

Review Response Prompt Pack

A free prompt pack for drafting faster, more useful Google review responses for small businesses without sounding canned.

Owners, admins, marketers, and operators handling reviews

GUIDE

A free prompt pack for drafting faster, more useful Google review responses for small businesses without sounding canned.

WHAT THIS ASSET COVERS

- Prompt templates for positive reviews, neutral reviews, and recovery situations
- Tone guidance to avoid sounding robotic
- Simple input fields so the prompt can be reused by any staff member

USE THIS WHEN

1. You want to respond to reviews faster without losing brand voice
2. Your team is inconsistent in how it handles public feedback
3. You want a low-friction way to test AI for operational tasks

WORKING ASSET

Use this pack when the business wants faster review replies without sounding robotic, defensive, or generic. These prompts are structured for modern AI models that perform best when the input context, constraints, and output format are explicit.

CORE VARIABLES

Fill these before running any prompt:

- `<business_context>`: trade, clinic, or firm type plus city or service area

- <service_event>: what the customer hired you for
- <review_summary>: one-sentence summary of what the reviewer said
- <customer_name>: first name if visible; otherwise leave blank
- <brand_tone>: calm, warm, premium, practical, fast-moving, clinical, etc.
- <next_step>: optional offline path for recovery situations
- <risk_flags>: legal, refund, safety, or compliance sensitivities to avoid improvising around

PROMPT ARCHITECTURE

For the strongest output, keep the prompt in this order:

1. Business context
2. Review details
3. Tone rules
4. Output rules
5. Final QA instruction

Use a structure like this:

You are drafting a public review reply for <business_context>.

Review details:

Customer name: <customer_name>

Review summary: <review_summary>

Service event: <service_event>

Tone rules:

Keep the voice <brand_tone>

Sound specific, not canned

Do not invent facts

Do not mention refunds, legal positions, or blame unless explicitly provided

Output rules:

60 to 90 words

Public-facing only

One clear closing sentence

Before finalizing, check that the reply sounds human, specific, and safe for a public Google review thread.

POSITIVE REVIEW

Write a public reply for a 5-star review using the context above.

Requirements:

Thank the reviewer naturally
Reference the service event specifically
If the name is present, use only the first name
Reinforce one thing the company is known for
Close with a light future-facing line without sounding salesy

NEUTRAL REVIEW

Write a public reply for a mixed or neutral review using the context above.

Requirements:
Acknowledge the customer experience without defensiveness
Recognize the positive portion first if one exists
Clarify care and accountability without overexplaining
Offer an offline next step if useful
Keep the tone steady and respectful

RECOVERY REVIEW

Write a public reply for a negative review using the context above.

Requirements:
Lead with calm accountability
Avoid argument, blame, sarcasm, or legal positioning
Do not repeat sensitive allegations in detail
Invite the customer into an offline next step using <next_step>
End with one sentence that shows seriousness and professionalism

CHANNEL GUIDANCE

- Google: keep it short, specific, and easy to scan
- Yelp: stay even more measured because reviewers often expect a calmer tone
- Healthcare or legal: avoid anything that confirms private customer details not already public
- Home services: reference the service moment and team responsiveness where true

QA CHECKLIST

Before posting, ask:

- Does the reply sound like the company rather than like AI?
- Is it specific enough to the actual service event?
- Did the model avoid inventing facts or overpromising?
- Would this reply still feel strong if a prospect read it before booking?

- If the review is negative, did the reply move the issue offline without sounding evasive?

FAILURE MODES

Watch for these common weak outputs:

- generic gratitude with no service-specific detail
- overly polished marketing language
- defensive replies that argue the facts in public
- fake empathy without a real next step
- overlong replies that read like a press release

SUGGESTED TEAM WORKFLOW

1. Draft with the prompt
2. Human review for facts and tone
3. Trim anything that sounds too polished
4. Publish within 24 to 72 hours
5. Save the strongest variants as future examples

DEPLOYMENT NOTES

HOW STRONG TEAMS ACTUALLY USE THIS ASSET

- Assign one accountable owner instead of letting "Review Response Prompt Pack" become shared but unmanaged work.
- Use it with owners, admins, marketers, and operators handling reviews in a weekly rhythm so the asset drives decisions rather than sitting in a folder.
- Decide in advance what counts as green, watch, and red performance so the team knows when to escalate.
- Capture learnings directly in the document every week so the asset becomes smarter over time instead of resetting to zero.

HOW TO GET STRONGER OUTPUTS FROM MODERN AI MODELS

- Start with a compact context packet: business type, customer situation, service offered, tone guardrails, and any facts the model must preserve.
- State the deliverable shape up front: channel, word count, required fields, and the exact output format you want back.

- Use variables and clear delimiters so the prompt can be reused safely by staff without rewriting the entire instruction every time.
- Include one strong example when tone and structure matter, then ask for a final answer only rather than hidden reasoning.
- Add a final self-check step for compliance, specificity, and whether the response actually sounds like a real operator wrote it.

BEST DEPLOYMENT SEQUENCE

- You want to respond to reviews faster without losing brand voice
- Your team is inconsistent in how it handles public feedback
- You want a low-friction way to test AI for operational tasks

WHAT SEPARATES A SERIOUS VERSION FROM A BASIC TEMPLATE

- Clear ownership for every step, not generic advice without accountability.
- Targets, thresholds, or decision rules that tell the team what good looks like.
- Specific working components: Prompt templates for positive reviews, neutral reviews, and recovery situations, Tone guidance to avoid sounding robotic, Simple input fields so the prompt can be reused by any staff member.
- A built-in review cadence so the document becomes part of operations rather than a one-time download.