GOOGLE DEEP REVIEW · HAM ÇIKTI / RAW OUTPUT

Türkçe belge koşusunun raporu

Report on the Turkish document run · Kasım / November 2026 · ocekdigital.com

Okumadan önce

Bu, Google Deep Review'ın bilerek 10 hata koyduğumuz hayali bir pastane yazısı için verdiği raporun ham hâlidir. Metne dokunmadık, yalnızca formülleri okunur biçimde gösterdik. Rapordaki rakamlar o hayali yazıdan geliyor; rehber olarak kullanmayın.

Raporun gösterdiği kaynakları tek tek açıp kontrol etmedik. Künyesi şüpheli olanlar (uydurma ya da yanlış yazılmış olabilir):

- "Gartner Research / IAB, 2025": iki ayrı kuruluş tek künyede
- "Main Street Meets Machine Learning", Bowen, 2025: tanımadığımız bir başlık
- "2023/2026", "2024/2025" gibi çift yıllı tarihler (Otis vd., Dell'Acqua vd., Hui vd., OECD)
- KVKK rehberinin "Yayın No. 113" numarası: rehber var gibi görünüyor, numarayı kontrol etmedik

Before you read

This is the unedited report Google Deep Review produced for a made-up bakery article in which we planted 10 errors on purpose. We did not change the text; only the formulas are rendered for readability. The numbers come from that made-up article; do not use it as a guide.

We did not open and check the sources the report cites. Suspicious references (possibly made up or mis-cited): "Gartner Research / IAB, 2025"; "Main Street Meets Machine Learning", Bowen, 2025; double years such as "2023/2026" and "2024/2025"; the "Publication No. 113" of the KVKK guideline.

HIGH LEVEL SUMMARY

Summary

This practitioner-oriented blog guide examines how micro-enterprises can leverage generative AI tools to reduce time spent on repetitive administrative tasks and convert those saved hours into financial returns. Using a three-person neighborhood bakery operating six days a week as a case study, the document outlines before-and-after time measurements across four routine workflows (customer messaging, Instagram captioning, custom order summaries, and supplier emails), translates the saved hours into monetary value, and provides a four-step onboarding framework alongside a multi-week trial schedule.

Strengths

- The guide translates generative AI adoption and time-motion tracking into an accessible, practical format tailored specifically to micro-enterprises and non-technical small business owners.
- The economic framing on Page 2 thoughtfully emphasizes that time saved through automation does not automatically become revenue unless the owner actively reallocates those freed hours into income-generating production, such as launching a corporate order line.
- The step-by-step onboarding structure encourages disciplined operational habits, specifically advising business owners to establish baseline time measurements before adopting new tools and to organize internal business facts (such as price lists and operating hours) into a centralized reference document.

