Beyond the Bio
Author Evidence

Who wrote it, what did they contribute, and what supports their knowledge of this specific subject?

Working draft · v0.1 · research brief

WHAT A BYLINE CAN AND CAN'T PROVE

WRITTEN BY



[Author name]
Senior specialist

LinkedIn ORCID

1. **Identity**
   Which person is this?
2. **Contribution**
   What did they actually do?
3. **Subject relevance**
   Why does their knowledge apply here?
4. **Provenance**
   Who asserted the evidence?

04	08	01
evidence layers	review checks	real self-audit

Ameneh Saeednia
Senior SEO and Generative Search Strategist

Research question

What does an author bio actually establish?

A named author makes responsibility clearer. But a long biography, prestigious title or external profile **does not by itself establish** that the person did the work, or knows the subject of a particular article.

Layer	Question	Relevant evidence
Identity	Which person is this?	Distinct profile, matching work history, relevant identifiers and dated records.
Contribution	What did this person do?	Method, analysis, collection, drafting or review role attached to the actual work.
Subject relevance	Why is their knowledge relevant here?	Applicable practice, qualification, work product or subject-specific contribution.
Provenance	Who asserted the evidence?	Self-description, publisher statement, organization record or independent source.

Main conclusion

Build an **evidence trail** for the relevant claims. Do not compress identity, contribution and topic relevance into one unexplained authority score. This is an editorial synthesis of the reviewed sources, not a statement about a hidden Google classifier.

How I built this

A desk review of **six primary documents** from Google, ORCID and NISO CRediT, completed 2 November 2026, then a real test of the method on my own byline (page 5).

Primary-source synthesis

Different systems answer different questions

Markup, profiles, identifiers and contributor roles each solve one part of the problem. None of them solves all of it.

Source finding	Practical use	Boundary
Google Article guidance recommends identifying authors with their type and a suitable URL or sameAs. [1]	Use a clear person or organization record consistent with the byline.	Markup expresses attribution. It **does not verify expertise**.
Google ProfilePage guidance focuses on a single affiliated person or organization. [2]	Use an appropriate profile page to explain identity and relevant background.	A general shop home page is not automatically a profile page.
ORCID distinguishes record-holder assertions from member-organization assertions. [3]	Read provenance for the particular affiliation or work entry.	A sparse or self-asserted record can still be valid. Missing markers are **not evidence of dishonesty**.
CRediT describes contributor roles and does not decide who qualifies as an author. [4, 5]	Explain who designed, collected, analyzed, wrote or reviewed the work.	The taxonomy is **not an expertise scale** or ranking framework.

Why these distinctions matter

A real person can be **irrelevant to the subject**. A qualified professional may not have reviewed a particular draft. A named reviewer may have checked only one section. A profile link resolves identity and nothing more.

What I kept from older checklists

Author checklists from my earlier roles asked good questions: who is responsible, what do others say, what does the author add. I kept the questions and dropped the shortcuts, like treating **positive mentions as proof of expertise**.

The eight review checks

Identity, participation and honest presentation

Checks 1 to 4 confirm who did what. Checks 5 to 8 confirm that the expertise fits the subject and is presented truthfully.

1

Resolve the author

Match the byline to the right person using **distinguishing facts**. Track former names or roles when they matter.

Evidence: Profile URL, role dates and a reasoned identity match.

2

State the contribution

Record who performed the material activities. One person can hold several roles; several people can share one. [4, 5]

Evidence: A contribution statement approved by the contributor.

3

Clarify review scope

If someone reviewed the content, state **what was reviewed and when**. Do not imply they did the research.

Evidence: Dated review record and its actual scope.

4

Trace evidence provenance

Identify who supplied the supporting information and whether sources are **independent or copied**. [3]

Evidence: Source URL, entry, date and assertion source.

5

Match expertise to the subject

Check whether the qualification or prior work relates to **this claim**. Not every experiential topic needs academic credentials.

Evidence: Relevant evidence and why it applies.

6

Separate first-hand work from synthesis

Distinguish **performed tests, lived experience, desk research and commentary**. Report material AI assistance.

Evidence: Method, artifacts and a truthful account.

7

Make attribution consistent

Compare **byline, profile and structured data**. Include the real contributors and correct identifiers. [1]

Evidence: Visible attribution and inspected markup, with discrepancies logged.

8

Keep limits and relationships visible

Record commercial relationships, access limits and who approved the claims. **Keep permission** for personal information.

Evidence: Disclosure, review date and unresolved evidence.

Real example: my own byline

What my author box proves, and what it doesn’t

I applied the four layers to my October 2026 post on Bing's AI Performance report and the About page it links to. Observed 3 November 2026.

