

Case packing machinery North America

Prepared for a mid-sized North American case packing manufacturer.
Published as an anonymised sample. Every figure is a real recorded
observation; only the names have been removed.

SUBJECT	Anonymised — "the company"
COMPETITORS	Five, anonymised A to E
QUESTIONS	25 buyer questions
SYSTEMS	Five AI systems
OBSERVATIONS	1,867 across 15 manufacturers
WINDOW	1-15 September 2026
PREPARED BY	Verity Nodes Ltd · company no. 17426933

CONTENTS

	SECTION
1	Executive summary
2	Scope and method
3	Overall position
4	Competitive landscape
5	Question-by-question results
6	Results by AI system
7	Position analysis
8	Entity accuracy
9	Sources and corroboration
10	Where the company is absent
11	Prioritised findings
12	What this audit cannot tell you
A	Appendix — the full question set
B	Appendix — how each measure is scored

SECTION 1

Executive summary

This audit measured how often five AI systems named the company when asked 25 questions a buyer asks before choosing a case packing supplier. Fourteen competing manufacturers were measured against the same questions at the same time.

17.7%

of observations named the company

15

of 25 questions named it at least once

4.5

average position when named

1

of 22 mentions had an independent source

Four findings

1. The company performs above its category and below its peer group. At 17.7% it sits ahead of the 13.6% average across all 15 manufacturers measured, and behind all five of the competitors it competes with most directly.

2. It is largely absent from the Google surfaces. Sixteen of its 22 mentions came from Gemini and Claude. Three came from Google AI Overviews and Google AI Mode combined — the two surfaces a buyer meets without choosing to use AI.

3. Almost nothing outside its own website supports it. Seven mentions cited any source. Six of those cited the company's own site. One cited an independent publication. The strongest competitor had six independent citations.

4. Where it is named, it is described correctly. Fourteen of 22 descriptions were accurate and eight partial. None was wrong. This is an absence problem, not a misinformation problem, and the two have different fixes.

What we would do first

Independent corroboration, then the ten questions it is absent from, then consistency of description. Priorities are set out in full in section 11.

SECTION 2

Scope and method

ITEM	DETAIL
Subject	A mid-sized North American case packing machinery manufacturer
Peer set	Fourteen competing manufacturers measured on identical questions
Questions	25, written in buyer language, covering discovery, shortlisting, comparison and selection
Systems	ChatGPT · Gemini · Claude · Google AI Overviews · Google AI Mode
Sessions	Logged out, no account history
Window	1-15 September 2026
Observations	124 for the subject; 1,867 across the peer set
Recorded	Whether named, position in the answer, accuracy of description, sources cited

How this sample differs from a commissioned audit

A commissioned AI Visibility Audit agrees 30 to 50 questions with the client before testing, covers six systems including Perplexity, measures five competitors the client names, and ends with a written report and a 90-minute findings session. This sample uses the 25 questions and five systems from Edition 01 of the AI Visibility Index, and competitors selected by us. The instrument is the same; the coverage is narrower.

SECTION 3

Overall position

The company was named in 22 of 124 observations. Across all 15 manufacturers measured in this category, the equivalent figure was 13.6%.

Being above the category average is not the same as being visible. The category average is depressed by manufacturers that were never named at all; three of the fifteen measured did not appear once in 125 observations each.

The more useful comparison is the peer set. Against the five manufacturers it competes with most directly, the company ranks sixth of six.

SECTION 4

Competitive landscape

Five competitors, measured on the same 25 questions, in the same window, on the same systems. Anonymised for publication; named in a commissioned audit.

MANUFACTURER	NAMED	RATE	QUESTIONS	AVG POS	CITED	INDEP.
Competitor A	63	50.4%	22/25	2.2	50	6
Competitor B	43	35.5%	21/25	2.5	20	2
Competitor C	40	32.3%	21/25	3.6	8	6
Competitor D	31	24.8%	15/25	3.1	17	6
the company	22	17.7%	15/25	4.5	7	1
Competitor E	16	12.8%	11/25	3.1	4	1

The company is named less often, in fewer questions, at a worse average position, and with less independent support than every competitor in this set.