Weaknesses

- The document contains unresolved internal contradictions regarding both cost and human oversight: Page 1 promises that everything in the guide can be accomplished using free versions ("*ücretsiz sürümlerle yapılabilir*"), whereas Pages 2 and 3 state that the core workflows require a paid 1,200 TL/month subscription; similarly, Step 4 warns never to send an AI-generated reply without reading it first, whereas the "Common Mistakes" section on Page 3 instructs users to put FAQ replies on automatic sending without checking them each time (Reference Paper: Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality, Dell'Acqua et al., 2023/2026).
- The quantitative analysis suffers from compounding arithmetic and scheduling errors: the weekly time-savings table sums $120 + 150 + 90 + 60$ minutes to 540 minutes (9 hours) instead of the correct 420 minutes (7 hours), the annual projection multiplies $10{,}800\ \text{TL} \times 12$ to get $108{,}000\ \text{TL}$ instead of $129{,}600\ \text{TL}$, the cost-to-benefit ratio reports $1{,}200\ \text{TL}$ as 25% ($1/4$) of $10{,}800\ \text{TL}$ rather than 11.1% ($1/9$), and the rollout schedule mismatches a 5-week table, a 6-week text description, and an 8-week calendar window (January 4 to February 26, 2027).
- In Step 3, advising small businesses to upload identifiable customer lists—including names, phone numbers, and past orders—into consumer-tier generative AI tools to send personalized promotional messages introduces severe legal and platform compliance risks regarding cross-border personal data transfers and prior commercial opt-in consent (Reference Paper: Üretken Yapay Zekâ ve Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Rehberi (15 Soruda), T.C. Kişisel Verileri Koruma Kurumu (KVKK), 2025; AI, Data Governance and Privacy: Synergies and Areas of International Co-operation, OECD, 2024).
- The evaluation of customer messaging efficiency attributes a 20-minute daily savings on answering the 10 most frequent static questions (prices, delivery hours, gluten-free options, address) to a paid 1,200 TL/month AI subscription by comparing it only against typing every response from scratch, overlooking zero-cost, deterministic native baselines such as WhatsApp Business Quick Replies (*Hızlı Yanıtlar*) and Meta Business Suite Saved Replies (*Kaydedilen Yanıtlar*) that automate static FAQs without subscription fees or hallucination risks (Reference Paper: Generative AI at Work, Brynjolfsson et al., 2023/2025; Generative AI and the SME Workforce: New Survey Evidence, OECD, 2024/2025).
- The guide presents broad empirical assertions—specifically that small businesses using AI see a 35% first-year revenue increase and that AI-written customer replies generate more sales than human-written ones—without citations, whereas empirical field studies show that while task-level writing speed increases substantially, firm-level revenue impacts are highly heterogeneous and often modest or null on average (Reference Paper: Experimental Evidence on the Productivity Effects of Generative Artificial Intelligence, Noy & Zhang, 2023; The Uneven Impact of Generative AI on Entrepreneurial Performance, Otis et al., 2023/2026; Main Street Meets Machine Learning: Inside the AI Productivity Boom at Small Businesses, Bowen, 2025; Generative AI and Firm-Level Productivity: Large-Scale Field Experimental Evidence from an Online Retail Platform, Hui et al., 2024/2025).

Potential Issues And Suggestions

[Giriş, Temel Vaatler ve Örnek İşletme Zaman Kazancı Analizi (Introduction, Core Promises & Case Study Time-Savings Analysis)] (Pages: 1-2)

Potential Mistakes and Improvements

1. **Arithmetic Error in the Weekly Time-Savings Table (`Toplam` Row, Page 1):**

- **Definitive Flaw:** In the time-savings table under *Örnek işletme: Mahalle pastanesi* (Page 1), the bakery is explicitly stated to operate 6 days per week ("*haftada 6 gün açık olan*", "*haftada 6 iş gününde*"). Each individual task row accurately computes daily savings (`Önce − Sonra`) and multiplies by 6 operating days to derive weekly savings (`Kazanç (dk/hafta)`):
  - *Müşteri mesajlarına cevap:* $60 - 40 = 20\ \text{dk/gün} \times 6\ \text{gün} = 120\ \text{dk/hafta}$
  - *Instagram gönderisi ve açıklaması:* $45 - 20 = 25\ \text{dk/gün} \times 6\ \text{gün} = 150\ \text{dk/hafta}$
  - *Özel sipariş için fiyat ve özet:* $30 - 15 = 15\ \text{dk/gün} \times 6\ \text{gün} = 90\ \text{dk/hafta}$
  - *Tedarikçi e-postaları:* $20 - 10 = 10\ \text{dk/gün} \times 6\ \text{gün} = 60\ \text{dk/hafta}$

  While the `Toplam` (Total) row accurately sums the first three numeric columns ($155\ \text{dk/gün}$ before, $85\ \text{dk/gün}$ after, and $70\ \text{dk/gün}$ saved), it reports the weekly total (`Kazanç (dk/hafta)`) as **`540 (9 saat)`**. However, both the vertical sum of the weekly column and the horizontal product of total daily savings over a 6-day workweek equal **`420` minutes (`7 saat`)**:

  $$120 + 150 + 90 + 60 = 420\ \text{dk} \quad (\text{or } 70\ \text{dk/gün} \times 6\ \text{gün} = 420\ \text{dk} = 7\ \text{saat})$$

  Because the financial return projections on Page 2 ("*Haftada 9 saat × 300 TL = haftada 2.700 TL*") directly propagate this 9-hour figure, this 120-minute (2-hour) weekly discrepancy inflates all subsequent weekly, monthly, and annual monetary projections by 28.6%.
- **Suggested Improvement:** Either update the `Toplam` cell under `Kazanç (dk/hafta)` from `540 (9 saat)` to `420 (7 saat)` (and adjust the downstream financial figures accordingly), or adjust the individual task rows so that the daily savings sum to $90\ \text{dk/gün}$ ($540\ \text{dk/hafta}$ across 6 operating days).

