
AI VISIBILITY AUDIT

Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers

San Antonio, Texas

PREPARED BY

Phil Helsel

Not-Just-AI Advisors

DATE

May 2026

BACKGROUND

25 years in enterprise technology — 8 years on search engines at FAST and Microsoft. CISM. Author, AZ-500 Microsoft Azure Security Technologies curriculum. Prior: security and infrastructure at Sun Microsystems, Oracle, and Microsoft Azure.

Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. The Gap: AI Search vs. Google Search
3. Your AI Visibility Snapshot
4. Competitor Comparison
5. Citation & Schema Audit
6. Prioritized Fix List
7. Recommended Engagement

This document is a sample deliverable. The subject firm is illustrative; data presented for “Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers” reflects realistic patterns observed across San Antonio personal injury firms during the audit research period (April–May 2026), but does not represent any specific real firm. Industry-wide statistics cited throughout are sourced from current published research and footnoted on the page where they appear.

Executive Summary

The finding in one sentence. Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers ranks competitively in Google for several core San Antonio personal injury queries, but is rarely cited in AI-generated answers from ChatGPT, Perplexity, Claude, or Google AI Overviews — the systems that are now answering an estimated 30% of all search interactions.

The headline number. Across 24 representative client-intent queries we tested, Reyes Cantú appeared in **0 of 24** AI-generated answers (ChatGPT, Perplexity, Claude). The same firm appeared on the first page of Google for **11 of 24** of those queries.

Why this matters. The two systems used to overlap. They no longer do. As recently as July 2025, roughly 76% of pages cited in Google AI Overviews also ranked in the top 10 for the same query. By February 2026, that figure had fallen to between **17% and 38%**, depending on dataset.¹ For ChatGPT specifically, only **6.82%** of cited results overlap with Google's top 10.² A #1 Google ranking no longer guarantees AI citation. Many firms are losing ground in AI without ever seeing it on a Google ranking dashboard.

What's broken at Reyes Cantú (preview)

- Avvo, Justia, and FindLaw profiles are present but incomplete or inconsistent with the firm website.
- Best Lawyers and Super Lawyers profiles exist for two of the firm's six attorneys; the other four are absent.
- Schema markup is limited to the default WordPress install — no **LegalService**, no **Attorney**, no **FAQPage** schema.
- NAP (name / address / phone) data varies across seven of the most AI-relevant directories.
- Attorney bios on the firm site are not structured for machine reading.

The opportunity. Less than 5% of local businesses have done meaningful AI-visibility work as of 2026. In legal, the figure is closer to zero.³ The work is bounded, technical, and largely one-time. The firm that completes it first in this market will sit alone inside AI answers for 12–24 months before competitors notice.

What this audit recommends. A structured 90-day engagement that addresses citation hygiene, schema implementation, attorney profile work, and content restructuring for AI legibility. Estimated effort and expected outcomes are detailed in Section 7.

¹ Ahrefs and BrightEdge studies, Feb 2026; ALM Corp, Google AI Overview Citations Drop, March 2026. brightedge.com · almcorp.com

² Ahrefs (Oct 2025), via The Digital Bloom, 2026 AI Citation Position & Revenue Report. thedigitalbloom.com

³ 5W Public Relations, GEO vs. SEO: The 2026 Venn Diagram, May 2026. prnewswire.com

The Gap: AI Search vs. Google Search

What changed

For nearly two decades, “showing up online” meant ranking on Google. The signals were known: backlinks, on-page SEO, Google Business Profile, reviews, local citations. A law firm that invested in those signals could expect proportional visibility across the search ecosystem.

That assumption has broken in the last 18 months.

AI answer engines — ChatGPT, Perplexity, Claude, and Google’s own AI Overviews and AI Mode — now operate as a parallel discovery layer with **different source preferences, different ranking signals, and different update cadences** than classic Google search. The brands that dominate Google often do not dominate AI. Many AI-cited brands rank nowhere on Google for the same query.

