Please read first. This report shows observations drawn from publicly available X activity and analyzed with automated tools, including AI. They are not statements of fact and should not be taken as reflecting favorably or unfavorably on anyone's character, identity, honesty or credibility. Individual measurements can look unusual for ordinary reasons and may be misleading on their own, so findings should be read together and in context. This report is for informational and educational purposes only and may not be used for employment, housing, credit, insurance or other eligibility decisions.

authentix

Evaluation Report

A read-only report generated from the persisted evaluation record. The pattern index is the final result of the full analysis: it combines Grok's comprehensive assessment with the account profile, the 30-day corpus and the AI reading of it, each part counted according to how much it could see. AAE-1.0's own score is listed separately.

This report is for informational and educational purposes only. It describes signals in public data and does not label, accuse or make claims about any person.

Evaluation

Account	**@AuthentixCheck**
Evaluation ID	**a96891b0-9dc6-4271-bdc1-f5ba5f88d9f6**
Evaluated	**Oct 9, 2026, 8:56 PM CDT**
Methodology	**AAE-FINAL-5.1**

Pattern Index

An index produced by our methodology, not a probability. It summarizes how many of the measured patterns were observed (higher means fewer were observed). It has not been validated against accounts of known origin, and missing information is marked unavailable rather than counted against the account.

Pattern index	**58.6 / 100**
Measured patterns	**Several measured patterns observed**
Coverage	**16 posts analyzed from the last 30 days; 0 of 1 pictures read.**
What it means	**Several measured patterns observed: read them together and in context; many have ordinary explanations.**

Why

- It sells a paid service (4 places): "Enter the username, see the price, pay once, and read the pattern index, verdict, and evidence". This is an ordinary sale, not a request to send money or invest.

Money or investment requests	**None observed**
Evidence	**Some history**

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

Several measured patterns were observed. Read them together and in context; many have ordinary explanations, listed with each finding.
Several measured patterns observed, pattern index 59 / 100. Several of the measured patterns were observed. Read them together and in context; many have ordinary explanations, listed with each one.

What to check yourself

- Look for the same information on the account's official website or another source it does not control.

Patterns worth a closer look

- Several of the measured patterns in this report pointing the same way, rather than one on its own.
- A link or contact method that does not appear on the account's official website.

If you're…

- **Buying, selling or doing a deal:** Neutral checks: confirm the seller or business through its own website or a marketplace profile, and check the linked site's contact details.
- **A new connection:** Neutral checks: a reverse image search of the profile picture shows where else it appears.
- **Crypto, investing or giveaways:** Neutral checks: look up any named company or fund in a public registry and look for the same offer on its official site.
- **Hiring or working with someone:** This report may not be used for employment or other eligibility decisions, even as one factor.

When to report

- X takes reports of spam, threats or harassment from the post or profile menu.
- If you have lost money to anyone online, contact your bank or card issuer, then reportfraud.ftc.gov (and ic3.gov for online fraud).
- If anyone threatens your safety, contact local police; in an emergency, call 911.

This report is for informational and educational purposes only. It describes signals in public data and does not label, accuse or make claims about any person. This is an automated description of public information at one point in time, not a statement of fact about anyone; it is a summary of public activity at a point in time.

Your Concerns, Answered

Sample of this section. This check was run without a selection, so its real report has no such section. To show how the section reads, it is filled in here for two concerns using only findings already printed in this report, quoted word for word. Your selection never changes the score or the conclusion, and the section is shown only to you, never on a shared report or to the account you checked.

Could resemble a scam profile	**Inconclusive**

- What points to it: "Four near-duplicate pay-per-check pitches posted within about three minutes on 2026-10-08".

- What points against it: "this feed behaves like repeated sales pushing, not like a known giveaway or phishing scam".

Could resemble impersonation	**Inconclusive**

- What points to it: "The display name overlaps a known authentication firm".

- What points against it: "Name overlap with a known firm is mix-up risk, not a finding about who runs it."

“Evidence found” means public data in this check supports the concern; it is not a finding of wrongdoing. “No evidence found” means nothing in this check supports it, which is not proof it is untrue.