2. **Internal Contradiction Between the Free-Tier Promise and the Case Study's Paid Subscription Requirement (Pages 1–3):**
   - **Definitive Flaw:** In the third paragraph of the introduction on Page 1, the text explicitly promises readers that everything in the guide can be accomplished using free versions without purchasing software:

     > "*İyi haber şu: Bu rehberdeki her şey ücretsiz sürümlerle yapılabilir. Pahalı bir yazılım satın almanız ya da bir yazılımcıyla çalışmanız gerekmiyor.*"

     This statement is directly contradicted later in the document when evaluating the primary case study and workflow steps:
     - On Page 2 (*Saatler paraya dönünce*), the text states that Ayşe Hanım pays a monthly subscription fee ("*Ayşe Hanım'ın kullandığı yapay zeka aboneliği aylık 1.200 TL*"), and Step 3 advises uploading reference documents and customer lists.
     - On Page 3 (*Ne kadar tutar?*), the text explicitly notes that the core workflows described in the guide cannot be executed on the free tier: "*Ayşe Hanım'ın kullandığı düzen için aylık 1.200 TL'lik bir abonelik gerekiyor; mesaj önerileri ve uzun belgelerle çalışma özellikleri ücretsiz sürümde yok.*" Furthermore, pasting or uploading a short reference document containing 10 FAQs, prices, and working hours to generate message drafts is supported on standard free tiers, whereas higher usage limits or uploading larger customer/order lists might require a paid plan.
   - **Suggested Improvement:** Revise the introductory statement on Page 1 and the cost discussions on Pages 2 and 3 to maintain cross-document consistency—for instance, by clarifying which specific steps work on free tiers (e.g., basic experimentation, simple drafting, or manually pasting short text snippets directly into prompts) versus when the standard monthly subscription (~1,200

TL/month) becomes necessary for full workflow integration, while still avoiding the need for expensive custom enterprise software or hiring a developer.

3. **Missing Baseline Comparison Against Free Native Messaging Features (Page 1):**
    - **Potential Concern:** At the bottom of Page 1, the case study attributes the 20-minute daily time savings on WhatsApp customer messages ("*Müşteri mesajlarına cevap*") entirely to a generative AI tool by comparing it against typing every response manually from scratch ("*Ayşe Hanım artık her mesaja sıfırdan cevap yazmıyor. En sık gelen 10 soruyu (fiyatlar, teslim saatleri, glutensiz seçenekler, adres) ve kendi cevaplarını bir kez yazdı. Yapay zeka yeni gelen mesaja bu cevaplardan uygun olanı önerip kibar bir dille düzenliyor*"). In practice, standard zero-cost features already built into the messaging platforms mentioned in the text—specifically **WhatsApp Business** (*Hızlı Yanıtlar* / *Quick Replies*, automated greeting/away messages, and product catalogs) and **Instagram / Meta Business Suite** (*Kaydedilen Yanıtlar* / *Saved Replies*)—allow small business owners to store and insert pre-written polite templates for their 10 most frequent static questions with a single shortcut, at zero subscription cost and without the risk of an AI model hallucinating incorrect prices or delivery hours (a risk later noted on Page 2, Step 4).
    - **Suggested Improvement:** Clarify where generative AI provides marginal value beyond free built-in quick-reply templates in WhatsApp Business and Instagram (such as handling multi-part questions, adapting tone to variable inquiries, or parsing unstructured custom cake order details), or note that static FAQ templates can be handled natively while reserving generative AI for complex or multi-part messages.
4. **Unreferenced Empirical Claim Regarding 35% First-Year Revenue Growth (Page 1):**
    - **Potential Concern:** In the second paragraph of Page 1, the text states:

        > "*Araştırmalar, yapay zeka kullanan küçük işletmelerin cirosunun ilk yılda %35 arttığını gösteriyor.*"

        Presenting an exact, causal-sounding 35% first-year revenue increase under a generic attribution ("*Araştırmalar*") without citing a specific study, survey methodology, or sample context is a potential concern for factual credibility. Empirical research and surveys on small-business generative AI adoption generally indicate that while routine time savings are common, revenue effects vary widely depending on baseline business capabilities, selection effects, and whether saved time is redeployed into new income-generating activities (a point the document itself highlights on Page 2: "*Kazanılan saat, kendiliğinden para olmuyor*").
    - **Suggested Improvement:** Provide the specific source citation for the 35% statistic, or qualify the phrasing to reflect verifiable survey findings and emphasize that revenue gains depend on reinvesting saved hours into revenue-generating activities.

