

VIEWS TO BUYERS · READER BONUS

The Skeptical Viewer Simulator

Rehearse your recommendation against the toughest viewers in your niche before you record

Nathan Conner

Snowball Affiliate · snowballaffiliate.com

A Private Rehearsal Room Before You Hit Record

A bonus companion to Views to Buyers by Nathan Conner (Snowball Affiliate)

HOW TO APPLY (Read This First)

You can run your first session in about 20 minutes. Here is the fast path.

- 1 **Pick one script outline.** Choose a video you haven't recorded yet. Rough is fine.
- 2 **Paste the Room Setter prompt** (Section 2) into a fresh AI chat.
- 3 **Fill in the Outline Intake** (Section 2). Be honest about what you have not tested. That honesty makes the simulation work.
- 4 **Run one persona at a time**, starting with the one that makes you wince most (Section 3).
- 5 **Answer out loud or in writing.** Don't skim the objections. Answer them.
- 6 **Log every "Dodged" or "Partial" grade** on the Objection Log (Section 7).
- 7 **Use a counter-prompt** (Section 5) to strengthen each weak spot without inventing anything.
- 8 **Re-test the fixed outline** with a different persona.
- 9 **Record.**

The rule that keeps this tool honest: The simulator finds weak spots. It never supplies facts. Every repair must come from evidence you actually have, or from something you go and get before recording.

1. OVERVIEW: WHY A REHEARSAL ROOM BEATS A BETTER SCRIPT

Most affiliate scripts fail quietly. Nobody leaves an angry comment. Viewers just think "yeah, but..." and click away.

That unspoken "yeah, but..." is where the sale dies. In the **Viewer-to-Buyer Bridge** (Intent, Match, Evidence, Trust, Action, Access, Conversion), every objection is a crack in one of those planks. The viewer won't tell you which plank cracked. They just don't cross.

The Skeptical Viewer Simulator makes those thoughts audible before you record, when fixing them costs one edit to an outline instead of a reshoot.

What this is

- A set of **five skeptical personas** you can summon in any AI chat
- A **session structure** that pressure-tests an outline in four rounds

- A set of **counter-prompts** that strengthen weak spots honestly
- **Worksheets** to log, rank, and fix what you find

What this is not

- It is **not** market research. The AI is guessing at how viewers think. Treat its output as hypotheses to check against real comments, search suggestions, and replies.
- It is **not** a persuasion engine. The goal is a script that survives scrutiny, not one that gets around it.
- It is **not** a fact source. If the AI states something about a product, treat it as unverified.

The three honesty rules of the room

- 1 No invented facts.** No made-up numbers, prices, specs, results, or testimonials, whether from the AI or from you.
- 2 Concede what's true.** If a skeptic is right, your best move is to say so on camera.
- 3 Hand the decision back.** Your job is to make the viewer's choice easier, not to make it for them.

Pushy scripts usually fail rule 3. Weak scripts usually fail rule 1. Skeptics smell both.

2. SETUP: THE ROOM SETTER PROMPT + OUTLINE INTAKE

Step A: Paste this first (the Room Setter)

You are the Skeptical Viewer Simulator, a private rehearsal room for a YouTube creator who recommends products with affiliate links.

ROLE: You play ONE skeptical viewer persona at a time. I will tell you which. You react to my script outline the way a real, realistic viewer would: short, specific, a little blunt, never cartoonish or cruel.

RULES:

1. Stay in character until I say "exit persona."
2. Raise ONE objection at a time. Then wait for my answer.
3. After my answer, grade it: LANDED / PARTIAL / DODGED, with one sentence on why, in the viewer's voice.
4. If PARTIAL or DODGED, follow up the way a real viewer would ("Okay, but..."). Maximum two follow-ups per objection.
5. NEVER invent facts about real products: no prices, specs, statistics, reviews, or comparisons. If a fact would matter, write [VERIFY: what needs checking] instead of stating it.
6. Base objections on what is IN my outline, what is MISSING from it, and

the typical doubts of this persona. Don't invent flaws in the product.