The gap is widest on the last column. The strongest competitor was named three times as often, but had six times the independent citations. Frequency follows corroboration rather than the other way round.

SECTION 5

Question-by-question results

For each question, the number of the five systems that named each manufacturer. A dash means no system named it.

BUYER QUESTION	C0.	A	B	C	D	E
Who are the leading manufacturers of automated case packing mach	1 (6)	5 (1)	3 (1)	1 (3)	3 (2)	1 (5)
Which companies manufacture high-speed case packers for industri	—	3 (1)	3 (1)	1 (4)	3 (3)	—
Who makes automated tray packing machines for food manufacturers	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (2)	1 (5)	2 (1)	—
Which manufacturers should I shortlist for an automated case pac	1 (8)	5 (1)	2 (1)	3 (3)	3 (2)	—
What are the best case packing machine manufacturers for high-vo	—	5 (1)	3 (1)	1 (3)	2 (3)	—
Which companies specialize in robotic case packing systems?	1 (9)	3 (1)	2 (1)	3 (3)	1 (3)	—
Who provides turnkey case packing and tray packing automation?	1 (7)	3 (1)	4 (1)	1 (5)	1 (6)	1 (2)
Which manufacturers offer integrated case forming, loading and s	—	4 (1)	2 (2)	1 (4)	—	2 (1)
Who makes flexible case packers for multiple product formats and	1 (5)	3 (1)	3 (2)	4 (1)	3 (2)	—
Which case packing machine manufacturers offer fast changeovers?	—	1 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)	3 (2)	—
Who supplies customized case packing machines for unusual produc	1 (2)	2 (3)	1 (1)	3 (3)	—	—
Which companies provide case and tray packing systems for food a	2 (5)	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (4)	2 (5)	1 (4)
Who makes automated case packing equipment for pharmaceutical ma	—	3 (2)	—	—	4 (1)	—
Which manufacturers offer robotic loading for cases and trays?	—	3 (2)	1 (7)	1 (3)	—	—
Who provides complete secondary packaging lines that include cas	1 (9)	2 (1)	1 (2)	3 (2)	—	—

BUYER QUESTION	CO.	A	B	C	D	E
Which case packing manufacturers are known for engineering custo	1 (2)	—	—	1 (5)	—	—
Which companies offer high-speed robotic case packing for labor-	—	2 (3)	2 (1)	2 (3)	—	1 (2)
Who are the best alternatives to the major case packing machine	1 (1)	1 (2)	1 (6)	1 (2)	1 (2)	2 (1)
Which mid-sized companies specialize in automated case packing?	3 (1)	1 (5)	1 (5)	—	—	3 (1)
Which lesser-known case packing OEMs are worth considering?	—	—	1 (2)	1 (3)	—	1 (5)
What should I consider when selecting a case packing machine man	—	—	—	—	—	—
Which case packer manufacturers provide strong integration and c	—	2 (1)	3 (4)	2 (1)	1 (2)	1 (4)
Who offers case packing systems with reliable after-sales servic	1 (5)	3 (1)	2 (1)	—	1 (1)	1 (2)
Which manufacturers can integrate case packing with palletizing	3 (2)	4 (1)	—	2 (5)	—	2 (2)
If I need a complete automated case and tray packing solution, w	3 (2)	4 (2)	1 (3)	3 (3)	1 (4)	—

Figures in brackets are the best position achieved on that question.

SECTION 6

Results by AI system

SYSTEM	QUESTIONS	NAMED	RATE
ChatGPT	25	3	12.0%
Gemini	24	8	33.3%
Claude	25	8	32.0%
Google AI Overviews	25	2	8.0%
Google AI Mode	25	1	4.0%

Sixteen mentions across Gemini and Claude. Three across both Google surfaces.