Minor Corrections and Typos

1. **Overstated Reading Time Metadata (Page 1, Header):** The metadata header under the title states "*Okuma süresi: 8 dakika*" (Reading time: 8 minutes). However, the entire three-page document contains approximately 750–800 words in total (including tables). At a standard adult reading speed in Turkish of roughly 180–220 words per minute, the actual reading time is approximately **3 to 4 minutes**, making the stated 8-minute duration roughly double the realistic reading time. Updating the header to "*Okuma süresi: 3–4 dakika*" (or "*4 dakika*") would accurately reflect the document's length.

[Finansal Dönüşüm, Maliyet Analizi ve 4 Adımlı Başlangıç Rehberi (Financial Valuation, Cost-Benefit Analysis & 4-Step Guide)] (Pages: 2)

Potential Mistakes and Improvements

- **Definitive Arithmetic Errors in the Financial Valuation Block ("Saatler paraya dönünce"):** The financial conversion box on Page 2 calculates the weekly, monthly, and annual monetary value of saved time as follows:

  > "*Haftada 9 saat × 300 TL = haftada 2.700 TL*
  > *Ayda (4 hafta) 2.700 × 4 = 10.800 TL*
  > *Yılda 10.800 × 12 = 108.000 TL*"

  There are two definitive mathematical errors and one calendar modeling concern in this derivation:

  1. **Internal Multiplication Error on the Annual Line (Definitive Flaw):** Even taking the stated monthly figure of $10.800\ \text{TL}$ as given, multiplying by 12 months yields $10.800 \times 12 = \mathbf{129.600}\ \text{TL}$, whereas the text reports $108.000\ \text{TL}$ (which is 10.800×10).
  2. **Cascading Addition Error from Page 1's Weekly Time Total (Definitive Flaw):** Carrying the erroneous 9-hour weekly figure from Page 1's table (where the individual weekly task savings actually sum to $420\ \text{minutes} = \mathbf{7}\ \text{hours/week}$ across the 6-day workweek) into Page 2 inflates all monetary valuations by $28{,}6\%$. Using the actual $7\ \text{hours/week}$ saved at $300\ \text{TL/hour}$:
     - **Weekly valuation:** $7\ \text{saat} \times 300\ \text{TL} = \mathbf{2.100}\ \text{TL}$ (stated as $2.700\ \text{TL}$, an overstatement of $600\ \text{TL/week}$).
     - **Monthly valuation (4 weeks):** $2.100\ \text{TL} \times 4 = \mathbf{8.400}\ \text{TL}$ (stated as $10.800\ \text{TL}$, an overstatement of $2.400\ \text{TL/month}$).
     - **Annual valuation (12 four-week months):** $8.400\ \text{TL} \times 12 = \mathbf{100.800}\ \text{TL}$ (stated as $108.000\ \text{TL}$, an overstatement of $7.200\ \text{TL/year}$).
  3. **Calendar Periodicity Assumption — 48 Weeks vs. 52 Weeks (Potential Concern):** Defining a month as 4 weeks and multiplying that 4-week total by 12 months implicitly models a year as $4 \times 12 = 48\ \text{weeks}$, omitting 4 weeks of operation per year. Across a standard 52-week calendar year, the corrected $7\ \text{hours/week}$ at $300\ \text{TL/hour}$ yields $52 \times 2.100\ \text{TL} = \mathbf{109.200}\ \text{TL/year}$ (whereas $9\ \text{hours/week}$ would yield $52 \times 2.700\ \text{TL} = \mathbf{140.400}\ \text{TL/year}$). If a 48-week operational year is intentional (e.g., to account for 4 weeks of annual closure or holidays), stating this assumption explicitly would improve clarity.