The Readout

In summary: this is a young sales account. Its pattern index is 59 out of 100, in the Several measured patterns observed range. It rests on 16 posts analyzed from the last 30 days. A whole-account review scored 36 out of 100, which is low, because repeated sales lines and off-topic replies sit beside a large follower count, and that mismatch is one measured pattern; new accounts and promotional posts often get few responses. A reading of the posts scored 28 out of 100, which is also low, because pitches such as a trust score and [old post quote removed] never show an actual check result. In its favor, original posts stay on the paid-check offer, the writing is not copied from elsewhere, and responses look real rather than hollow. Whether the linked site is a working service, and what the one picture shows, could not be checked, and that gap is not held against the account. The reading would rise if later posts showed real results, less repeated sales wording, and replies that stay on the product.

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> This is a plain-language summary of the evidence. It’s an automated reading and can be wrong, so use it together with the sections below.

How The Pattern Index Is Built

Every part is scored out of 100; higher means fewer measured patterns were observed. Grok’s review is one part of the pattern index; the profile check, the measured posting behavior and the AI reading of the posts make up the rest, each counted according to how much it could see. The exact method is proprietary. Pictures that look AI-made or AI-edited lower the evidence score and the AI reading; Grok also sees each picture’s reading. Pictures that could not be read never lower it.

Grok’s review of the whole account	**36 / 100**
Basic account profile check	**56 / 100**
Measured posting behavior	**88 / 100**
AI reading of the posts	**28 / 100**

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> The weakest part is AI reading of the posts (28 / 100). Read that section first to see which measured patterns it rests on.
>
> **What this check found**
> - AI reading of the posts: 28 / 100.
> - Grok’s review of the whole account: 36 / 100.

- Basic account profile check: 56 / 100.
- Measured posting behavior: 88 / 100.

What to check yourself

- Start with the section for AI reading of the posts: it is the lowest part of the index.

Patterns worth a closer look

- The parts disagree sharply (28 vs 88): one kind of evidence looks fine while another doesn't. Reading both sections together gives the context.

What would change this

- The AI reading rises when posts say plainly who the account is and match its bio.

Grok's Review Of The Whole Account

Grok's score	**36 / 100**

Commercial promo account for a paid X-account checker. Bio matches the pitch, but follower count far exceeds engagement, posts burst in near-duplicate CTAs, and several replies are off-topic or link-only. Not a clear impersonation of a known public account; the one picture found could not be read (0 of 1 pictures read).

Consistency of voice and profile	**42 / 100**
Claims vs. posted content	**34 / 100**
Behavior	**28 / 100**
Content	**32 / 100**
Resemblance to another account (100 = none seen)	**72 / 100**
Known risk patterns (100 = none seen)	**48 / 100**
Conversation	**38 / 100**
Claims versus posts	**78 / 100**
Language	**50 / 100**

What raises questions

- 5172 followers and 295 posts but almost every shown post has 0 likes and 0 reposts. Few responses compared with the follower count is one measured pattern; new accounts, link posts and X visibility limits often get few responses.
- Four near-duplicate pay-per-check pitches posted within about three minutes on 2026-10-08, a promotional burst rather than organic posting.
- Unverified account, following only 64, listed 0, while repeatedly pushing a t.co checkout link.
- Reply to @ihaveamanners is only 'Total pos' and does not engage the thread; other replies are bare links.
- Reply to @LisaKat97964119 drops the sales link instead of answering, a solicitation pattern in conversation.

- The one picture found could not be read (0 of 1 pictures read), so pictures are marked unavailable and not counted.

What supports it

- Bio and posts sell the same paid per-account check with score, verdict, and evidence, so the stated purpose matches the feed.
- Some replies sound like a person (RIP Coach Fran; sports comment), so the account is not only a single promo template.
- Display name authentix is not shown conflicting with a clearly famous X account; branding is self-promotional, not a celebrity clone.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

Grok raised questions that aren't tied to specific posts, so the evidence for them is thin. They are left as questions, not findings.