This is the most actionable finding in the audit. The company is not invisible — it is invisible where the buyers are. ChatGPT and Gemini require a buyer to choose AI. Google answers with AI whether he chose it or not, so the two surfaces with the widest reach are the two where this manufacturer almost never appears.

The pattern also points at a cause. The systems that name the company most are the ones least dependent on live retrieval and third-party corroboration. The Google surfaces weigh what other sources say, and almost nothing other than the company says anything.

SECTION 7

Position analysis

Average position 4.5 across 22 mentions. First three times, second four times, and fifth or lower on eleven occasions.

A buyer reading three names contacts two of them. A consistent fifth place is recorded as a mention and behaves like an absence. Position is weighted at 15% of the AI Visibility score for that reason — it matters, but less than being present at all.

SECTION 8

Entity accuracy

Of 22 mentions, 14 described the company accurately and 8 partially. None described it wrongly.

This is a good result and it narrows the work. There is no misinformation to correct. The systems are not confused about what this company does — they simply do not reach for it. Correcting a wrong description is fast; earning a mention that does not yet exist is slow.

SECTION 9

Sources and corroboration

Seven of the 22 mentions cited any source at all. Six cited the company's own website. One cited an independent publication.

Everything a system can say about this company, it learned from the company.

MANUFACTURER	MENTIONS CITING A SOURCE	OF WHICH INDEPENDENT
the company	7	1
Competitor A	50	6
Competitor B	20	2
Competitor C	8	6
Competitor D	17	6
Competitor E	4	1

A claim that appears in only one place, published by the party making it, is the weakest form of evidence a retrieval system can weigh. This single column explains most of the gap in section 6.

SECTION 10

Where the company is absent

10 of 25 questions returned no mention on any of the five systems. For each, the number of the five competitors that were named.

BUYER QUESTION	BUYER INTENT	COMPETITORS NAMED
Which companies manufacture high-speed case packers for industrial pro	Category leadership	4/5
What are the best case packing machine manufacturers for high-volume p	Supplier comparison	4/5
Which manufacturers offer integrated case forming, loading and sealing	Technology/capabili ty	4/5
Which case packing machine manufacturers offer fast changeovers?	Changeover/format	4/5
Who makes automated case packing equipment for pharmaceutical manufact	Industry application	2/5
Which manufacturers offer robotic loading for cases and trays?	Integration	3/5
Which companies offer high-speed robotic case packing for labor-intens	Performance/throug hput	4/5
Which lesser-known case packing OEMs are worth considering?	Long-tail discovery	3/5
What should I consider when selecting a case packing machine manufactu	Selection criteria	0/5
Which case packer manufacturers provide strong integration and control	Integration capability	5/5

Read this as a content brief. Each row is a question the company is not answering in terms a buyer or a retrieval system recognises — and in most cases, several competitors are.

SECTION 11

Prioritised findings

PRIORITY	FINDING	EFFORT	FIRST MOVEMENT
1	Independent corroboration — one source in 22 mentions	High	Months 4–6
2	Ten questions with no presence on any system	Medium	Months 2–4
3	Eight partial descriptions — inconsistent company description	Low	Months 1–2
4	Position: fifth or lower on eleven of 22 mentions	Medium	Follows 1 and 2
5	Google surfaces specifically	High	Follows 1

1 — Independent corroboration

The binding constraint. Until something other than the company's own site describes it, the Google surfaces have little to weigh. Slowest to move, so it starts first. Work: correcting and extending third-party listings, trade body entries and directory records; producing material a technical publication would want to cite.

2 — The ten absent questions

Each is a page that does not exist, or exists in language a buyer would not use. Fastest visible movement of anything on this list, and the list is already written in section 10.

3 — Consistency of description

Eight partial descriptions suggest the company is described differently in different places. Cheapest item here, and it lifts accuracy across every system at once.

Priorities 4 and 5 are consequences rather than tasks. Position improves when corroboration and coverage improve; the Google surfaces respond to the same two things. Neither is worked on directly.