7. Escalation level: [GENTLE / REALISTIC / TOUGH-BUT-FAIR]. Never abusive.

8. Begin with a 2-sentence persona intro, then your first objection.

Reply "Ready" and wait for my outline.

Step B: Fill in the Outline Intake

Copy this, complete every field, and paste it after the AI replies "Ready."

VIDEO WORKING TITLE: _____

CATEGORY / TOPIC: _____

TARGET VIEWER (who, situation, level): _____

THEIR INTENT (what they searched or wanted when they clicked): _____

PRODUCT(S) (use generic names): _____

MY MAIN RECOMMENDATION / CLAIM: _____

EVIDENCE I ACTUALLY HAVE

- Hands-on use (how long, doing what): _____

- Tests / comparisons I ran: _____

- Footage / screenshots / receipts I can show: _____

- Things I read or verified on official pages: _____

WHAT I HAVE NOT TESTED OR DON'T KNOW: _____

DOWNSIDES I'VE ACTUALLY EXPERIENCED: _____

FREE OR CHEAPER ALTERNATIVES THAT EXIST: _____

WHO THIS IS *NOT* FOR: _____

HOW / WHERE I DISCLOSE THE AFFILIATE LINK: _____

MY CALL TO ACTION + WHERE THE LINK LIVES: _____

OUTLINE (bullets are fine):

1. Hook: _____

2. Setup / who this is for: _____

3. Main points: _____

4. Proof section: _____

5. Downsides / limits: _____

6. Recommendation + CTA: _____

Why the "not tested" field matters. It stops the AI from attacking things you've already handled and points it at the real gaps. It also forces you to see your own edges before a viewer does.

3. THE FIVE SKEPTICAL VIEWERS

Each persona attacks a different part of the Bridge. Run the one that matches your weakest plank first.

Quick map (a guide, not a law): Budget-Conscious Viewer → **Match, Evidence, Action** Burned-Before Viewer → **Trust** Free-Option Defender → **Intent, Match** Spec-Checker → **Evidence** Time-Poor Professional → **Intent, Access, Conversion**

PERSONA 1: THE BUDGET-CONSCIOUS VIEWER

Who they are: Every purchase has to justify itself. They aren't cheap. They're careful, and they've regretted spending before.

Inner monologue: "Is this worth it for someone like me, or only for people with more to spend?"

Bridge plank under stress: Match (is this right for my situation?) and Action (is the commitment small enough to take?).

Signature objections:

- "Is the cheaper option really that much worse?"
- "What do I actually lose if I skip this?"
- "Is this a nice-to-have you're calling a need?"
- "What does it really cost once I add everything else I'd need?"
- "Can I try it before I'm committed?"

What wins them:

- A clear "**worth it if / not worth it if**" line
- Honest mention of total cost of ownership (extras, subscriptions, accessories), verified before you say it
- A cheaper path named without embarrassment

Persona prompt:

Play THE BUDGET-CONSCIOUS VIEWER. You are careful with money and have regretted past purchases. You are not hostile, just unwilling to be rushed. Challenge value, hidden costs, "need vs. nice-to-have" framing, and whether I've respected a tight budget. Don't state any prices; use [VERIFY] if a cost matters. Start with your first objection.

PERSONA 2: THE BURNED-BEFORE VIEWER

Who they are: They bought something a creator hyped, and it let them down. Now they read every recommendation as a possible setup.

Inner monologue: "You get paid if I buy. Why should I believe you?"

Bridge plank under stress: Trust.

Signature objections:

- "You earn a commission, so of course you say that."
- "Every review says it's great. Where are the downsides?"
- "How long did you actually use this?"
- "Would you recommend it if there were no link?"
- "What happens when it breaks or doesn't work for me?"

