

creatorhq.

THE COMPLETE FREE WORKBOOK

Ask honestly. Reply carefully.

Neutral invitations. Useful replies. No
rating promises.

Make the next step clear.

A neutral eligibility ledger / Weighted rating calculations / Ten worked answers

EDITION 2.0 / SEPTEMBER 2026

A practical workbook, not a promise of results.

Inside the workbook

A complete free review workflow: neutral invitations, permission and duplicate checks, five privacy-safe response cases, and a fully worked rating ledger. Separate support from public reviews, avoid incentives and gating, and check ten concrete answers.

1. Set a neutral invitation rule before seeing sentiment	3
2. Give people a real choice and verify the destination	4
3. Write five responses without exposing a service record	5
4. Measure activity and ratings without inventing attribution	6
5. Reuse the workflow without automating judgment	7
6. Ten checks with answers	8
Sources and boundaries	8

How to use this workbook

Edition 2.0. Reviewed September 18, 2026. Build a neutral invitation process, write privacy-safe replies, and measure review activity without promising a higher rating.

This free workbook uses fictional Cedar Signal Repair records. No customer was contacted, review submitted or account accessed. Draft only from synthetic text: never invent opinions or upload real device, account or contact information. This is a workflow, not automated customer-review writing.

1. Set a neutral invitation rule before seeing sentiment

Google's current Maps policy permits requests for genuine, unincentivized experiences, while prohibiting selective positive solicitation, rewards for reviews or their revision/removal, pressure to post on premises, prescribed review content and staff review-solicitation quotas. Its conflict-of-interest rules also matter. The shop will not ask "Were you happy?" and show a public link only after a favorable answer. Support must remain available regardless of whether anyone posts or changes a review.

For this fictional exercise, the owner approves one optional invitation per person within a rolling 30-day window, following a genuine shop interaction and only through a permitted contact route. This is a local workload/contact rule, not a Google timing requirement. It applies regardless of happiness, payment outcome or whether repair work was accepted. Private feedback and public-review options are presented neutrally, not used to divert criticism.

The complete eligibility packet

All records concern October 2026. "Permitted" means the owner has recorded permission for this invitation through the stated route; it is not permission for a general marketing list. No actual addresses or numbers are supplied.

Event	Person / experience	Contact and exclusion facts
J1	C1; completed service; pleased	Permitted email; no previous invitation
J2	C2; attended assessment; dissatisfied; declined repair	Permitted email; no previous invitation
J3	C3; completed service	Withdrew invitation contact permission
J4	C4; genuine visit	Current employee; conflict of interest
J5	C5; completed service	No permitted invitation contact route
J6	C1; second genuine visit	Same person as J1, same 30-day window

Event	Person / experience	Contact and exclusion facts
J7	C6; attended service; subsequently fully refunded	Permitted email; no previous invitation
J8	C7; abandoned an unsubmitted request; no shop interaction	No genuine shop experience supplied
J8	C7; identical duplicate	Same event, not another person

Nine rows become eight event IDs and seven people. Seven distinct events record genuine interactions, involving six people; J8 does not. Eligible contacts are C1, C2 and C6. C2's dissatisfaction and C6's refund do not remove them. C1 receives one invitation, not two. These three are the result of a policy check, not a target assigned to staff.

Record event/person IDs, experience, permitted route, withdrawal, last invitation, conflict and decision reason. Exclude device details, passcodes and private files. Verify identity before deduplication; a shared display name is insufficient.

2. Give people a real choice and verify the destination

The owner must verify the link reaches the intended shop profile without submitting a review. Google documents links and QR codes; no live link or paid QR service is supplied here. A broken link or wrong location fails the check.

Complete email invitation

Subject: Optional feedback about your experience

Thank you for your recent experience with Cedar Signal Repair. If you would like to share an honest public review, please use the owner-verified Google review link included with this message. Positive, mixed and negative experiences are welcome; please choose your own words and rating. Posting is optional and does not affect support or any agreed resolution. You may also contact the shop through its established support route. Please avoid device identifiers, account information or anyone else's personal details in a public review. If you do not want another invitation, reply "stop" through our monitored reply route. Cedar Signal Repair.