Layer	What the page shows	Assessment and fix
Identity	Visible byline and “Written by” card with portrait, linking to my About page and LinkedIn. The About page adds GitHub and ORCID.	**Supported.** Fix: the byline says Ami, the profiles say Ameneh. State both names once on the About page.
Contribution	First-person writing. No note on how the post was researched or whether AI helped draft it.	**Partly supported.** Fix: add a one-line “How this was written” note to posts.
Subject relevance	The bio covers technical SEO, entity strategy and AI-search research. The post gives guidance (“I would…”) rather than results from using the report.	**Supported for guidance.** Fix: keep it framed as recommendations, or add real screenshots when I have them.
Provenance	Every credential is **self-asserted** on my own site or my own profiles. The podcast page is hosted by a collaborator.	**Unresolved for independence.** Normal for a personal site. Independent evidence would be talks, citations or bylines on other sites.

What it shows

My author box does its main job well: it tells you **who** wrote the post. It is weaker on **how** the post was made. That's the most common gap I expect to find, and the cheapest one to fix.

Fictional teaching examples

Same bio, different evidence needs

These scenarios are invented for teaching. They are **not audits** of named people or claims about my clients.

Scenario	What it establishes	What remains to verify
A travel writer describes a tour they took, with dated notes and original photos.	Potential **first-hand evidence** for that specific experience.	When, which itinerary and what changed. It does not qualify the writer to give unrelated legal advice.
A researcher has an ORCID record and lists an employer.	An **identity record** and an affiliation assertion.	Who supplied the affiliation, whether dates apply, and what supports expertise for this work.
A technical specialist is named as reviewer of an AI-written article.	A stated **review role**, if confirmed.	Which version and sections were checked, and whether sources and claims were actually reviewed.

Example contribution statement

"Research design and analysis: [name]. Data collection: [name]. Drafting: [name]. Technical review of the methods section: [name], completed [date]." Adapt to the real work. **Do not populate roles from a job title.**

Example profile introduction

"[Name] works on [specific subject]. For this resource, [name] performed [actual contribution]. Relevant evidence includes [verified work or qualification]. This article covers [scope] and does not establish [limit]."

Reusable register

Connect the person to the claim

Record the evidence against the specific work, not just against the author's home page.

Field	Record
Content URL / version	The specific work and reviewed version.
Person / identity source	Byline name, distinguishing details and matching profile or identifier.
Contribution	Actual role, scope and confirmation from the contributor.
Subject claim	The particular expertise or first-hand claim being made.
Supporting evidence	Work artifact, appropriate qualification, source entry or documented activity.
Provenance / independence	Who asserted the evidence. Note copied profiles and self-asserted information.
Assessment	Supported for this scope / Partly supported / Unresolved / Conflicting / Not assessed.
Action / owner / recheck	Correct attribution, obtain evidence, narrow a claim or clarify limits. Assign an owner.

Avoid unfair shortcuts

A sparse online footprint is **not evidence of deception**. Follower counts, awards, a professional portrait and biography length do not substitute for claim-specific evidence.

Privacy and proportionality

Use public professional evidence and information supplied **with permission**. Do not request private identity documents to fill an editorial author profile.

Validation plan

Test the workflow before it becomes a Skill

The self-audit on page 5 is one data point. The next step is a five-resource pilot.

Pilot	What to test
Sample	Five resources with different contributor patterns: solo writer, team research, expert review, first-hand account and secondary synthesis.
Independent review	Two reviewers identify the same four evidence layers before comparing judgments.
Disagreement log	Separate identity confusion, missing role scope, irrelevant expertise and weak provenance.
Repair	Ask the owner for missing facts. Revise only with support and permission.
Readback	Confirm the published attribution and evidence links reflect the approved information.

Report what was actually measured

Count unresolved identities, unconfirmed contributions and unsupported subject claims within the declared sample. **Do not call these counts an author authority score.**

AI Skill acceptance cases

Test a **namesake**, an affiliation unrelated to the article, a reviewer who checked **one section**, a valid **self-asserted ORCID entry** and a genuine first-hand account without formal credentials.

This method can't tell you how Google weights any author factor, or whether an AI system will cite the author.

Sources and provenance

References and reading boundaries

01 **Article structured data. Google Search Central**
Author identification and attribution. No expertise certification is implied.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/structured-data/article

02 **ProfilePage structured data. Google Search Central**
Use cases and focus of a profile page.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/structured-data/profile-page

03 **Interpreting the trustworthiness of an ORCID record. ORCID**
Assertion provenance and the limits of sparse or self-asserted records.
https://info.orcid.org/interpreting-the-trustworthiness-of-an-orcid-record/

04 **CRediT contributor roles. NISO**
Role transparency, distinct from authorship qualification. CC BY 4.0; concepts paraphrased.
https://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles/

05 **CRediT role descriptors. NISO**
Specific activities behind contributions, adapted here rather than applied as certification.
https://credit.niso.org/contributor-roles-defined/

06 **Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content. Google**
Sourcing, expertise and first-hand experience as self-assessment questions.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

How it connects

Entity Clarity resolves the subject. **Claim to Source** checks support for a statement. **Proof on the Page** considers where evidence appears. This brief asks who contributed and why their knowledge is relevant.

Scope

v0.1, November 2026. By Ameneh Saeednia, prepared with AI assistance. The self-audit is real; the other scenarios are fictional. Not peer reviewed.