The market data

Metric	Value	Source
Share of all search interactions now occurring in AI tools	~30%	Sedestral, AI Search Market Share 2026
ChatGPT monthly active users (global)	891 million	First Page Sage, Q2 2026 Report
ChatGPT share of informational queries	23%	First Page Sage
Perplexity estimated monthly queries (mid-2026)	1.2–1.5 billion	Similarweb / Perplexity
Google AI Overview trigger rate, legal queries	23.6% overall · 57.9% question-style	Ahrefs (146M-SERP analysis)
Lawyers using AI tools internally in daily work	79%	Clio 2025 Legal Trends Report

Sources: 5WPR / Haute Lawyer 2026 Legal AI Visibility Report; First Page Sage; Sedestral; Clio.⁴

The overlap collapse

The single most important data point for any law firm to understand:

“The overlap between pages ranking in Google’s top 10 and pages cited in AI-generated answers has fallen from approximately 70–76% (mid-2025) to between 17% and 38% (February 2026).”

Sources: Brandlight analysis cited in 5WPR (2026); Ahrefs (Feb 2026); BrightEdge (Feb 2026); ALM Corp summary (March 2026).⁵

For ChatGPT specifically — the largest AI platform by user count — the overlap with Google’s top 10 is even narrower: **6.82%**. And **28.3% of ChatGPT’s most-cited pages have zero organic visibility in Google search**. A page that ranks nowhere on Google can be ChatGPT’s primary source.

These are not the same system. Optimizing for one no longer optimizes for the other.

Why the gap exists

Each AI platform pulls from a different basket of sources, weighted differently:

Platform	Primary source layer	Notable weight
Google AI Overviews	Google's organic index, filtered	Local Service Ads, Map Pack
Google AI Mode	Google's index (different filtering than AIO)	Lower top-10 overlap (~14%)
ChatGPT Search	Bing Search API (~92% of the time)	"Best Of" lists, structured directory data
Perplexity	Own web retrieval layer	Third-party directories (Avvo, Justia), entity consensus
Claude	Real-time web search via Brave	Authoritative sources, structured data

For legal queries specifically, **seven directories dominate AI citation** across all four major platforms: **Chambers, Legal 500, Super Lawyers, Best Lawyers, Martindale, Avvo, and Justia.**⁶ Individual law firm websites — including the most prestigious in America — appear inside those directories but rarely as independent voices in AI answers.

The implication: a law firm's own website is no longer the primary asset for AI visibility. The firm's presence inside the seven directories — accurate, complete, schema-rich, and consistent — is the asset.

What AI engines actually look for

Across our research and the published literature, four signals appear repeatedly as drivers of AI citation for legal queries:

- 1. Entity consensus.** AI tools cross-reference what your website claims against external databases — State Bar profiles, Avvo, Justia, FindLaw, court filings. When all sources tell the same story, AI develops confidence and cites the firm. When sources disagree, AI tends to omit the firm rather than risk an inaccurate recommendation.
- 2. Third-party recognition.** Peer-reviewed selections (Best Lawyers, Super Lawyers, Chambers) are weighted heavily because AI engines treat them as objective external validation, not paid promotion.
- 3. Structured data (schema markup).** AI tools prefer machine-readable data. JSON-LD schema for **LegalService, Attorney, and FAQPage** makes the difference between a firm being interpreted correctly and being skipped over for ambiguity.
- 4. Practice-area depth.** Firms cited consistently in AI answers tend to have dedicated, content-rich pages for each meaningful practice area, with the practice area named explicitly in the H1 and answered as a direct question.

The next two sections measure Reyes Cantú against these four signals.

⁴ Sedestral, AI Search Market Share 2026 — sedestral.com. First Page Sage, Google vs ChatGPT Q2 2026 Report — firstpagesage.com.

⁵ 5WPR, Overlap Between Top Google Rankings and AI-Cited Sources Has Collapsed, May 4 2026 — prnewswire.com. ⁶ 5WPR / Haute Lawyer, 2026 Legal AI Visibility Report, April 29 2026 — prnewswire.com.

A nighttime photograph of a city skyline, likely Toronto, featuring the CN Tower and several skyscrapers. The city lights are reflected in a body of water in the foreground. The sky is a deep blue, and the overall scene is dimly lit, emphasizing the artificial lights of the city.

PART TWO

Your Visibility, Measured.

Sections 3–7 — snapshot, comparison, audit, fixes, engagement.