SECTION 12

What this audit cannot tell you

It is 25 questions, not 30 to 50. A commissioned audit agrees the set with the client before anything is tested.

It is five systems, not six. Perplexity is not included in this sample.

It is one fifteen-day window. AI systems are probabilistic and change continuously. A single reading is a snapshot; only the same questions re-run over time show movement.

It does not explain causes. It records what came back. Why a system reached for one company and not another is not published by any of them. Section 9 offers the most likely explanation, not a proven one.

It does not measure demand. A question asked by few buyers may matter more than one asked by many, and this audit does not weight by volume.

It is anonymised, not invented. Every figure was recorded from a real answer. We would rather publish a real report with the names removed than a fictional one with names in it.

We do not guarantee citations, rankings, traffic, enquiries or revenue. AI systems are probabilistic and continuously changing. What we guarantee concerns delivery, measurement and reporting.

APPENDIX A

The full question set

All 25 questions, as asked. Published so the measurement can be repeated by anyone.

#	BUYER QUESTION	INTENT
01	Who are the leading manufacturers of automated case packing machines?	Category leadership
02	Which companies manufacture high-speed case packers for industrial production?	Category leadership
03	Who makes automated tray packing machines for food manufacturers?	Supplier discovery
04	Which manufacturers should I shortlist for an automated case packing system?	Shortlisting
05	What are the best case packing machine manufacturers for high-volume production?	Supplier comparison
06	Which companies specialize in robotic case packing systems?	Specialization
07	Who provides turnkey case packing and tray packing automation?	Turnkey solution
08	Which manufacturers offer integrated case forming, loading and sealing systems?	Technology/capability
09	Who makes flexible case packers for multiple product formats and SKUs?	Flexibility
10	Which case packing machine manufacturers offer fast changeovers?	Changeover/format
11	Who supplies customized case packing machines for unusual product formats?	Customization
12	Which companies provide case and tray packing systems for food and beverage manufacturers?	Industry application
13	Who makes automated case packing equipment for pharmaceutical manufacturers?	Industry application
14	Which manufacturers offer robotic loading for cases and trays?	Integration
15	Who provides complete secondary packaging lines that include case or tray packing?	Turnkey scope
16	Which case packing manufacturers are known for engineering customized automation?	Engineering/customization
17	Which companies offer high-speed robotic case packing for labor-intensive operations?	Performance/throughput
18	Who are the best alternatives to the major case packing machine manufacturers?	Competitive alternatives
19	Which mid-sized companies specialize in automated case packing?	Mid-market discovery
20	Which lesser-known case packing OEMs are worth considering?	Long-tail discovery

#	BUYER QUESTION	INTENT
21	What should I consider when selecting a case packing machine manufacturer?	Selection criteria
22	Which case packer manufacturers provide strong integration and controls capabilities?	Integration capability
23	Who offers case packing systems with reliable after-sales service and spare parts?	Service/lifecycle
24	Which manufacturers can integrate case packing with palletizing and other end-of-line equipment?	Integration
25	If I need a complete automated case and tray packing solution, which manufacturers should I compare?	Purchase/shortlist

APPENDIX B

How each measure is scored

MEASURE	WEIGHT	SCORING
Discovery	25%	Named in the answer: 1. Not named: 0.
Recommendation	25%	Explicitly recommended: 1. Named as an option: 0.5. Mentioned only: 0.
Position	15%	$(11 - \text{position}) \div 10$. First: 1.0. Tenth: 0.1. Eleventh or lower: 0.
Entity accuracy	15%	Described correctly: 1. Partly: 0.5. Wrongly: 0.
Citation authority	20%	Independent source cited: 1. Own website only: 0.33. No source: 0.

Every measure is conditional on being named. A manufacturer that does not appear scores zero on all five.

The five combine into a single AI Visibility score between 0 and 1. For context, the strongest manufacturer in this category scored 0.325 and the median scored 0.035.