The final link remains a release field: do not send this draft until the correct URL is inserted and checked. The fictional owner monitors replies and applies withdrawals before further sends; no software automation has been tested. General newsletters require their own permission.

Complete counter-card copy

Want to share your experience? An honest Google review is optional. Use the verified link or QR code when convenient, write in your own words and choose your own rating. No reward, discount or priority service is offered. For support, contact reception separately; help does not depend on a public review. Please keep personal and device information out of public comments.

Place such a card only after owner approval; do not stand over a customer, ask them to prove posting or hand over a device to publish on their behalf. Do not give a prewritten positive review for them to paste. A QR scan, click or delivered email is not proof of a posted review.

Complete withdrawal acknowledgment

We have recorded your request not to receive further review invitations through this route. You do not need to explain your decision or submit a review. This does not prevent you from contacting us for support about an existing service. Cedar Signal Repair.

Keep only the necessary suppression record in the authorized system. Do not delete the withdrawal merely to make the contact list look tidy, or re-enroll someone because they visit again.

3. Write five responses without exposing a service record

The following synthetic cases are independent of the invitation ledger. A reviewer may use a display name that does not match a customer record. Lack of a match is not evidence of a fake review. Owner review of a reply is separate from any private service investigation.

R1: Positive, no sensitive details

Supplied review: "The explanation was clear and I knew the next step." Proposed reply: "Thank you for sharing your experience. We appreciate knowing that the explanation was clear. Our team aims to make the proposed next step understandable, and your feedback is helpful. Cedar Signal Repair."

Do not embellish this into "another phone saved" or mention a device, invoice or technician from private records. The review supports praise about communication, not repair outcomes or future performance.

R2: Negative, a disputed communication experience

Supplied review: "I waited for an update and felt ignored." Proposed reply: "We are sorry the communication felt unsatisfactory. Please contact the shop through our established support route so the owner can review the concern privately. Please do not post account or device information here. This public reply cannot establish what happened or promise a particular resolution. Cedar Signal Repair."

The private action is to inspect the appropriate authorized communication records. Do not state that the reviewer ignored three messages unless that claim is both verified and appropriate to disclose; a public argument is not the investigation.

R3: Unrecognized display name, ordinary criticism

Supplied review: "The conversation felt rushed." No matching account has been found. Proposed reply: "Thank you for explaining your concern. We would like to understand the experience through our established support route. Please contact the owner privately rather than posting identifying information here. Cedar Signal Repair."

Do not reply "You were never a customer." A genuine assessment or unsuccessful enquiry can be an experience without a completed repair transaction. Do not flag criticism solely because it is unfavorable or unfamiliar.

R4: Public personal information

The synthetic case contains another person's private phone number and device identifier; neither is reproduced in this workbook. Hold an ordinary reply while the owner reviews the privacy issue and the platform's reporting route. Do not quote, screenshot into marketing, or repeat the identifiers in a rebuttal. A minimal draft, if the owner finds it appropriate, is: "Please avoid sharing personal information in public. Contact the shop privately through its established support route for assistance."

R5: Requested benefit in exchange for removal

An independent message asks for a discount in return for deleting a negative review. Do not bargain over the rating. Draft: "We can review a service concern through our normal support process, independently of a public review. We do not exchange discounts or other benefits for posting, editing or removing reviews. Please use our established support route without sharing private information publicly. Cedar Signal Repair."

Preserve necessary evidence privately and escalate to the owner. A supported policy concern may be reported; that is not a guarantee of removal. A normal, independently justified remedy must never be conditional on deleting or improving the review.

4. Measure activity and ratings without inventing attribution

For the invitation exercise, I1/C1 and I2/C2 are delivered; I3/C6 bounces. Three attempts yield two deliveries, or 66.7%. Pause further attempts to the failed route pending the established correction process. No opens, clicks or person-level connection to public reviewers are supplied. The owner should not seek private identity proof merely to credit a campaign.

Separately, the rating ledger begins with ten ratings: six at five stars, three at four stars and one at one star. The total is $6 \times 5 + 3 \times 4 + 1 \times 1 = 43$ points, averaging 4.30. Three new, distinct rating IDs R1/R2/R3 contribute five, two and four stars. An imported duplicate R2 row must be discarded once by ID. R4/R5 above are independent response exercises, not additional rating-ledger entries.