Your AI Visibility Snapshot

Methodology

We tested Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers across four AI platforms (ChatGPT, Perplexity, Claude, Google AI Overviews) using 24 representative client-intent queries grouped into four categories:

- **High-intent local** (e.g., "best personal injury lawyer in San Antonio") — 6 queries
- **Long-tail informational** (e.g., "what should I do after a truck accident in Texas") — 6 queries
- **Practice-area-specific** (e.g., "motorcycle accident lawyer San Antonio") — 6 queries
- **Decision-stage** (e.g., "should I hire a lawyer or settle with the insurance company") — 6 queries

For each query, we recorded: (a) which firms were named in the AI answer, (b) which sources the AI cited, and (c) whether Reyes Cantú appeared at all.

Tests were run between April 28 and May 5, 2026. Results are representative of that window; AI rankings shift continuously and should be re-tested quarterly.

Aggregate result

Platform	Reyes Cantú appearances	Out of
ChatGPT	0	24
Perplexity	0	24
Claude	0	24
Google AI Overviews	1	24
Total AI surface	1	96

For comparison — Reyes Cantú's Google organic ranking on those same 24 queries:

Result	Count
First-page Google result	11 of 24
Top-3 Google result	4 of 24
Map Pack appearance	7 of 24

The pattern is clear and matches the broader market data: the firm earns Google visibility but is not winning the AI citation layer.

Sample query: "best personal injury lawyer in San Antonio"

Platform	Firms named	Primary sources cited
ChatGPT	George Salinas Injury Lawyers, Crosley Law, Wayne Wright LLP	Super Lawyers, Best Lawyers, Avvo, firm websites
Perplexity	George Salinas, Crosley Law, Cowen Rodriguez Peacock	Justia, Avvo, Super Lawyers, Texas State Bar
Claude	George Salinas, Crosley Law, Eric Ramos Law	Best Lawyers, Super Lawyers, firm websites
Google AIO	Wayne Wright, George Salinas, Cowen Rodriguez Peacock	Local Service Ads, Map Pack, Best Lawyers

Reyes Cantú: not named in any of the four answers.

The firms that do appear share three common traits:

1. Complete profiles in at least 4 of the 7 dominant legal directories
2. Multiple attorney recognitions in Best Lawyers and/or Super Lawyers
3. Practice-area pages with substantial content (1,200+ words) and proper schema

Sample query: "motorcycle accident lawyer San Antonio"

Platform	Firms named	Reyes Cantú?
ChatGPT	Carabin Shaw, George Salinas, Hill Law Firm	Not named
Perplexity	Carabin Shaw, Thomas J. Henry, Hill Law Firm	Not named
Claude	Carabin Shaw, Hill Law Firm, George Salinas	Not named

The pattern repeats. Where Reyes Cantú does have legitimate practice-area depth (the firm represents motorcycle accident clients regularly per its website), the AI layer does not know.

Sample query: "what's the average car accident settlement in Texas"

Platform	Sources cited
ChatGPT	Forbes Advisor, Texas State Law Library, three out-of-state firm blogs
Perplexity	Two industry-research sites, Justia article, two firm blogs (neither in Texas)
Claude	Forbes Advisor, NerdWallet, one Houston firm blog

This query category — informational, long-tail, decision-shaping — represents an estimated 40% of legal-query volume but is currently dominated by national content sites and out-of-market firm blogs.

Reyes Cantú produces no comparable content. This is the highest-leverage gap identified in the audit.

Competitor Comparison

We benchmarked Reyes Cantú against four San Antonio personal injury firms that consistently appeared in our AI tests. The competitor set was chosen for proximity (all serve Bexar County), comparable practice scope (general personal injury / auto accident), and AI-citation frequency in our 24-query test set.

Firm	AI mentions (of 96)	Best Lawyers?	Super Lawyers?	LegalService schema?	Atty full Avvo profile
George Salinas Injury Lawyers	47	Yes (founder)	Yes (3 attys)	Yes	6 of 6
Crosley Law	39	Yes (2 attys)	Yes (4 attys)	Yes	8 of 9
Wayne Wright LLP	28	Yes (1 atty)	Yes (2 attys)	Partial	5 of 7
Cowen Rodriguez Peacock	24	Yes (3 attys)	Yes (3 attys)	Yes	4 of 5
Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers	1	No	2 of 6 attys	No	2 of 6

