal prompt testing by a company's own team

The systems recognized that these are alternatives rather than exact equivalents. Software provides monitoring and scale. Agencies provide implementation. Internal testing provides raw answers. The Frank Masotti report provides a manual diagnosis and written interpretation of one business.

The narrower and more precise the customer's need, the stronger the report's competitive position becomes.

SECTION 14

What Information Appears to Be Missing

The systems identified two different kinds of missing information: information they wanted about the business and information they wanted about the methodology.

Independent Client Evidence

Claude and ChatGPT wanted reviews, client approved case studies, references, independently visible outcomes, and evidence that someone other than Frank had evaluated the usefulness of the work.

A Clearer Public Methodology

ChatGPT wanted to know whether the prompts were identical, whether conversations were fresh, whether the models were signed out, which versions were visible, how responses were preserved, and how findings were classified.

Better Separation of Historical Work

ChatGPT and Claude still needed a cleaner distinction between current services and previous ventures, titles, products, and methods.

Clearer Measurement Language

ChatGPT challenged the difference between information that is unknown, not retrieved, not mentioned, contradicted, or misunderstood. It also questioned whether a likely public source can be described as the proven cause of a model's answer.

The first issue is a market credibility gap. The remaining issues can be addressed through clearer public documentation and more precise report language.

SECTION 15

How Confident Are the Systems?

Gemini: High Confidence

Gemini expressed strong confidence in the current product and professional category. Its answers were the most consistent across the test.

ChatGPT: Strong Product Confidence, Uneven Identity Confidence

ChatGPT explained the report in depth but sometimes gave generic or cautious answers when the question depended on recognizing Frank Masotti without the complete product context.

Claude: Low and Unstable Confidence

Claude could move from detailed recognition to complete nonrecognition across separate questions. Even when it found the business, it did not trust the available evidence enough to recommend without qualification.

Confidence and accuracy must be evaluated separately. A model can be highly confident in a broad or outdated interpretation. A cautious model can identify a legitimate weakness that a confident model ignores.

SECTION 16

What Assumptions Are the Systems Making?

Historical Information Is Still Current

ChatGPT and Claude often assumed that older brands, titles, and service descriptions remain part of the active business.

Related Names Form One Current Business Structure

The systems combined FrankMasotti.com, Masotti AI, Business Visibility Group, Generative Search Visibility, and older report names into one present day ecosystem.

Repeated Sources Are Not Independent Proof

Claude recognized that press release copies and similar biographies can originate from one source even when they appear on many domains.

Three Models Are Three Consistent Witnesses

ChatGPT correctly challenged this assumption. Agreement across ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude shows consistency, but it does not by itself prove factual accuracy because the models may rely on overlapping public information.

One Answer Represents Every Customer Experience

The research shows why this assumption is unsafe. Wording, retrieval, platform changes, location, and the date of testing can alter what a user sees.

SECTION 17

What Could Cause Misclassification?

- ✓ Older websites, profiles, and press releases that remain publicly accessible
- ✓ Several former business names and product names connected with the same person
- ✓ Broad professional profiles that list services no longer offered
- ✓ A real history in SEO and digital marketing that outweighs newer category language
- ✓ Location references to both Phoenix and Tucson
- ✓ A new service category that overlaps with familiar SEO, GEO, reputation, and AI visibility categories
- ✓ Name collision with other people called Frank Masotti
- ✓ Retrieval failure or a model choosing not to search during an individual answer
- ✓ AI generated summaries being repeated elsewhere and reinforcing an earlier interpretation

The September test demonstrates that misclassification is not always caused by incorrect information. It can also occur when a system fails to retrieve, connect, or prioritize accurate current information that it successfully used in another conversation.

SECTION 18

Attributes Associated With the AI Business Understanding Report

Question 15 was added to test the attributes each system associates with the current product.

All three systems identified a strong common attribute set.

- ✓ Manual
- ✓ Human analyzed
- ✓ Cross model
- ✓ Diagnostic
- ✓ Independent
- ✓ Plain English
- ✓ Point in time
- ✓ Focused on accuracy, consistency, and completeness
- ✓ Designed to reveal omissions, outdated information, and misunderstandings
- ✓ One time rather than subscription based
- ✓ Delivered as a written report
- ✓ Built around diagnosis before treatment

ChatGPT gave the most detailed attribute map. It organized the report around AI perception, accuracy, cross model analysis, information gaps, market perception, and actionability.

Gemini emphasized the manual execution, three model scope, one time pricing, and evidence before action.

Claude emphasized the difference between a written qualitative analysis and an automated visibility score, while adding the same independent validation concerns found elsewhere in its answers.

The new attribute question confirms that the report's intended character is reaching all three systems even when the wider professional identity remains mixed.

SECTION 19

Platform by Platform Findings

Gemini

Gemini currently has the strongest overall understanding.

It recognizes Frank Masotti as an AI Business Understanding Analyst, identifies the report as the primary service, understands the manual three model process, separates important previous projects from the current business, and would recommend the report for the correct buyer.