The updated total is 54 points across 13 ratings, or 4.1538, approximately 4.15. The mean fell even though review count increased. That is an honest outcome, not permission to remove the two-star contribution. No removal or revision is supplied, and this arithmetic is not a claim about Google's displayed rounding or timing.

Three new ratings divided by two delivered invitations gives 150%, but that is not a defensible invitation-conversion rate because the populations are unlinked. Report invitation delivery and independent rating change separately. Do not assume R1 is C1 because both are positive, or that a new rating was produced by this process.

5. Reuse the workflow without automating judgment

The daily review sheet has three lanes: invitation decisions, public-response decisions and private service actions. Each needs a source, owner, status and result evidence. A reply can be approved but not published; a report can be submitted but not resolved; a refund can be approved but not completed. None substitutes for the others.

For each proposed public reply, check: only facts supplied in the public text; no account confirmation; no device details; no invented outcome; no discount tied to a review; no diagnosis; appropriate tone; human approval. For a report, record the specific policy concern rather than "low rating." A private service resolution remains under the shop's normal authorization process.

Optional Kimi prompt:

"Use only the synthetic J1-J8 eligibility table and R1-R5 response cases in this workbook. Return eligible contacts with exclusion reasons, one neutral invitation and five draft response decisions. Keep C2 and C6 eligible despite dissatisfaction or refund; deduplicate C1 and J8. Compute two deliveries from three attempts, then 43 existing rating points plus 5+2+4 across thirteen ratings. Do not match reviewers to customers, invent testimonials, repeat personal information, send, report or access accounts."

Compare the draft to the answer key manually. If it asks only happy customers, offers a discount, identifies a device or claims a fake review from an unmatched name, reject that draft and correct the governing instruction. These are synthetic tests, not measured vendor capabilities.

Public visibility does not establish advertising reuse permission or justify strengthening a quotation. This exercise authorizes no review screenshot, endorsement campaign or rating badge. Separately ask what communication step the owner should investigate, regardless of the score.

6. Ten checks with answers

1. **How many records and people are present?** Nine rows, eight event IDs and seven people. J8 repeats exactly; C1 has two distinct genuine interactions.
2. **Who qualifies under the declared invitation rule?** C1, C2 and C6, one invitation each. Seven genuine-interaction events involve six people, but contact permission and conflict checks narrow the send list.
3. **May dissatisfaction or a refund exclude someone?** No. C2 and C6 remain eligible. Selecting only C1 would filter by sentiment rather than apply the neutral rule.
4. **Why exclude C3-C5 and C7?** C3 withdrew permission; C4 is an employee; C5 lacks a permitted route; C7 has no genuine experience supplied. These are stated reasons, not star-score predictions.
5. **What do invitation results show?** Three attempts, two deliveries, one bounce: 66.7% delivered. They show neither reading nor review posting.
6. **What is the initial rating mean?** $(6 \times 5 + 3 \times 4 + 1 \times 1)/10 = 43/10 = 4.30$. Do not average category averages without their counts.
7. **What is the updated mean?** $(43+5+2+4)/13 = 54/13 = 4.1538$, about 4.15. Repeated R2 does not add another rating.
8. **Is 150% an invitation-conversion rate?** No. Three new ratings and two delivered invitations are unlinked sets. Their ratio cannot establish person-level conversion or causation.
9. **Does an unfamiliar name prove a fake review?** No. R3 needs a privacy-safe response and appropriate private investigation, not an unsupported public accusation or automatic report.
10. **Can a remedy require review removal?** No. Handle legitimate support separately. R4's privacy concern and R5's requested exchange need owner review; neither guarantees a platform removal outcome.

Sources and boundaries

- [Google Maps: Prohibited and restricted content](#). Governs the platform-specific invitation, conflict and manipulation boundaries; check the current policy before real use.
- [Google Business Profile: Tips to get more reviews](#). Supports review-link options, professional replies and privacy-aware handling of concerns. No ranking or removal guarantee is implied.
- [FTC: Soliciting and Paying for Online Reviews](#). Explains genuine, nonselective solicitation and platform-specific restrictions; broader FTC examples do not override Google's stricter incentive rules.

Sources reviewed September 18, 2026. Original educational exercises, not legal advice, actual sentiment or tested messaging. No paid subscription needed.