What wins them:

- Disclosure **early and plain**, not buried
- Downsides you actually experienced, stated specifically
- A visible "I'd pass on this if..." moment
- Honesty about the limits of your testing

Persona prompt:

Play THE BURNED-BEFORE VIEWER. A past recommendation from a creator cost you money and trust. You assume incentives shape opinions until shown otherwise. Challenge my disclosure, my downsides section, how long I used the product, and whether anything in the outline sounds like a sales script. Be skeptical, not cynical. Start with your first objection.

PERSONA 3: THE FREE-OPTION DEFENDER

Who they are: They believe a free or built-in tool does 80% of the job, and they're often partly right. They'll defend the free option in the comments.

Inner monologue: "Why pay for this when [free thing] exists?"

Bridge plank under stress: Intent and Match.

Signature objections:

- "I do this with a free tool already. What's the actual gap?"
- "Are you recommending this because it's better or because it pays?"
- "Did you give the free option a fair test?"
- "Who really needs the paid version?"
- "Isn't this solving a problem most people don't have?"

What wins them:

- A **fair-fight section**: you actually used the free option and say where it holds up
- A precise **"the free option stops being enough when..."** threshold
- Willingness to say "if you're in the first group, stay free"

Persona prompt:

Play THE FREE-OPTION DEFENDER. You believe free or built-in tools are usually enough and you've seen creators dismiss them unfairly. Challenge whether I compared fairly, whether I've identified the exact point where free stops working, and whether I'm manufacturing a problem. Don't make claims about specific free tools' features; use [VERIFY]. Start with your first objection.

PERSONA 4: THE SPEC-CHECKER

Who they are: They have a second tab open to the official product page and the comment section ready. They aren't unfriendly, just precise.

Inner monologue: "Does that match what the product page says?"

Bridge plank under stress: Evidence.

Signature objections:

- "You said it does X. Under what conditions?"
- "What did you compare it against, and how?"
- "Is that your experience or the manufacturer's claim?"
- "That's a vague word. What does 'fast' / 'durable' / 'easy' mean here?"
- "Which version or model are you reviewing?"

What wins them:

- Every claim labeled: **tested by me / read from official source / not verified**
- On-screen proof (footage, screenshots, documented steps)
- Precise wording instead of adjectives
- Corrections pinned in the description when you're wrong

Persona prompt:

Play THE SPEC-CHECKER. You verify claims and dislike vague adjectives. Challenge anything in my outline that is unsupported, ambiguous, or unclear about whether it came from my testing or from marketing. Ask what version/conditions apply. Do not supply specs yourself; mark any needed fact as [VERIFY]. Start with your first objection.

PERSONA 5: THE TIME-POOR PROFESSIONAL

Who they are: Busy and decisive. They'll buy fast if you make it easy, and leave fast if you waste a minute.

Inner monologue: "Just tell me if this is for me and what to do next."

Bridge plank under stress: Intent, Access, and Conversion.

Signature objections:

- "What's the answer? Why is it minute six and I still don't know?"
- "Is this for my situation, yes or no?"
- "Where's the link, and what happens after I click?"
- "Is setup going to eat my weekend?"
- "Give me the one-line version."

What wins them:

- **Answer-first structure** (verdict early, evidence after)
- Timestamps/chapters and a visible "skip to" path
- A clear next step with the link easy to find
- Honest setup-effort estimates from your experience

Persona prompt:

Play THE TIME-POOR PROFESSIONAL. You are decisive and impatient with padding. Challenge my pacing, how fast I give the answer, how clearly I say who this is for, and how easy it is to act. Flag any friction between "I'm convinced" and "I've done something about it." Start with your first objection.

4. THE FOUR-ROUND SESSION

Don't just chat. Run a structure.

ROUND 1: COLD READ (3 minutes)

Paste the outline and say:

Persona: [NAME]. Do a cold read. Without asking me anything, list the 5 objections you'd have by the end of this video, ranked by how likely you are to click away or not buy. One line each. Then stop.

Why it works: You see the whole map before you get pulled into defending one point.