Gemini's main weakness is occasional overstatement about information being missing from training data when the response only proves that the information was not surfaced.

ChatGPT

ChatGPT has the strongest conceptual understanding of what the report measures and where the methodology needs clearer boundaries.

It would recommend the report for perception, classification, omission, and recommendation analysis. However, it still categorizes Frank broadly and continues to treat older ventures and services as current.

ChatGPT's interpretation is: strong product understanding, mixed professional identity, and useful methodological skepticism.

Claude

Claude presents the largest combination of identity instability and credibility resistance.

When retrieval works, Claude understands the service, price, process, and distinction from software. When it does not, Claude claims it lacks reliable information. It also places unusual weight on the self published nature of the available evidence.

Claude's interpretation is: detailed but skeptical when recognition works, complete nonrecognition when it does not.

SECTION 20

What Changed Since the July 2026 Baseline

The July report found mixed understanding across all three systems. The September comparison shows measurable improvement, but not complete resolution.

The Current Product Name Is Stronger

AI Business Understanding Report now appears consistently across the systems. Older product names still surface, but they no longer prevent recognition of the current name.

Gemini's Identity Understanding Improved

Gemini moved from a broad SEO and AI visibility interpretation to the current AI Business Understanding Analyst identity and explicitly described important earlier projects as inactive.

ChatGPT's Product Understanding Deepened

ChatGPT now explains the report's scope, customer fit, limitations, competitive distinction, and attributes with considerable precision. Its broader classification of Frank Masotti remains unresolved.

Claude's Core Pattern Did Not Change

Claude can find and explain the current offer, but recognition remains inconsistent and recommendation remains restricted by the lack of independent evidence.

The Product Is Now Clearer Than the Identity

In July, both the product and professional identity were mixed. By September, the product itself is substantially clearer. The remaining confusion sits around history, category, natural recall, and trust.

SECTION 21

The Business Impact

Customers Can Still Receive Different First Impressions

A Gemini user may receive a confident current explanation. A ChatGPT user may receive a strong explanation of the report combined with outdated professional labels. A Claude user may receive skepticism or complete nonrecognition.

Exact Product Questions Produce the Strongest Results

The systems are most accurate when the user names the AI Business Understanding Report or asks for a manual comparison of ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude.

Broad Category Questions Favor Larger Platforms

When the user asks generally about AI visibility companies, familiar software platforms and agencies appear before Frank Masotti.

Old Information Still Expands the Apparent Service Menu

A buyer could incorrectly conclude that Frank currently sells SEO, GEO, marketing consulting, AI infrastructure, and implementation alongside the report.

Credibility Evidence Influences Recommendation

The product can be understood through first party information. Stronger unqualified recommendation requires evidence that does not originate entirely from Frank Masotti.

SECTION 22

Strategic Priorities

Publish the Testing Method

Explain that every question is asked while signed out, in a fresh conversation, without history, saved memory, personalization, or previous context. State that the same structured questions are used across all three systems and the responses are preserved exactly as returned.

Use More Precise Finding Labels

Separate incorrect, contradicted, outdated, omitted, unknown, and unstable findings. Do not treat information that was not mentioned as proof that it is absent from training data.

Distinguish a Likely Source From a Proven Cause

A matching old webpage can be identified as a possible contributing source. The report should not claim that the page caused a model's response unless that relationship can actually be established.

Keep One Current Identity

Frank Masotti is an AI Business Understanding Analyst. The AI Business Understanding Report is the current service. Previous ventures belong to the professional history rather than the current service list.

Build Independent Evidence

Client approved reports, reviews, case studies, references, and independently visible outcomes are the clearest answer to Claude's recommendation resistance.

Preserve Point in Time Accuracy

Every report should record the date, platforms, visible model information when available, testing conditions, raw responses, and verified business information used to judge accuracy.

SECTION 23

Final Conclusion

Frank Masotti is not invisible to AI.

ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude can all find and explain the AI Business Understanding Report. They generally understand that the report is manual, compares three major systems, examines what AI currently believes about a business, and provides diagnosis without optimization or a software subscription.

The product has achieved clearer understanding than the professional identity surrounding it.

Gemini sees the current person and product most clearly.

ChatGPT understands the product in depth but continues to classify Frank Masotti with broader and older professional categories.

Claude understands the report when retrieval works, fails to recognize it when retrieval does not, and remains unwilling to recommend without stronger independent evidence.

The product is understood. The identity is improving. Stable recall and independent credibility remain unfinished.

The most important next step is not another new title, method, or business name.

It is strengthening one current identity and documenting the method with the same clarity now being applied to the findings.

The target understanding remains simple:

Frank Masotti personally analyzes how ChatGPT, Gemini, and Claude understand a business and documents the findings in the Frank Masotti AI Business Understanding Report.

The September test also confirms why three systems are necessary. They examined the same person, the same product, and the same public information under the same clean testing conditions. They did not produce one shared understanding.

They produced three related but materially different interpretations.