The pattern across the leaders is consistent. The firms winning AI citation share four characteristics:

- 1. Dense directory presence.** Every attorney has a complete, claimed Avvo profile with peer endorsements. Justia profiles are filled out (not stub records). FindLaw entries link back to firm pages with consistent NAP data.
- 2. Peer-reviewed recognition cascading across multiple attorneys.** Not just the founder. Best Lawyers and Super Lawyers selections at the partner and senior-associate level. AI engines weight third-party recognition heavily; firms with three or more recognized attorneys appear in answers roughly 4× more often than firms with one.
- 3. LegalService schema implemented across all practice-area pages.** Each practice area has its own page, named explicitly in the H1 ("Motorcycle Accident Lawyer in San Antonio"), with structured data tagging the practice area, location, and attorneys.
- 4. Substantive long-form content for informational queries.** Each leader publishes 50–200 articles answering questions a real injured person would ask before contacting a lawyer. These articles are the content AI engines cite when synthesizing answers.

Reyes Cantú is not behind on the fundamentals of legal practice. The firm has reputable attorneys, real case results, and competitive Google visibility. **The gap is in the AI citation layer specifically — and the gap is bridgeable inside 90 days.**

Citation & Schema Audit

This section documents the technical findings: where Reyes Cantú's data lives across the seven dominant legal directories, what's missing, and what's inconsistent.

NAP consistency check

Firm name, address, phone (NAP) consistency is foundational. AI engines cross-reference these fields across sources to build entity confidence. Inconsistent NAP data signals "this firm may not be what it claims" and depresses citation rates.

Source	Firm name	Address	Phone
Firm website	(baseline)	(baseline)	(baseline)
Google Business Profile	✓ Match	✓ Match	✓ Match
Texas State Bar	✓ Match	× Old suite number	✓ Match
Avvo	✓ Match	✓ Match	× Different intake line
Justia	× "Reyes Cantu" (no accent)	✓ Match	✓ Match
FindLaw	✓ Match	✓ Match	× Different intake line
Yelp	× Listed as "Reyes & Cantú Law"	✓ Match	✓ Match
Best Lawyers	✓ Match (founder only)	✓ Match	✓ Match
Super Lawyers	✓ Match (2 attys only)	✓ Match	✓ Match

Five of nine sources show inconsistencies. Each individual issue is small. Cumulatively, they degrade entity confidence enough to materially reduce AI citation.

Directory completeness audit

The seven directories that drive AI citation for legal queries — and how Reyes Cantú scores against each:

Directory	Profile status	Critical gaps
Avvo	Claimed	Only 2 of 6 attorneys have peer endorsements; firm bio is 2 lines; no client reviews requested in 9 months
Justia	Claimed	Practice areas listed as "Personal Injury" only — not segmented (auto, truck, motorcycle, premises, wrongful death)
FindLaw	Listed (not claimed)	Stub profile; no firm bio; no attorney pages
Super Lawyers	2 of 6 attorneys recognized	Other 4 attorneys may qualify but have not been nominated; no firm-level "Top 10" or "Rising Stars" tracking

Directory	Profile status	Critical gaps
Best Lawyers	Not listed	No firm or attorney profile
Martindale-Hubbell	Stub listing	No peer review ratings; no AV/BV/CV rating displayed
Chambers USA	Not listed	Personal injury plaintiffs is not a Chambers-tracked category in Texas — acceptable; no action required

Score: 1.5 of 7 directories at “complete and credible” status. Industry-leading firms in the same competitive set score 5–6 of 7.

Schema markup audit

We crawled the firm website (reyscantulaw.com) and inspected the structured data on representative pages.

Page	Schema present	Schema missing
Homepage	Organization (default WordPress)	LegalService, LocalBusiness, breadcrumbs
About page	Person (one attorney)	Person for the other 5 attorneys; no Attorney schema; no firm-level org schema
Practice area pages	None	LegalService for each practice area
FAQ page	None	FAQPage (the questions are good content; the markup is missing)
Attorney bio pages	Default WordPress	Person / Attorney with credentials, bar number, education, practice specializations

No schema specific to the legal vertical exists on any page of the site. This is the single highest-impact technical fix in this audit. AI engines that need to verify “is this a real law firm with these specific practice areas in San Antonio” cannot do so from the current markup.⁷

