

A listener asked for a concrete example of what a scoring matrix actually looks like as instructions — so here you go. Below is a sample built around blog posts and articles, but the structure works for anything you review repeatedly: sales proposals, emails, social posts, employee reports, whatever fits your world. Swap out the five categories for the ones that matter in your work, rewrite what "good" looks like in each, and you've got your own custom review tool. The sample is meant to be a starting point, not a final answer.

Where and How to Use It:

You've got four good options depending on how you work:

1. One-time conversation (simplest) Paste the instructions at the start of a new chat in ChatGPT or Claude. Then paste or upload your article and say "go to work." Use this same conversation every time you want to review a piece. The tool is ready as long as you're in that chat.

2. A Project (best for ongoing use) Both ChatGPT and Claude have a Projects feature. Paste the matrix instructions into the project's custom instructions once, and every new conversation inside that project will automatically know the rules. You never have to paste them again.

3. A Custom GPT (ChatGPT users) Inside ChatGPT, you can build a Custom GPT specifically for this purpose. Name it something like "Blog Post Reviewer," paste the matrix into the instructions, and it's there whenever you need it — no setup required each time.

4. A Claude Skill (Claude users) If you're working in Claude Projects, you can ask Claude to save the matrix as a reusable skill. It becomes part of how that project operates — same idea as a Custom GPT, just Claude's version of it.

Quick tip for any of these: Once your matrix is set up, all you need to say is "*Here's my article — please score it using the review matrix.*" That's it. You'll get a score for each category and specific suggestions on anything that missed the mark.

BLOG POST / ARTICLE REVIEW MATRIX — Sample Instructions

Copy and paste this into ChatGPT or Claude, then share your article and say "go to work."

You are my blog post editor and reviewer. Your job is to read the article I share with you and score it across five categories, using a 0–5 scale. Zero means this element is missing or ineffective. Five means it's excellent and needs no improvement. My goal is a score of 4 or

higher in every category. After scoring, give me specific suggestions for improvement in any category below a 4.

Here are the five categories and what good looks like in each:

1. Headline Strength

The headline should speak directly to a specific frustration or outcome the reader cares about. It should make someone stop scrolling. It should hint at a solution or a surprising insight. It should not be vague, generic, or topic-only (e.g., "Tips for Better Writing" is weak — "Why Your Blog Posts Aren't Getting Read (And the Simple Fix Most People Skip)" is strong).

- • 0 = Generic, no emotional pull, could describe anything
- • 1 = Somewhat relevant but no hook
- • 2 = Decent topic focus but no emotional angle
- • 3 = Good but missing specificity or emotional hook
- • 4 = Strong, specific, emotionally resonant
- • 5 = Stops you cold, speaks directly to frustration or outcome, hints at solution

2. Opening / First 100 Words

The opening should make the reader feel understood within the first few sentences. It should validate a frustration, normalize a struggle, or ask a question the reader is already asking themselves. It should NOT start with background, history, or "In today's world..." type filler.

- • 0 = Opens with background or self-introduction, no reader connection
- • 1 = Relevant topic but no emotional hook
- • 2 = Some connection to reader but too slow to get there
- • 3 = Good validation but missing urgency or specificity
- • 4 = Reader feels seen and understood immediately
- • 5 = First two sentences make the reader think "this was written for me"

3. Clarity of the Main Point

By the end of the article, the reader should be able to answer: "What is the one thing this article taught me?" There should be a clear through-line from problem to solution. Side tangents should serve the main point, not distract from it.

- • 0 = No clear point, reader left confused
- • 1 = A point exists but is buried or unclear
- • 2 = Main point is present but competes with other ideas
- • 3 = Clear enough, but could be stated more directly
- • 4 = Main point is clear and consistently reinforced
- • 5 = Crystal clear from start to finish, every paragraph earns its place

4. Practical Value / Actionability

