Content Review Decisions

A practical Skill and human review method for deciding which pages stay, improve, consolidate or retire.

Public beta · v0.1 · research-informed method

FOUR ACTIONS, ONE REASON FOR EACH

Keep

A distinct useful purpose remains.

Update

The job is right; the content or setup needs repair.

Merge

Two pages do the same job; one should do it better.

Remove

No continuing role, after dependencies are checked.

Low traffic starts the investigation. **Evidence decides the action.**

04	06	05
editorial decisions	evidence gates	scenario walkthroughs

Ameneh Saeednia
Senior SEO and Generative Search Strategist

Start here

Make the reason visible

A weak traffic number is **an invitation to investigate, not a verdict**. Start with the page's job, examine the evidence and separate the editorial recommendation from permission to change the site.

What you receive

A reusable **Skill**, decision guide, blank review record, completed public-page example and five-scenario assessment. The Skill needs no API key or private analytics connection for a basic review. It must **mark unavailable evidence** rather than inventing it.

Who this is for

Content leads, SEO consultants and editors reviewing existing pages. Low traffic is a reason to look closer, not a reason to delete. It gives a **reasoned decision**, not a quality score, and it never deletes anything.

Release status

v0.1 beta, 2 November 2026. Tested on five fictional scenarios and a real review of two of my own articles. Not yet benchmarked across agents or on client sites.

How to start

Load SKILL.md and its references in an agent that supports Skills, or supply the files as review instructions. Provide page text or URLs, purpose and available evidence. **Review the output before approving any implementation.**

A prompt to try

“Review these pages for keep, update, merge or remove. Use the supplied evidence, label missing checks and give a specific next action with an owner. Do not modify the site.”

Six evidence gates

Diagnose before deciding

Each gate is a question to answer, with evidence, before any action is recommended.

Gate	Evidence to record
Purpose	Reader, question, journey stage, business role, owner and intended action.
Access	Inspected status, canonical, noindex, discovery and indexing evidence. Label unchecked fields.
Value	Accuracy, source support, original contribution and decision-critical gaps.
Overlap	Shared questions and unique contributions. Audience and role, not just shared keywords.
Performance	Source, period, denominator, seasonality, demand and measurement changes.
Dependencies	Relevant links, campaign use, policy or record needs, destination and approval owner.

Unknown is not zero

A missing analytics export is **not zero conversions**. An inaccessible page has not been examined. A canonical or robots check that was not run remains untested. State which unknown could change the recommendation.

Topic overlap is not duplication

A field note and a reference guide can share a topic while serving **different questions**. A merge needs a defensible destination and a plan to keep useful unique material. Canonicalization is for duplicate or very similar URLs. [3]

The decision

Four actions, separate readiness

The action says what should happen. Readiness says whether anyone has approved it yet.

Action	When it fits	Next requirement
Keep	A distinct useful purpose remains.	Review trigger and any verification task.
Update	The purpose remains but content or technical handling needs repair.	Exact correction, owner, source and readback.
Merge	Materially overlapping jobs can be better served by a chosen destination.	Content-transfer map, dependencies and appropriate URL handling.
Remove	No continuing useful role remains after dependency checks.	Approval, record needs, response handling and link cleanup.

Readiness is independent

Record **Provisional, Ready for approval, Approved** or **Implemented**. Do not claim approval or implementation without evidence. If a responsible action cannot be chosen, defer the decision, name the missing check and keep the page pending review.

Length, age and traffic are not verdicts

A short policy can fully serve a customer need. A seasonal guide needs seasonal context. An accidental noindex can need technical repair without a rewrite. **Google does not specify a preferred word count.** [1, 2]

URL handling follows the user need

Use a **permanent redirect** for a genuine move to an appropriate replacement. If a page is gone with no replacement, propose a suitable **404 or 410** after approval. Avoid blanket homepage redirects. [4]

Initial assessment

Five fictional cases, bounded claims

Each scenario was supplied as a fictional evidence packet. The table shows what the Skill recommended and why.

Supplied scenario	Recommendation	Reason
180-word refund policy. Accurate and used at checkout; few organic visits.	**Keep** / Ready for approval	Useful support task. Traffic and length alone do not justify removal.
Christmas guide: June clicks compared with December; campaign still planned.	**Keep** / Provisional	Mismatched seasons cannot establish content failure.
Useful guide; observed noindex confirmed accidental by owner.	**Update** / Ready for approval	Repair the technical exclusion. Do not infer poor copy.
Field note and diagnostic guide share sitemap keywords but answer different questions.	**Keep** / Provisional	Different jobs. No automatic merge or canonical.
Retired offer; owner and dependency inventory confirm no continuing role or replacement.	**Remove** / Ready for approval	Recommend suitable missing-page handling. The review does not authorize deletion.

What this shows

The Skill reached the expected decision in all five cases and **refused to act on traffic alone**. It's a walkthrough, not an accuracy benchmark. A genuine merge still needs testing.

Review, not implementation

The Skill made **no deletions, redirects or publications**. Approval and implementation stay with a person. Full packets and reasoning are in the scenario assessment.

Reusable record

Make the next action executable

A recommendation without an owner, a change and a readback is just an opinion.

Record	Minimum useful detail
Identity and purpose	URL, page group, reader job and owner.
Evidence	Observation, source or locator, date and period. Supplied versus inspected.
Findings	Technical checks, accuracy, contribution and overlap comparison.
Recommendation	Action, readiness, rationale and evidence that could change the decision.
Implementation	Specific change, owner, dependencies, approval and URL plan if relevant.
Validation	Dated readback, outcome measure, comparison period and attribution limits.

Verify implementation before measuring impact

Confirm the approved change is live and links and HTTP behavior work. Record **baseline and release date**. Compare an appropriate demand window and page group, and note simultaneous changes. Before and after movement alone does not establish causation.

Public example

The companion example reviews **two seogirl.ca sitemap articles**. It keeps the field-note role and recommends a factual correction to the broader guide. It does not approve consolidation or verify the original 40K project figure.

Primary sources

Guidance behind the boundaries

01 **Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content. Google**
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

02 **Debugging drops in Google Search traffic. Google**
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/monitor-debug/debugging-search-traffic-drops

03 **Consolidate duplicate URLs (canonicalization). Google**
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/crawling-indexing/consolidate-duplicate-urls

04 **HTTP status codes and network errors. Google**
https://developers.google.com/crawling/docs/troubleshooting/http-status-codes

05 **Sitemaps overview. Google**
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/crawling-indexing/sitemaps/overview

Attribution and limits

By Ameneh Saeednia (SEO Girl), prepared with AI assistance. Guidance reviewed 2 November 2026. The four-action workflow is my own review method, not an official Google framework. No client records are included.