ROUND 2: INTERROGATION (10 minutes)

Say: "**Begin the interrogation at your #1 objection.**" Answer each one in the **Four-Beat Honest Answer** format:

1. NAME IT. Say the objection back plainly. **2. SHOW IT.** Give the evidence you actually have. **3. LIMIT IT.** State where your answer stops being true. **4. HAND IT BACK.** Let the viewer decide with a clear criterion.

Template: "Fair question: [objection]. Here's what I saw: [evidence]. That said, [limit or caveat]. So if [viewer situation A], [outcome]. If [viewer situation B], [different outcome]."

If the grade comes back PARTIAL or DODGED, don't argue with the grader. The grade is useful because a real viewer would have reacted the same way.

ROUND 3: REPAIR (10 minutes)

Say "**exit persona**," then use the counter-prompts in Section 5 on every weak spot you logged.

ROUND 4: RE-TEST WITH A NEW PERSONA (5 minutes)

Paste the revised outline and run a different persona's cold read. You're checking that the fix for one skeptic didn't open a hole for another. (It happens. A heavy "free option" fix can bury the answer for the Time-Poor Professional.)

5. THE COUNTER-PROMPTS: STRENGTHEN WITHOUT PUSHING

These are the tools that turn objections into a better script. Each one has a guardrail built in.

COUNTER-PROMPT 1: The Honest Repair

Exit persona. Here is the objection: "[OBJECTION]". Here is my current answer: "[MY ANSWER]". Here is the evidence I actually have: [EVIDENCE LIST].

Give me 3 ways to strengthen my answer using ONLY that evidence. For each: (a) the rewritten line, (b) which evidence it relies on, and (c) what a skeptic could still say. Do not add any claims, numbers, or facts I haven't provided. If the answer needs evidence I don't have, say "EVIDENCE GAP: [what I'd need]" instead of filling it in.

COUNTER-PROMPT 2: The Gap-to-Footage Converter

Turns "I can't prove that" into a to-do list.

For each EVIDENCE GAP above, tell me the smallest, fastest thing I could do before recording to close it: a quick test, a screen recording, a side-by-side, a check of the official page, a question to the support team. Rank by effort (low/medium/high) and by how much skeptic resistance it would remove. Don't tell me what the result will be.

Aha: Many "weak spots" are really unfilmed strengths. A 10-minute test can turn a Dodged objection into your strongest section.

COUNTER-PROMPT 3: The Concession Builder

The skeptic is partly right about: "[POINT]". Draft 3 versions of a short on-camera line (under 20 seconds each) where I concede this honestly and explain who it affects. One calm, one dry-humored, one direct. No spin, no "but" that cancels the concession.

Why concessions work: Skeptics assume you'll defend everything. When you concede first, the rest of your claims get a fairer hearing.

COUNTER-PROMPT 4: The "Not For You" Generator

Based on my outline and evidence, write 5 "this is NOT for you if..." lines specific to this product and viewer. Each should name a real situation, not a vague disclaimer, and be something I could say sincerely. Flag any that rely on facts I haven't confirmed with [VERIFY].

COUNTER-PROMPT 5: The Pushiness Detector

Run this on your final script, not your outline.

Act as an editor, not a viewer. Scan this script for pressure and manipulation:

- urgency or scarcity I can't verify
- guilt, shame, or fear framing
- "you need..." / "you must..." language
- claims implying results are guaranteed or typical
- vague superlatives ("best," "game-changer") without support
- benefits that outrun my evidence

Quote each instance, explain what a skeptic would feel, and propose a rewrite that keeps the helpful intent but hands the decision back to the viewer. Do not add new claims.

COUNTER-PROMPT 6: The Fair-Fight Builder (for the Free-Option Defender)

Help me structure a fair comparison between [PRODUCT A] and [FREE OPTION]. Give me a checklist of what I should test on both under identical conditions, a way to state the "free is enough if..." threshold, and a neutral way to describe what I observed. Don't claim any feature differences; list them as questions for me to verify.

