

An independent med spa in a large US city, in brief

A preview of an independent public-evidence worked example of the Core Review method · not a complete Core Review · checked 20 to 21 October 2026 · prepared by TheyName

This is a short preview of a longer worked example. Nobody commissioned it. It uses public information only. The clinic was never contacted, and nothing was submitted: no form, call, email, sign-up or booking.

To keep the clinic anonymous, this preview leaves out its prices, dates, review counts and team details, and describes its competitors only in general terms. The full report keeps the exact figures, because they are the findings.

What this preview shows. One thread through the report: what the clinic's pages say, what that means, what to decide, who does the work, and how anyone would know it worked. The full report runs to 30 pages, with five findings, a measurement plan and an evidence ledger. Ids in brackets (S1, C44, F17) point to that ledger.

How to read the tags

TAG	MEANS
FACT	Anyone could check it against the source and get the same answer
SEEN	We saw it in a check that can be repeated (method and date given)
READING	Our interpretation, with the facts it rests on
DO	A recommendation, with what it rests on

A0 • Decisions on one page

The situation. An established independent med spa with a clear point of view and published prices. Its own pages give a first-time injectables patient three answers on the consultation fee, two cancellation rules, two deposit amounts, and different prices for the same treatment.

What's working. Prices on the page, detailed aftercare, named clinicians with credentials, a stated whole-face approach, and a booking widget that passes our phone check.

The decisions

1. **RESOLVE NOW** Set one rule for each commercial term (consultation fee, deposit, cancellation, lateness) and state it the same way on every page and booking screen. **The owner.**
2. **RESOLVE NOW** Confirm each treatment's current price, label who it's for, and make the price list, treatment pages and booking agree. **The owner.**
3. **RESOLVE NOW** Decide what a patient does if something doesn't feel right after treatment. **The clinical lead.**
4. **RESOLVE NOW** Correct the address and hours in the site's business markup, and close or relabel the expired sale that booking still sells, once the owner confirms whether it continues. **The owner,** then whoever maintains the site.
5. **RESOLVE NOW** Fill in an unfilled privacy template. Outside the review's scope, listed so it isn't lost. **Whoever advises the clinic on legal terms.**
6. **IMPROVE NEXT** Make the home page and price list work on a phone. **The owner,** with whoever maintains the site.

Not yet, on this evidence. A redesign, a new booking system, an SEO retainer. A chatbot or AI assistant would repeat answers that disagree, so it waits until 1 to 3 are done. An AI receptionist isn't ruled out, and nothing public supports it either. Only the clinic's call records could show whether calls go unanswered.

None of these six decisions needs a new site or new software.

The rest of this preview follows decision 1 from the evidence to the work.

The finding · The commercial terms disagree

This is Finding 1 of five, in the six steps every finding gets.

- **Evidence** **FACT** Consultation: free and optional on the FAQ, a required fee on the price list, and a non-refundable fee in booking that is higher with the lead injector. Deposit: one amount on the policies page, a higher one in booking. Cancellation: 48 hours' notice and one fee on the FAQ, 24 hours and a higher fee on the policies page (S1 to S12). Screenshots on file, 20 October 2026.
- **Finding** **SEEN** A first-time injectables patient can't tell from the clinic's own pages what a consultation costs, which deposit they'll pay or what cancelling costs.
- **Implication** **READING** For the objective of protecting appointment time: the terms a patient accepts in booking aren't the ones on the policies page, and a fee nobody expected is the easiest to dispute. Our review study doesn't make this case for us. No negative review in it complains about a consultation fee (0 of 347), only 7 of 347 mention deposits, and none of the clinic's own reviews mentions fees (F17, F31, F32). The case rests on accuracy, and on the patient knowing what they'll pay.
- **Confidence** Firm that the terms disagree. Test first that it matters. Some gaps may be deliberate or old: a facials consultation is free in booking, and a recent promotion waived fees. One nearby competitor's policies page also gives two notice periods, so this is common (S4, S42, C44).
- **Recommendation** **DO** The owner decides one current rule per term, with any intended exceptions. It's stated once on the policies page and repeated word for word in the FAQ, price list and booking descriptions. We don't judge the fees themselves. Whoever manages booking makes the edits.
- **Validation** No baseline. A dated re-read finds one answer per term, and the owner tallies fee questions and disputes from then on.
- **What would change it** If the booking text is current and the pages are old, the fix is deleting old wording. If every difference is intended, the fix is labeling, not changing a rule.