Practice-area page audit

Per the 2026 LovedByAI / BrightLocal research on AI legal citations, practice-area pages must meet four criteria to be cited reliably: (1) practice area + city named in the H1, (2) 800+ words of substantive content, (3) direct-answer format, (4) **LegalService** schema specific to the practice area.⁸

Page	H1 specific?	Words	Direct-answer?	Schema?
Car Accidents	Partial (no city)	412	No	No
Truck Accidents	Yes	287	No	No
Motorcycle Accidents	Partial	198	No	No
Slip and Fall	No (just “Premises Liability”)	156	No	No
Wrongful Death	Yes	524	Partial	No
Workers' Comp	No (page is stub)	89	No	No

Median word count: 243. The competitor leaders (Crosley, George Salinas, Cowen Rodriguez Peacock) average 1,400–2,200 words on equivalent pages with full schema and direct-answer formatting.

Attorney bio audit

Attorney pages are an underweighted citation surface. AI engines cite attorney bios when answering queries like “is [attorney name] a good lawyer” or “who handles [specific practice area] cases at [firm name].” Reyes Cantú’s six attorneys have:

Element	Coverage
Bar number listed on bio page	1 of 6
Law school listed	6 of 6
Year admitted to Texas Bar	4 of 6
Practice-area specializations explicitly listed	2 of 6
Notable cases or representative matters	0 of 6
Speaking engagements / publications	0 of 6
Person schema implemented	1 of 6

The bios read like resumes from 2010. They do not give AI a reason to single out a specific attorney for a specific query.

⁷ Toppe Consulting, Structured Data for Law Firms. toppeconsulting.com

⁸ LovedByAI, How Perplexity Recommends Lawyers; How Lawyers Get Recommended on ChatGPT. lovedby.ai (Perplexity) · lovedby.ai (ChatGPT) · Best Lawyers, How AI Is Changing How Clients Find Lawyers. bestlawyers.com

Prioritized Fix List

We've grouped findings into three tiers based on impact and effort. The recommended sequence below assumes the firm wants to be visible across all four major AI platforms within 90 days.

Tier 1 – Quick wins (Week 1–2)

These changes are technical, bounded, and produce measurable lift in AI citation within 30 days.

#	Action	Effort	Owner
1.1	Standardize NAP across all 9 monitored sources. Pick a canonical version; update each directory to match.	4–6 h	SEO consultant
1.2	Implement LegalService and LocalBusiness JSON-LD schema on the homepage	2–3 h	Web developer
1.3	Implement Attorney schema on each of the 6 attorney bio pages	4 h	Web developer
1.4	Implement FAQPage schema on the existing FAQ page	1 h	Web developer
1.5	Claim and complete the FindLaw stub profile	1 h	SEO consultant
1.6	Update Avvo: full firm bio, all 6 attorneys claimed, peer-endorsement requests sent	3 h	Consultant + atty
1.7	Update Justia: split practice areas into specific categories	1 h	SEO consultant

Tier 1 total effort: ~16–20 hours of consulting time + 3–4 hours of attorney participation.

Expected outcome: Entity-confidence rebuild begins; Tier 1 fixes typically produce a 2–4× improvement in AI citation rates within 60–90 days because AI re-crawls and re-evaluates.

Tier 2 – Medium lift (Month 1)

#	Action	Effort	Owner
2.1	Rewrite all 6 practice-area pages to 1,200+ words with direct-answer formatting and explicit "Practice Area + San Antonio" H1	12–18 h	Consultant + atty review
2.2	Implement LegalService schema specific to each practice area	3 h	Web developer
2.3	Rebuild attorney bios: notable cases, representative matters, speaking engagements, publications, bar numbers	6–10 h	Each atty + editor
2.4	Submit 4 additional attorneys for Super Lawyers / Rising Stars consideration (preparation only)	4 h	SEO consultant
2.5	Pursue Best Lawyers nomination process for the firm and 2–3 attorneys	4 h	SEO consultant
2.6	Build out 12 long-form informational articles (1,500+ words each) on questions a real injured person asks before contacting a lawyer	24–30 h	Consultant + atty review

Tier 2 total effort: ~55–70 hours, spread across 3–4 weeks.

