What the human review changes

Addendum 1.2.0, 8 October 2026. Review of 70 French J+30 observations: first readings, choices after discussion, documentary disagreements and sensitivity analyses. Author: Bertrand Morel, Edikka. Human reviewer: Isabelle Frassy.

The human reading retains all 50 historically positive citations. Mentions become 18/294 (6.12%). Treating the four disputed cases solely as source labels gives 14/294 (4.76%). That second calculation is a hypothesis; it does not replace Isabelle's choices.

J+30 scenario	Mentions	Citations
Historical edition retained	18/295 (6.10 %)	50/295 (16.95 %)
Human reading after discussion	18/294 (6.12 %)	50/294 (17.01 %)
Sensitivity: four cases as sources only	14/294 (4.76 %)	50/294 (17.01 %)
Sensitivity: two entire rows removed	18/293 (6.14 %)	49/293 (16.72 %)

The two denominators of 294 cover different answers. The mention is unknown for J30-P001-CGPT-R1; the citation is unknown for J30-P005-GGL-R3. Each metric excludes its own unknown value. The last row removes both entire answers and their contributions to the numerator.

J0 retains historical coding: 32/295 mentions (10.85%) and 35/295 citations (11.86%). The 225 valid J+30 answers outside the sample also retain historical coding; this review does not newly validate them.

A targeted review with a disclosed relationship

On 7 and 8 October 2026, Isabelle Frassy reviewed all 50 historically positive citation or mention answers and 20 stratified negatives, five per platform. She declares a personal relationship with the author, no participation in the initial collection and no remuneration. Permission to name her is recorded. **Independence is not established.**

This study measures neither traffic, sales nor a causal content or SEO/GEO effect. Quality scores, factual-fidelity scores and new collection are outside its scope. English documentation describes the same French-only corpus.

Decisions and their limitations

First readings and responses after rule clarification are retained separately. First-pass blinding was not directly observed. Codex prepared the materials, reconciled the documents and calculated the scenarios; it is not a second human reviewer.

Review stage	Mention agreement	Citation agreement
First reading	60/69; 1 indeterminate	68/68; 2 indeterminate
After discussion	66/69; 1 indeterminate	69/69; 1 indeterminate

Agreement with historical coding among determined values, in a targeted sample: these fractions do not estimate accuracy across all 295 answers. Post-discussion agreement is not an independent reliability measure.

The ten cases reconsidered

Answers	Final human choice	Provenance and handling
P009, P010, P011, P013, P016, P022 / Perplexity R1	Six revised NOs	New choices in the review document; earlier YES readings retained.
J30-P018-PPLX-R1	YES maintained	Explicit new choice in the document; disagreement retained.
J30-P014-PPLX-R1 J30-P001-CLDE-R1 J30-P015-CLDE-R1	Three maintained YESs	Confirmation relayed by Bertrand in chat; not a new signed document.

Edikka is present in all four excerpts. The disagreement concerns its function: a mention in the answer or a source label. Text archives do not reliably preserve this visual distinction, and no original MIA-FR J+30 screenshot is available. The human-reading scenario retains the four YESs; source-only treatment remains hypothetical.

One supported correction and two unknown values

P025-PPLX-R3: the archived text supports NO for mention; citation remains YES. **P001-CGPT-R1:** missing text, indeterminate mention; the source URLs support citation YES. **P005-GGL-R3:** answer text exists, but the source file is empty; citation is indeterminate. For **P007-CLDE-R1**, the archive explicitly records no displayed sources, supporting citation NO independently of whether the answer names the brand.

How coding affects the results

Each scenario is compared with the same J0 coding. Intervals describe variation across prompts in this corpus; they do not adjust for platform changes, collection conditions or coding ambiguities.

Scenario	Metric	Change (pp)	95% CI (pp)
Historical edition retained	Mentions	-4.75	-9.57 / +0.34
Historical edition retained	Citations	+5.08	-1.45 / +11.82
Human reading after discussion	Mentions	-4.73	-9.41 / +0.12
Human reading after discussion	Citations	+5.14	-1.37 / +11.86
Sensitivity: four cases as sources only	Mentions	-6.09	-10.53 / -1.33
Sensitivity: four cases as sources only	Citations	+5.14	-1.37 / +11.86
Sensitivity: two entire rows removed	Mentions	-4.70	-9.39 / +0.16
Sensitivity: two entire rows removed	Citations	+4.86	-1.70 / +11.60

The conclusion about mentions depends on the four disputed codings. The interval includes zero in the human-reading scenario but is entirely negative in the source-only sensitivity. Citation intervals include zero in all four scenarios. No scenario is selected to obtain a more favourable conclusion.

The same mention total, different answers

The human total of 18 follows removal of the unverifiable P001-CGPT-R1 mention, addition of the P014/P018-Perplexity YESs, and removal of the P025-PPLX-R3 mention. It happens to equal the historical total of 18, but its members differ. No unknown value is imputed as NO.

The range from 14 to 18 mentions is a coding sensitivity range, not a confidence interval. The four documentary disagreements differ from the three binary human-versus-original disagreements after discussion. Source share, prompt coverage and ordinal scores are not recalculated here.

Reproduce, verify and cite

Exact calculation and integrity checks

25 French prompts, four platforms, three repetitions: 300 planned runs and 295 valid runs per wave. The additional off-plan Claude calibration remains excluded. The bootstrap uses 10,000 paired draws of 25 prompts with replacement; all platforms and repetitions within each prompt stay grouped. Identical draws for J0/J+30, seed 20260826, mulberry32, R-7 quantiles.

Unknown values are excluded per metric within each draw; a separate sensitivity removes both entire rows. These explicit choices do not resolve possible missing-data bias. Intervals are exploratory: a fixed corpus for one brand does not represent a market.

Reproduce: unzip the archive, enter its directory, run `node review-analysis.mjs`, then `node --test review-analysis.test.mjs`. Node.js 20 or later; no account, network or external package is needed. The command verifies checksums, results and historical intervals.

Readable, reusable files

human-review.json / .csv: 70 first readings, initial codings, subsequent choices and provenance. **results.json / sensitivity-results.csv:** counts, denominators and intervals. **inputs-j0.json / inputs-j30.json:** unchanged historical inputs. **METHOD.fr.md / METHOD.en.md**, a dictionary, code, tests, manifests and reports complete the package.

Private Word documents, correspondence, platform-session URLs and full third-party answer transcripts are not redistributed. Document hashes and the provenance of choices are published. Calculation reproducibility therefore does not, by itself, enable a complete repeat of the documentary review or certify its validity.

Citation, responsibilities and versions

Morel, B. (2026). MIA-FR — AI visibility J0 / J+30: human review, coding disagreements and reproducible sensitivity analyses / Relecture humaine (1.2.0). Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23232844.

Human review: Isabelle Frassy, acknowledged as a contributor without assigning coauthorship. Preparation, reconciliation, drafting and calculations assisted by Codex; editorial responsibility: Bertrand Morel, Edikka. Data and documentation: CC BY 4.0; code: MIT. Hashes establish integrity, not the truth of coding.

Historical sources: supplement 1.1.1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.23052222; J0, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.22114665; protocol, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.22106520. Those editions remain unchanged. This review occurred after data collection and is not a preregistered analysis.