The decision · What to do, and in what order

R1 · One rule per commercial term, stated the same everywhere **RESOLVE NOW**

- Finding 1 · serves the clinic's objectives on appointment time and new patients · decided by **the owner** · depends on nothing
- Impact unknown · urgency now, because the terms are unclear · confidence firm that it exists, test first that it matters · effort small
- How we'll know: one answer per term on every page and booking screen; a tally of fee disputes

The judgements are never added up into a score.

What R1 doesn't justify. A chatbot on the site would repeat pages that disagree, so it stays in "Not yet" until R1 to R3 are done and inquiries show questions the pages don't answer.

The work • Who does it, and how we'd know

The work, inside what the clinic already pays for

ACTION	THE WORK	WHO CAN DO IT	COULD THEYNAME DO IT?
R1	Decide one rule per term, then edit the FAQ, price list, policies and booking descriptions	The owner decides. Whoever maintains the site and the booking menu makes the edits	The decisions are the owner's. The edits, yes, once the owner has decided
R2	Confirm each treatment's current price and label who it's for, then make the price list, treatment pages and booking agree	The owner decides the prices. Whoever maintains the site and the booking menu makes the edits	The pricing decisions are the owner's. The edits, yes, once the prices are confirmed
R3	Write the concern route and the care timings, then put the same block on every care page and in the booking confirmation	The clinical lead writes it. The site maintainer and the booking provider place it	Placing it, yes. Writing it, no: we don't write clinical wording
R4	Correct the business markup, publish hours, close or relabel the expired sale once the owner confirms whether it continues	The site maintainer, in one sitting once the owner answers	Yes, as part of the implementation project below
R5	The privacy notice	Whoever advises the clinic on legal terms	No. Outside our remit
I1	Phone fixes to the home page and price list	The site maintainer, inside the current builder	Yes, as part of the implementation project below

R1 to R5 and I1 are the six decisions in the decision summary, in the same order.

A focused implementation project. The immediate scope is to make the home page and price list work on a phone, correct the business information, and close or relabel the expired sale once the owner confirms whether it continues. Once the owner and clinical lead supply the approved wording, the related content updates can be included. TheyName can confirm access and platform constraints, then provide a separate implementation quote. A new website is not justified by the available evidence.

The validation step

ACTION	MEASURE	MEASURED TODAY?	BASELINE	OWNER	LOOK AGAIN
R1	Answers per term. Fee disputes	No. Disputes unknown	Conflicting answers today: 3 for consultation, 2 for deposit, 2 for cancellation	Owner	On the day, then monthly

No target yet, because disputes have no baseline. The re-read shows whether the fix landed, the tally whether it mattered.

Where this leads. On this evidence the work is fixes, not a rebuild. If further evidence shows that the home page still creates difficulty after these fixes, a focused page redesign may be appropriate. The scope would depend on what that evidence reveals. If the clinic later pulls its booking reports and call log, an Extended Review answers what public evidence can't. TheyName can scope and deliver the improvements that fit, and the clinic stays free to use its current provider instead.

What the full report adds

- Four more findings in the same six steps (prices, aftercare, out-of-date details, the phone experience), a measurement plan and the evidence ledger.
- Every term and price, page by page, with the exact figures.
- The booking walk, tap by tap, to the step that asks for contact details. We stopped there.
- What patients write about, from the clinic's own reviews and our 1,514-review study.
- How the clinic compares with four nearby competitors on the same walk.
- What it can't show: what happens after a patient calls or messages, and whether any of this has cost bookings. Those need the clinic's own records.

Preview of an independent public-evidence worked example of the Core Review method by TheyName, not a complete Core Review. The clinic's name is withheld. Public information only, checked 20 to 21 October 2026. The clinic was never contacted and nothing was submitted.