- **Definitive Error in the Cost-to-Benefit Ratio and Percentage Calculation ("Saatler paraya dönünce"):** In the paragraph immediately following the financial calculation box, the text states that a monthly AI subscription fee of $1.200\ \text{TL}$ corresponds to approximately 25% of the monthly financial gain, concluding that $1\ \text{TL}$ out of every $4\ \text{TL}$ earned goes toward the tool:

  > "*Ayşe Hanım'ın kullandığı yapay zeka aboneliği aylık 1.200 TL. Bu tutar, aylık kazancın yaklaşık %25'ine denk geliyor. Yani her 4 liralık kazancın 1 lirası araca gidiyor ve geri kalanı işletmede kalıyor.*"

  This is mathematically incorrect against both the stated monthly figure and the corrected baseline:

  - Dividing the $1.200\ \text{TL}$ monthly cost by the stated $10.800\ \text{TL}$ monthly gain yields:

$$\frac{1.200\ \text{TL}}{10.800\ \text{TL}} = \frac{1}{9} \approx \mathbf{11{,}11\%}$$

This corresponds to $1\ \mathrm{TL}$ **out of every** $9\ \mathrm{TL}$ (leaving $8\ \mathrm{TL}$ in the business), not 25% ($1\ \mathrm{TL}$ out of $4\ \mathrm{TL}$). For a $1.200\ \mathrm{TL}$ cost to represent 25% of monthly gains, the monthly savings would have to be $4.800\ \mathrm{TL}$ (or the monthly subscription cost would have to be $2.700\ \mathrm{TL}$, equal to one week's stated savings).

- Even when calculated against the corrected 4-week monthly gain of $8.400\ \mathrm{TL}$ ($7\ \mathrm{hours/week}$), the cost share is $\frac{1.200\ \mathrm{TL}}{8.400\ \mathrm{TL}} = \frac{1}{7} \approx \mathbf{14{,}29\%}$ ($1\ \mathrm{TL}$ **out of every** $7\ \mathrm{TL}$). Both the percentage and the fractional ratio in this paragraph should be recalculated and corrected.

- **Definitive Internal Contradiction and Technical Feasibility Concern Regarding Mandatory Human Review vs. Automated Sending ("Nereden başlamalı: 4 adım", Step 4 vs. Page 3 "Sık yapılan hatalar" & "Ne kadar tutar?"):** Step 4 ("*Göndermeden önce okuyun*") establishes an unconditional human-in-the-loop quality-control rule:

  > "*4. Göndermeden önce okuyun. Yapay zekanın yazdığı bir cevabı asla okumadan müşteriye göndermeyin. Yanlış bir fiyat ya da yanlış bir teslim saati, kazandığınız bütün zamandan daha pahalıya patlar.*"

  However, on Page 3 under "*Sık yapılan hatalar*", the third bullet ("*Her cevabı tek tek kontrol etmek*") labels reviewing every response as a common mistake and instructs the reader to put frequently asked questions on automatic send without checking them:

  > "*Her cevabı tek tek kontrol etmek. Sık sorulan sorular için cevapları otomatik gönderime alın; bunları her seferinde kontrol etmenize gerek yok. Zamanınızı özel siparişlere ayırın.*"

  This raises both a direct internal contradiction and a technical feasibility concern:

  1. **Direct Contradiction:** Because the 10 frequent questions defined on Page 1 explicitly include prices and delivery hours ("*fiyatlar, teslim saatleri, glutensiz seçenekler, adres*")—the exact items Step 4 warns could cause costly errors if sent unverified—and Page 1 states that the AI merely suggests and formats replies for Ayşe Hanım ("*Yapay zeka yeni gelen mesaja bu cevaplardan uygun olanı önerip kibar bir dille düzenliyor*"), advising readers on Page 3 not to check FAQ replies directly contradicts Step 4.
  2. **Technical Feasibility Without Integration Software or Native Templates:** Under "*Ne kadar tutar?*" on Page 3, the guide states that no additional setup or software fee is required beyond the $1.200\ \mathrm{TL/month}$ AI subscription ("*Bunun dışında bir kurulum ya da yazılım ücreti yok*"). However, a standalone conversational AI subscription only generates draft suggestions within a chat interface and cannot natively intercept incoming WhatsApp or Instagram messages to dispatch automated replies without third-party API/webhook middleware or chatbot software integration. Conversely, if "*otomatik gönderim*" for standard FAQs is intended to refer to built-in, rule-based platform features (such as WhatsApp Business *Hızlı Yanıtlar* / Automated Messages or Instagram / Meta Business Suite *Kaydedilen Yanıtlar*), those deterministic features operate via static templates for free and do not hallucinate once verified. Explicitly distinguishing between deterministic native auto-replies/templates for static FAQs and dynamically generated LLM drafts for custom inquiries (which always require human verification) would resolve both the contradiction with Step 4 and the technical feasibility gap.