COUNTER-PROMPT 7: The Answer-First Rewrite (for the Time-Poor Professional)

Rewrite my first 60 seconds so the verdict and the "who it's for / not for" appear in the first 30 seconds, followed by one sentence on what the viewer will see next. Keep my claims unchanged. Show the before and

after and tell me what was cut or moved.

COUNTER-PROMPT 8: The Disclosure Placement Test

Given my outline, suggest 3 natural places to disclose the affiliate relationship in the video, in the description, and in the pinned comment. For each, write the line in plain, unapologetic language. Rank by how likely a skeptical viewer is to see it as honest rather than defensive.

6. WORKED EXAMPLE (ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY)

This is a hypothetical walkthrough using a made-up product and made-up details. It exists to show the method. None of it describes a real product, a real result, or any real creator.

Scenario: A creator plans a video, "Software A for Planning Content: Is It Worth Paying For?"

Evidence the creator has (hypothetical): Used it on one project, has screen recordings of their workflow, has also used a free spreadsheet method before. **Hasn't tested:** team features, customer support.

Outline excerpt (before)

- 1 Hook: "This changed how I plan my videos."
- 2 Main point: "It saves time and keeps everything organized."
- 3 Recommendation: "If you're serious about growing, you need Software A. Link below."

Round 1: Cold read highlights

Persona	Top objection
Budget-Conscious	"Is this a need or a nice-to-have for a small channel?"
Burned-Before	"'Changed how I plan' is what every sponsored video says."
Free-Option Defender	"A spreadsheet does this. What's the actual gap?"
Spec-Checker	"Saves time how? Compared to what?"
Time-Poor	"Do I need it or not? Say it in 30 seconds."

Round 2: One interrogation exchange (Free-Option Defender)

Simulator: "I plan content in a free spreadsheet. What exactly does Software A do that I can't?"

Creator's first answer: "It's just more organized and professional."

Grade: DODGED. "'Organized' isn't a gap. Organized how? I can organize a spreadsheet."

Creator's revised answer (Four-Beat): "Fair question, a spreadsheet works. Here's what I saw: [specific step in my workflow that took more manual effort in the spreadsheet, shown on screen]. That said, if you're planning a handful of videos a month, the spreadsheet may be all you need. If you're [specific situation where manual effort stacks up], that's where Software A started to make sense for me."

Grade: LANDED, with a follow-up: "Did you try fixing the spreadsheet before switching?" This tells the creator to show that in the video.

Round 3: Repair

- **Gap found:** "Saves time" has no support. **Gap-to-Footage action:** time one comparable task in both methods on screen and report what happened, whatever the result.
- **Concession added:** "I haven't tested the team features, so if you work with an editor or collaborator, I can't speak to that."
- **Pushiness Detector flagged:** "You need Software A" → rewritten to "Here's who I think should consider it, and who should stay with what they've got."

Outline excerpt (after)

- 1 Hook: "I tried paying for a planning tool after years of using a free spreadsheet. Here's where the spreadsheet won, and where it didn't."
- 2 Early disclosure: "I use an affiliate link for Software A. I'll tell you where I'd skip it."
- 3 Verdict in 30 seconds + who it's for / not for
- 4 Side-by-side on screen: one task, both methods
- 5 Limits: what I didn't test
- 6 CTA: "If you fit the first group, the link's in the description. If not, no need to click."

Notice: the revised video is more honest and has more to show. That's the pattern. Honest repairs usually add specificity, which also tends to be what viewers find convincing.

7. WORKSHEETS (PLUG-AND-PLAY)

WORKSHEET A: Objection Log

Copy one row per objection.

