THE QUIET PROTOCOL
AI SYSTEMS & AUTOMATION

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 new review lands while the phone is ringing. You want to reply properly, but you do not have twenty minutes to find the right words. Use these prompts to draft a short response, then have a person check it before publishing.

Start with the shared prompt, add the relevant situation, and replace the bracketed inputs. The examples show wording, not customer results. For a clinic or law firm, start with the privacy-sensitive version even when the review is positive.

CORE VARIABLES

Give the model only what it needs to write the public reply. Use your approved AI workspace. Leave patient records, legal files, account details, addresses and private messages out of the prompt.

- <business_context>: business type and public business name.
- <review_summary>: a brief, non-identifying summary of the feedback. Summarize a sensitive review instead of pasting its details.
- <approved_public_detail>: one detail that may safely appear in the response. Leave this blank for sensitive work unless the responsible professional approves it.
- <brand_tone>: plain, warm, practical or another voice your team actually uses.
- <next_step>: a verified business contact or support route. Leave blank if no route has been approved.
- <risk_flags>: privacy, disputed facts, safety, threats, discrimination, legal action or another reason for a person to take over.

The model should not fill missing inputs with guesses. A missing fact is a reason to simplify the reply or hold it for review.

PROMPT ARCHITECTURE

Use this shared prompt first. It defines the job, the allowed facts and the approval boundary.

```
Draft a public review reply for <business_context>.
Feedback summary: <review_summary>
Approved public detail: <approved_public_detail>
Voice: <brand_tone>
Approved contact route: <next_step>
Risk flags: <risk_flags>

Use only the supplied facts. Do not invent a visit, purchase,
conversation, refund, repair, result or promise.
Keep the reply short enough to read comfortably on a phone.
Do not add promotional keywords, sales claims or a booking pitch.
Do not repeat private information or identify the reviewer.
Do not ask the reviewer to change or remove their review.

Return two separately labelled parts:
PUBLIC DRAFT: the proposed reply only.
STAFF CHECK: missing facts, privacy concerns and needed approval.

If a safe public draft depends on an unapproved fact, return
HOLD FOR REVIEW instead of guessing. Do not publish anything.
```

Copy only the approved public draft into the review platform. The staff check stays internal.

POSITIVE REVIEW

A good reply thanks the person without turning their feedback into an advertisement. Add this instruction to the shared prompt.

```
The review is positive.
Thank the reviewer naturally. If an approved public detail is
supplied, mention it once. Keep the wording warm and direct.
Do not claim a result, name a staff member or describe work that
is not in the approved input. Avoid a sales pitch at the end.
```

For a home-service business, suppose the approved summary is “clear arrival updates and a tidy work area.” A possible reply is: “Thanks for sharing this. We appreciate your feedback about the arrival updates and keeping the work area tidy.” No address, repair diagnosis or invented follow-up is needed.

NEUTRAL REVIEW

Mixed feedback needs both parts acknowledged. A star rating alone does not tell you what happened.

> The review contains both positive and negative feedback.
> Acknowledge the concern without arguing or repeating allegations.
> Recognize the positive point if the summary includes one.
> Use the approved contact route if a private conversation would help.
> Do not promise compensation, a remedy or a response deadline
> unless that exact promise has been authorized in the input.

If a reviewer liked the work but found the arrival window unclear, an approved draft might say: “Thank you for the feedback. We appreciate your comments about the work and hear your concern about the arrival updates. Please contact [approved route] so our team can look into it.” Verify the contact route before posting.

RECOVERY REVIEW

For an unhappy review, the job is to open a useful next step, not win an argument in public.

> The review describes an unhappy experience.
> Acknowledge the concern calmly without admitting an unverified fact.
> Do not blame the reviewer or argue from private company records.
> Invite a private conversation through the approved contact route.
> Do not promise a refund, replacement, result or deadline.
> If the review raises safety, threats, discrimination or legal action,
> mark the response HOLD FOR REVIEW for the responsible person.

A simple starting point is: “We take this feedback seriously and would like the appropriate person to review it. Please contact [approved route].” The owner still decides whether a reply is appropriate and what the business can actually offer.

PRIVACY-SENSITIVE REVIEW

Clinics, law firms and other confidential services need a different starting point. Do not treat details posted by a reviewer as permission for the business to confirm or add to them. The responsible professional should approve the response policy and any exception.

> This business handles confidential matters.
> Do not confirm or deny that the reviewer is a patient or client.
> Do not describe appointments, treatment, representation, outcomes,
> fees, insurance, records or private conversations.
> Do not repeat sensitive details from the review.
>
> Use a general acknowledgment and the approved business contact
> route only. Keep the draft suitable even if the reviewer has

never used the business. Flag the draft for professional approval.