What this check found

- Supports: Bio and posts sell the same paid per-account check with score, verdict, and evidence, so the stated purpose matches the feed.
- Supports: Some replies sound like a person (RIP Coach Fran; sports comment), so the account is not only a single promo template.
- Supports: Display name authentix is not shown conflicting with a clearly famous X account; branding is self-promotional, not a celebrity clone.
- Raises a question: 5172 followers and 295 posts but almost every shown post has 0 likes and 0 reposts. Few responses compared with the follower count is one measured pattern; new accounts, link posts and X visibility limits often get few… Not tied to a specific post, so the evidence for it is thin.
- Raises a question: Four near-duplicate pay-per-check pitches posted within about three minutes on 2026-10-08, a promotional burst rather than organic posting. Not tied to a specific post, so the evidence for it is thin.
- Raises a question: Unverified account, following only 64, listed 0, while repeatedly pushing a t.co checkout link. Not tied to a specific post, so the evidence for it is thin.
- Raises a question: Reply to @ihaveamanners is only 'Total pos' and does not engage the thread; other replies are bare links. Not tied to a specific post, so the evidence for it is thin.

What to check yourself

- Look through its recent posts for what Grok describes; if you can't find it, the evidence for it is thin.
- For a concern about a claim, look for an independent source that confirms or contradicts it.

What would change this

- If the questioned posts are explained by context, or the claims are confirmed elsewhere, a recheck would read them differently.

The Analysis

What kind of account this is

This reads as a young brand page selling account checks, not as a personal voice and not as a clear fake of someone else. The name and bio present a service that scores any account and explains why, sold as one account for one price. Original posts repeat that offer, including "Pay per account. No subscription." and [old post quote removed]. A few replies are off the product, such as a coaching tribute and the one-word "Catatonic", so this is not only a promo loop, but the public identity is still the brand. That mix matters because stray replies make a business page look less steady than its sales copy. Four near-duplicate pitches landed within minutes on one evening, each with the same check link, which is consistent with promotional posting. The display name overlaps a known authentication firm, while the handle and bio describe a different checker, so confusion is plausible without a confirmed impersonation.

What it claims about itself

The bio and the sales posts agree; that is a match between claims and posts, not a measure of whether the product works. The bio says it checks any account, with a score, a verdict, and evidence, one account for one price. Original posts repeat that offer, including "One account, one price." and [old post quote removed]. That match is 75 out of 100 on whether posts back the bio, which is fairly strong, and it matters because the page is posting as the service it claims to be. The pinned post is empty, so it adds nothing. Replies pull away: coaching lines and "Total pos" are not about checks, and staying on one subject is 32 out of 100, which is low. Public sources do not confirm the product, the links could not be opened, and [old post quote removed] is asserted without a posted result.

Known risk patterns

This feed shows repeated sales posting, not like a known giveaway or phishing scam. That pattern matters because repeated links are how paid spam asks for money without looking like a classic con. Original posts and some replies sell the same paid check, with lines such as "pay once, and read the pattern index" and "Try it today". It is a service sale, not an investment ask. Several posts reuse near-identical wording and the same link in a short burst, a common sign of templated promo rather than fresh writing. Some replies are only a bare link, and the bio also points people toward a website. There is no sign of bait meant only to harvest replies, and no clear cue of pretending to be a specific person. Name overlap with a known firm is mix-up risk, not a finding about who runs it.

How the signals fit together

Read the steadier measurements and the weaker writing together and in context. Posting rhythm, original wording, and audience response all look strong. Those findings matter because hollow or bought accounts usually fail at least one of them. They do not erase the weaker side. Posts do not stay on one subject, replies in the sample barely spread across different conversations, and a reading of the writing is low because sales copy repeats while other replies wander into coaching talk and one-word lines such as "Catatonic". That split matters: a clean growth pattern can sit on a promo script. The account is young, unverified, and on no public lists, so the history is short. Near-duplicate pay-once lines look like solicitation spam but not a recognized scam template, which is why the combined reading stays at 59 out of 100, in the Several measured patterns observed range, rather than a clear pass or a clear fail.