- **Potential Concern — Data Privacy (KVKK / GDPR) and Commercial Electronic Message (ETK / İYS) Compliance Risks ("Nereden başlamalı: 4 adım", Step 3):** Step 3 ("*Kendi bilgilerinizi verin*") instructs small business owners to upload their customer lists—explicitly including customer names, phone numbers, and past order histories—directly into the AI tool to generate personalized promotional campaign messages:

> "*Daha kişisel mesajlar için müşteri listenizi (ad, telefon numarası ve son siparişleri) yükleyip her müşteriye özel kampanya mesajı yazdırabilirsiniz.*"

Following this recommendation without safeguards exposes small businesses operating in Türkiye to two substantive legal and regulatory compliance risks:

1. **Personal Data Protection Law (6698 Sayılı KVKK / GDPR):** Customer names, phone numbers, and purchasing histories constitute personally identifiable data (*kişisel veri*). Uploading raw customer lists to third-party, foreign-hosted consumer LLM platforms constitutes both processing and cross-border transfer of personal data (*yurt dışına veri aktarımı* under KVKK Article 9). Doing so without fulfilling mandatory disclosure obligations (*aydınlatma yükümlülüğü*), obtaining explicit customer consent (*açık rıza*), and ensuring statutory transfer safeguards violates KVKK regulations. Step 3 should advise business owners **never to upload identifiable customer personal data (names and phone numbers)** into general consumer AI tools, recommending instead that they generate reusable message templates using anonymized order categories or placeholders (e.g., `[Müşteri Adı]`, `[Son Sipariş]`) that are filled in locally.
2. **Electronic Commerce Regulations (6563 Sayılı ETK & İYS):** Sending personalized promotional campaign messages ("*özel kampanya mesajı*") to customers' phone numbers requires prior opt-in commercial electronic message consent (*ticari elektronik ileti onayı*) registered through the Message Management System (*İleti Yönetim Sistemi — İYS*). Adding a brief caveat reminding readers to send promotional messages only to customers with valid opt-in consent would protect small businesses from regulatory penalties.

- **Potential Concern — Unsubstantiated Empirical Claim on Sales Conversion ("Nereden başlamalı: 4 adım"):** Immediately following Step 4, the text asserts as an unqualified general fact:

  > "*Müşteriler bu değişikliği genellikle fark etmiyor; fark ettiklerinde de olumlu karşılıyor. Yapay zekanın yazdığı müşteri cevapları, insanların yazdıklarından daha çok satış getiriyor.*"

  No citation, empirical study, or data from the bakery case study is provided to substantiate the claim that AI-written customer replies generate more sales than human-written ones, or that customers uniformly react positively when they notice AI-generated responses (indeed, earlier on Page 2, the bakery's actual revenue gain is attributed to reallocating saved hours into a new corporate cake line, not to higher chat conversion rates). Unless backed by a specific empirical source, this statement should be moderated (for example, noting that faster, polite responses can help prevent lost orders caused by delayed replies when an owner is busy).

Minor Corrections and Typos

- **Currency Unit Consistency in the Financial Calculation Box ("Saatler paraya dönünce"):** In the second and third lines of the calculation box (`Ayda (4 hafta) 2.700 × 4 = 10.800 TL` and `Yılda 10.800 × 12 = 108.000 TL`), the currency unit (TL) is omitted on the multiplicands (`2.700` and `10.800`), whereas it is included on the first line (`Haftada 9 saat × 300 TL = haftada 2.700 TL`). Standardizing the unit notation across all three lines improves readability.