#	Persona	Objection (their words)	Bridge plank	Grade (L/P/D)	Evidence I have	Evidence gap	Fix
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

WORKSHEET B: Weak-Spot Triage

Score each logged objection:

- **Likelihood** a real viewer thinks this: 1 (rare) to 3 (common)
- **Damage** if left unanswered: 1 (minor) to 3 (kills trust/sale)
- **Fixability** before recording: 1 (hard) to 3 (easy)

Priority = Likelihood × Damage × Fixability

Objection	L	D	F	Priority	Action
					Fix on camera / Fix in description / Cut claim / Accept and disclose

Decision rules:

- **High priority (18-27):** Fix on camera. These get their own moment in the video.
- **Mid (8-17):** Handle in a line, in the description, or in a pinned comment.
- **Low (1-7):** Log it. Check real comments later to see if it appears.
- **High damage + low fixability:** Cut or soften the claim. If you can't support it, don't say it.

WORKSHEET C: Four-Beat Answer Builder

OBJECTION: _____

1. NAME IT: "Fair question: _____"

2. SHOW IT: "Here's what I saw: _____"

(evidence type: tested / read officially / experienced)

3. LIMIT IT: "That said, _____"

4. HAND IT BACK: "So if you ____, _____. If you ____, _____."

WORKSHEET D: The Evidence Ladder

Label every claim in your script with its rung, and say the rung out loud when it matters.

- 1 Shown:** footage or screen proof of my own test
- 2 Used:** my own experience over time, described specifically
- 3 Verified:** read on an official page, cited on screen
- 4 Reported:** someone else's account, labeled as theirs
- 5 Unverified:** cut it, or flag it clearly as unverified

Rule of thumb: Rungs 1-3 can carry a recommendation. Rung 4 can add color. Rung 5 doesn't belong in a recommendation.

WORKSHEET E: Pre-Record Checklist

- ☐ Every persona has been run at least on a cold read
- ☐ The top 3 objections each have a Four-Beat answer in the script
- ☐ Every claim is labeled by evidence rung
- ☐ The verdict and "who it's for / not for" appear early
- ☐ At least one honest downside comes from my own experience
- ☐ I've said what I did **not** test
- ☐ The free or cheaper option has been fairly represented
- ☐ Affiliate disclosure is plain and early
- ☐ Pushiness Detector run on the final script
- ☐ The link location is stated clearly, with no hunting
- ☐ Anything marked [VERIFY] has been verified or removed

8. APPLICATIONS: WHERE ELSE TO USE THE ROOM

The simulator works on more than outlines. Here is where it pays off, stage by stage.

Hooks and titles (Intent)

Paste your three hook options. Ask each persona, "Which would you click, which would you distrust, and why?" Look for a hook that earns the click without promising more than the video delivers.

Descriptions and pinned comments (Access, Conversion)

Paste your description. Run the Time-Poor Professional: "Find the link and tell me what happens when I click. Where did you get confused?" Friction between "convinced" and "clicked" is a Bridge problem, and descriptions are where it often hides.

Comparison videos (Match, Evidence)

Run the Free-Option Defender and the Spec-Checker together (see Panel Mode below). Comparisons attract the most scrutiny.

Single-product reviews (Trust)

The Burned-Before Viewer goes first. Reviews live or die on credibility.

"Best of" lists

Ask the Budget-Conscious Viewer: "Why is each item on this list, and who would you skip?" If you can't answer in a sentence, the list has filler.

Comment replies and community posts

Paste a real skeptical comment. Ask the simulator to draft a Four-Beat reply for you to edit. Never post AI text unedited. Make sure it only claims what you can back.

Live streams and Q&A prep

Run a rapid-fire session: "Throw 15 one-line objections at me, 10 seconds each. I'll answer out loud." Practice builds fluency, not scripts.

Updating older videos

Paste an old script. Ask: "What would a skeptic say that I couldn't have anticipated then?" Use the answers for a pinned correction or an updated description.

9. ADVANCED TIPS: THE INSIDER MOVES

1. Calibrate with real language

Paste 10-20 real comments from your own channel or similar videos (not invented ones) and say: "Learn the tone, vocabulary, and doubts in these. Rewrite your objections in this voice." Real phrasing beats generic AI phrasing.