For a clinic or law firm, a possible starting point is: “Thank you for sharing feedback. We do not discuss individual matters in public. Please contact [approved route] if you would like to speak with our team.” This wording is a draft for review, not a compliance guarantee.

The reason for this distinction is practical. US HHS has addressed improper disclosures of patient information in review responses. The ABA also cautions lawyers about confidential information in replies to online criticism. These are US references, not a statement that every US state or Canadian province uses the same rules. Your firm's or clinic's responsible professional sets its applicable policy. See the sources below.

DISPUTED OR UNRECOGNIZED REVIEW

Not finding a matching record does not prove a review is false. Keep investigation and public wording separate.

> Staff do not recognize the review, or some facts are disputed.
> Do not accuse the reviewer of lying or state that no record exists.
> Do not disclose search results from customer, patient or client files.
> Suggest a neutral public acknowledgment with an approved private contact route, or HOLD FOR REVIEW if a reply would reveal details.
> Put platform-reporting or investigation suggestions in STAFF CHECK, never in the public draft. Do not promise removal.

Have a person review any platform report separately. A reporting option is not a guarantee that the platform will remove the review.

QA CHECKLIST

Before posting, the named approver checks the exact public draft:

1. Every factual statement comes from approved input.
2. No patient, client, account, address or private conversation is identified or confirmed.
3. No unapproved remedy, result, deadline or legal position is promised.
4. The contact route works and has an owner who can handle the reply.
5. The wording fits the business and does not sound defensive or promotional.
6. No request to revise, remove or improve the rating has been added.
7. Any sensitive or disputed case has the required professional approval.
8. Only the public draft is copied. Internal notes and placeholders are removed.

If one check fails, edit the reply or hold it. An AI draft is not an approval.

CHANNEL GUIDANCE

For Google and other public review platforms, keep the response readable and useful to the reviewer and the next person reading. There is no benefit to repeating the business name, city and service keywords in every sentence.

For home services, an approved non-sensitive detail can make a reply specific. For clinics and law firms, use the privacy-sensitive path. For accounting and financial services, keep tax, account and financial details out of the public thread as well.

Review responses are separate from review invitations. If you also request reviews, use the same neutral invitation for every eligible customer, regardless of sentiment. Do not offer an incentive or make support conditional on changing a review. The review request pack (https://www.thequietprotocol.com/downloads/google-review-request-pack) provides the separate invitation workflow.

FAILURE MODES

Reject a draft that invents what happened, copies private details, argues with the reviewer, promises compensation without approval, or ends with a sales pitch. Also watch for a draft that sounds reassuring but sends the person to a contact route nobody monitors.

A generic reply is not fixed by adding confidential detail. Make it clearer, shorter or more useful instead.

SUGGESTED TEAM WORKFLOW

Choose one reviewer and one backup. Set a response target your team can meet rather than promising a universal deadline publicly.

1. Read the review and identify whether it is routine, sensitive or disputed.
2. Prepare the minimum approved input and select the relevant prompt.
3. Draft in the approved workspace. Keep publication manual until the approval process is agreed.
4. Run the QA checklist. Escalate flagged drafts to the responsible person.
5. Publish the approved response and assign any private follow-up to a named owner.
6. Check that follow-up happened. A polished reply does not resolve the underlying problem.

Keep a simple log: review link, category, assigned owner, draft status, approval date, publication date and private follow-up owner. Keep confidential investigation notes in the appropriate private system.

PUT THE PROCESS TO WORK

The Quiet Protocol can configure review requests and the staff follow-up around them. Start with the process you need: who receives feedback, who drafts, who approves and who handles the next conversation. Agree the connections and approval rules in scope before switching anything on.

Explore TQP's review and reputation services (https://www.thequietprotocol.com/solutions/reputation-management).

SOURCES

- HHS: New Vision Dental review-response disclosure settlement (https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/for-professionals/compliance-enforcement/agreements/new-vision/index.html), reviewed October 22, 2026. Supports the healthcare disclosure caution above.
- American Bar Association: Five Tips for Social Media Savvy Attorneys (https://www.americanbar.org/groups/litigation/resources/newsletters/solo-small-firm/five-tips-for-social-media-savvy-attorneys/), reviewed October 22, 2026. Supports the lawyer confidentiality caution above.

The prompts, examples and team workflow are TQP's practical drafting guidance. They are not findings from those sources or a promise of ranking improvement.