[Deneme Planı, Maliyet Özeti, Sık Yapılan Hatalar ve Sonuç (Trial Plan Schedule, Cost Summary, Common Pitfalls & Conclusion)] (Pages: 2-3)

Potential Mistakes and Improvements

1. **Inconsistent Trial Duration, Missing Baseline Measurement Week, and Calendar Date Mismatch (`Deneme planı`, `Sık yapılan hatalar`, and `Sonuç`):** There are several discrepancies across the

rollout table, the accompanying text, the calendar example, and the conclusion regarding how long the trial lasts and when baseline measurement occurs:

- **5-Week Table vs. 6-Week Narrative:** The rollout table on Page 3 defines a **5-week** schedule (`1–2. hafta`, `3–4. hafta`, and `5. hafta`), and the `Sonuç` section likewise refers to filling out the comparison table at the end of the **fifth week** ("*beşinci haftanın sonunda kendi tablonuzu doldurun*"). However, the sentence immediately beneath the table refers to the plan as a **6-week** trial ("*Toplam 6 haftalık bu deneme için yılbaşı sonrası iyi bir zaman*").
- **Omission of the Baseline Measurement Week from the Schedule Table:** Step 1 on Page 2 ("*1. Bir hafta süre tutun*"), the first bullet under `Sık yapılan hatalar` ("*Ölçmeden başlamak. İlk haftanın süresini tutmayan işletme, bir ay sonra 'işe yaradı mı' sorusuna cevap veremiyor*"), and the `Sonuç` section ("*Bir hafta süre tutarak başlayın*") all require spending the first week tracking pre-AI baseline durations before modifying any workflows. However, the `Deneme planı` table starts `1–2. hafta` directly with AI implementation for customer messages ("*Müşteri mesajları: sık sorulan sorular belgesi, cevap önerileri*"), omitting a dedicated baseline measurement week. Explicitly adding the baseline week as Week 1 in the table (and shifting the subsequent phases accordingly to total 6 weeks, while updating the fifth-week reference in `Sonuç`) is a potential way to resolve both the missing baseline phase and the 5-week vs. 6-week discrepancy.
- **8-Week Calendar Span:** The concrete dates proposed below the table—starting Monday, January 4, 2027 ("*4 Ocak 2027 Pazartesi*") and ending Friday, February 26, 2027 ("*26 Şubat 2027 Cuma*")—actually span **8 full weeks** (54 calendar days inclusive), matching neither the 5-week table nor the stated 6-week duration. Starting on Monday, January 4, 2027, a 5-week trial would conclude on Friday, February 5, 2027, whereas a 6-week trial would conclude on Friday, February 12, 2027.

2. **Inconsistent Task Coverage and Rollout Scope Across the Case Study Table, Rollout Schedule, and Conclusion (`Deneme planı` and `Sonuç`):** There are two potential concerns regarding how the workflows from the case study are scoped and scheduled across the document:
   - **Omitted Fourth Workflow in the Rollout Table:** The benchmark table on Page 1 evaluates four distinct workflows: (1) *Müşteri mesajlarına cevap*, (2) *Instagram gönderisi ve açıklaması*, (3) *Özel sipariş için fiyat ve özet*, and (4) *Tedarikçi e-postaları*. In the `Deneme planı` table on Page 3, Week 5 instructs the reader to refill the exact same table to compare before-and-after figures ("*Ölçüm: aynı tabloyu yeniden doldurun, önce ve sonra karşılaştırın*"). However, Weeks 1–4 of the rollout schedule assign only three of those four workflows, omitting **custom order pricing and summary (*Özel sipariş için fiyat ve özet*)**—even though the third bullet of `Sık yapılan hatalar` subsequently instructs the reader to dedicate saved time to custom orders ("*Zamanınızı özel siparişlere ayırın*").
   - **Multi-Task Rollout vs. Single-Task Advice in the Conclusion:** While the `Deneme planı` table schedules three different workflows across Weeks 1–4 (and groups Instagram posts and supplier emails into the same 2-week block despite the warning under `Sık yapılan hatalar` against changing multiple tasks simultaneously), the `Sonuç` section instructs the reader to change only **a single task** before measuring results at the end of Week 5 ("*Bir hafta süre tutarak başlayın, tek bir işi değiştirin ve beşinci haftanın sonunda kendi tablonuzu doldurun*"). Aligning the task scope across the Page 1 benchmark table, the `Deneme planı` schedule, and the `Sonuç` section would make the execution plan consistent.

Minor Corrections and Typos

None.