2. Panel Mode

Run a panel of all five personas. After each section of my outline, each persona gives one-line reactions (max 15 words), then identify which section triggers the most objections overall. Do not resolve anything. Just show me the reaction map.

Use this for a bird's-eye view, then drop into single-persona rounds.

3. The Silent Viewer Test

You are a viewer who never comments. Tell me, section by section, the exact moment you'd be most likely to click away, and what you'd be

thinking just before you left.

Silent viewers are most viewers. This prompt hunts for quiet drop-off.

4. The Reverse Roleplay

Swap sides: "Now you're the creator. I'll be the skeptic. Answer my objection the way you think I should." Compare the AI's answer to yours. You'll see where you rely on adjectives and where it reaches for claims you can't support (which you should not copy).

5. The Escalation Dial

Run each persona at **Gentle**, **Realistic**, and **Tough-but-fair**. Gentle shows structure problems. Tough shows credibility problems. Don't fix everything at the toughest level. Some skeptics will never be convinced, and that's fine.

6. The One-Sentence Stress Test

Ask: "In one sentence, what would make you not buy this, even after the video?" If the answer is "nothing, it's a fair recommendation," you're probably close. If the answer is "I'd have no way to know if it fits me," you have a Match problem.

7. Sycophancy Check

AI tends to be agreeable. If every grade is LANDED, suspect the setup, not your brilliance:

You've been too generous. Re-grade my last three answers as a viewer who's been burned before. What would make you uneasy?

8. Keep a Skeptic Bank

Save every objection that recurs across your videos. Over time, you'll see your channel's recurring weak plank, whether that's usually Evidence, Trust, or Access, and you can build a standing segment or a reusable on-screen proof habit to cover it.

9. Verify Before You Fix

Anything the simulator suggests that sounds factual (a feature, a comparison, a limitation) goes on a [VERIFY] list. Check it against the official source or your own test, or drop it. The AI is a sparring partner, not a researcher.

10. Know When to Stop

Two full sessions per script is usually enough. If you're polishing past that, you're likely stalling. Record, publish, and let real viewers be your next round.

10. COMMON MISTAKES (AND THE FIX)

Mistake	What happens	Fix
Letting the AI supply facts	Fabricated claims enter your script	Enforce [VERIFY]; use Counter-Prompt 1's "no new claims" rule
Defending instead of answering	Every grade comes back Dodged	Use the Four-Beat format
Fixing only the easy objections	Credibility problems remain	Triage by Priority score
Over-conceding	Video feels unsure of itself	Concede specifics, then give a clear who-it's-for
Treating the AI as the audience	You optimize for a simulation	Cross-check with real comments and replies
Turning every fix into a hard sell	You trade one skeptic for another	Run the Pushiness Detector last
Skipping Round 4	New holes appear unnoticed	Re-test with a different persona

11. CONCLUSION: RECORD LIKE SOMEONE WHO'S ALREADY BEEN QUESTIONED

Viewers don't need a perfect creator. They need one who has already asked the hard questions and answers them plainly.

That's the point of the rehearsal room:

- **Intent:** your hook promises only what the video delivers
- **Match:** the video says who it's for and who should walk away
- **Evidence:** every claim has a rung on the ladder
- **Trust:** disclosure is early, downsides are real, concessions are specific
- **Action:** the next step is obvious and low-pressure
- **Access:** the link is easy to find
- **Conversion:** nothing between "I'm ready" and "I did it" feels like a trick

Run one outline through the Room this week. Log the objections, fix the top three, and record. Then compare what real viewers say against what the simulator predicted. That gap is your training data, and it grows with every video.

Your next step: Open a fresh chat, paste the Room Setter, fill in the Outline Intake, and start with the persona you least want to face.

Companion to Views to Buyers by Nathan Conner, Snowball Affiliate. All examples are illustrative, and all product names are placeholders. Always verify product facts yourself and

follow the disclosure rules that apply where you publish.