Tier 3 – Strategic (Months 2–3)

#	Action	Effort	Owner
3.1	Local digital PR: pursue mentions in 4–6 SA-area news outlets, San Antonio Bar publications, or law-related podcasts	15–20 h	SEO consultant
3.2	Establish a monthly content rhythm: 4 articles/month, each pegged to a real client question	Ongoing	Consultant + firm
3.3	Quarterly AI re-test: re-run the 24-query battery, measure citation lift, adjust	4 h/quarter	SEO consultant
3.4	Refresh content on a 13-week cycle (AI citations decay around the 13-week mark without updates)	Ongoing	SEO consultant

Recommended Engagement

This audit is a one-time deliverable. The fixes it recommends require execution. Below is a recommended 90-day engagement to address Tier 1 and Tier 2, with Tier 3 transitioning into a monthly retainer if results warrant.

90-day engagement scope

Month 1 — Foundation

- Complete Tier 1 (citation + schema fixes)
- Begin Tier 2 practice-area page rewrites
- First two long-form articles published
- Monthly check-in with managing partner

Month 2 — Depth

- Complete Tier 2 (bios, directory recognition submissions, remaining practice-area pages)
- Six long-form articles published
- First quarterly AI re-test (mid-month)

Month 3 — Inflection

- Complete remaining long-form content (12 total)
- Begin Tier 3 digital PR outreach
- Final AI re-test against the original 24-query baseline
- Decision point: continue into ongoing retainer (Tier 3 monthly cadence) or end engagement

Engagement structure

Element	Detail
Engagement length	90 days
Audit fee (this deliverable)	\$1,500 — flat
Implementation engagement fee	Quoted at engagement start, based on scope confirmation
Reporting	Monthly written summary + a 30-minute review call
Deliverables	Tier 1 + Tier 2 implementation; 12 long-form articles; updated schema across all pages; quarterly AI re-test report
Termination	Either party may terminate at any 30-day mark with written notice

Expected outcomes (90 days)

Realistic, not promised. Outcomes depend on the firm's participation in items requiring attorney input.

- AI citation rate: from current 1 of 96 to a target range of 25–45 of 96 across the same 24-query battery
- Schema coverage: 0% → ~95% of meaningful pages
- Directory completeness: 1.5 of 7 → 5+ of 7
- Practice-area page depth: median 243 words → median 1,400+ words
- Long-form content library: 0 → 12 articles answering high-intent informational queries

What this audit does not promise: A specific dollar increase in case intake. AI visibility is a leading indicator. It correlates with intake but is not the only variable. Anyone who promises a specific revenue number from SEO work is selling something other than honesty.

Next step

A 30-minute conversation to walk through this audit, answer questions, and decide whether the engagement above fits the firm's goals and timing. No pitch. Just a working session.

— Phil Helsel, Not-Just-AI Advisors

About this audit

Prepared by: Phil Helsel, Not-Just-AI Advisors, San Antonio, Texas.

Background. 25 years in enterprise technology, including 8 years working on search engines at FAST Search & Transfer and Microsoft. Author of the AZ-500 Microsoft Azure Security Technologies certification curriculum. CISM. The remainder of a 25-year career was spent in security and infrastructure at Sun Microsystems, Oracle, and Microsoft Azure.

Methodology references and source data. All third-party statistics in this audit are sourced from current published research (April 2025 – May 2026), footnoted on the page where they appear. Major sources include 5WPR's 2026 Legal AI Visibility Report, BrightEdge AI Search Insights, Ahrefs SERP analyses, Clio's 2025 Legal Trends Report, Brandlight overlap research, and primary tests run between April 28 and May 5, 2026.

Re-test cadence. AI visibility is not a static condition. We recommend re-testing the query battery quarterly. The 13-week threshold beyond which content shows measurable decline in AI citation frequency without refresh applies to legal content as well as commercial content.

This is a sample deliverable. "Reyes Cantú Injury Lawyers" is illustrative; data presented for the firm is realistic but does not represent a specific real San Antonio firm. Industry-wide statistics and the four named competitor firms (George Salinas Injury Lawyers, Crosley Law, Wayne Wright LLP, Cowen Rodriguez Peacock) reflect publicly available market information accurate as of May 2026.

Not-Just-AI Advisors · San Antonio, Texas · notjustaiadvisors.com