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> This explains how the evidence fits together. It describes the account, not the person behind it, and it's an automated reading.

Evidence Areas

Each area is scored out of 100 (higher means fewer measured patterns were observed). An area that could not be checked is marked unavailable and left out of the index, never counted against the account.

Claims versus posts - 75 / 100

Looks at whether what the account says it is in its name and bio matches what it actually posts. Why it matters: when an account claims to be one thing and posts like another, it may be repurposed, bought or posing as something it is not.

Posting rhythm - 87 / 100

Looks at how often and when the account posts. Why it matters: automated and spam accounts tend to post in bursts or around the clock.

Content originality - 100 / 100

Looks at whether posts are original or repeated, and whether they push links, money or off-platform contact. Why it matters: copy-paste posts and money or contact requests are patterns worth a closer look.

Conversation - 71 / 100

Looks at how much it writes itself versus replying or reposting, and who it talks to. Why it matters: an account that mostly replies to strangers is behaving like outreach, not like a person or brand with its own voice.

Audience response - 100 / 100

Looks at whether people actually respond to its posts. Why it matters: real audiences respond unevenly; no response, or response out of line with its size, suggests a hollow or bought audience.

Audience balance - 100 / 100

Looks at followers compared with accounts followed, and size compared with posting history. Why it matters: mass-following to collect follow-backs is a common growth trick of spam accounts.

Network - 79 / 100

Looks at a sample of its recent followers and the accounts it follows. Why it matters: accounts surrounded by empty or brand-new accounts can be part of coordinated activity.

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> The areas that could be measured show few of the patterns this report looks for. Anything unavailable is left out, never counted against the account.
>
> **What this check found**
>
> - Conversation: 71 / 100.
> - Claims versus posts: 75 / 100 (strong).
> - Network: 79 / 100 (strong).
> - Posting rhythm: 87 / 100 (strong).
> - Content originality: 100 / 100 (strong).
> - Audience response: 100 / 100 (strong).
> - Audience balance: 100 / 100 (strong).

The AI Reading Of The Posts

Consistency of voice and profile - 34 / 100

Voice is mixed: short topical replies sit beside repeated sales copy, same-link replies, and a same-minute promotional cluster. Picture evidence is missing, so it is not used.

Claims vs. posted content - 28 / 100

Public posts mostly repeat paid authentix pitches and reused links. Product claims such as a trust score and high-grade technology are not backed by posted check results. A few short non-sales replies are also present.

Posting behavior patterns - 34 / 100

Activity is sparse across 9 of 30 days with some short, varied replies, but a four-post sales cluster in minutes and repeated link-only replies make the rhythm only partly ordinary.

Conversation patterns - 38 / 100

A few replies track the posts they answer, but others are one word, duplicate bare links, or a service pitch. Inbound mentions are mostly generic private-chat lines, often aimed at other handles, not threaded discussion.

Do its posts match what it says it is? - 58 / 100

Bio matches the paid authentix check pitches in original posts. Pinned is empty, lists are none, and likes are unavailable. Several replies are about coaching or unrelated remarks, so alignment is mixed.

Language and tone - 35 / 100

Short replies sound colloquial and varied, but several originals and two replies reuse near-identical sales wording and the same links in a tight burst. Templated promo copy is clear; machine translation is not.

Pictures

Pictures are marked unavailable for this check: there is not enough visual information to describe them. One recent sales post carries a picture beside the line "Doubt is the right first move.", but that image could not be read, so it cannot support or undermine the claim that the service reads "pictures and profile." Nothing available shows generator-typical picture sizes, yet that is only a weak hint and does not prove the image is genuine. The rest of the recent posts are text and links, so the public face is words, not a visual brand. The picture is left out of the pattern index and never counted against the account.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

The posts read low on consistency of voice and profile, claims vs. posted content, posting behavior, conversation patterns and tone. That's a pattern in the posts, not a judgment of the person; reading a few posts yourself gives the context.

What this check found

- Claims vs. posted content: 28 / 100.
- Consistency of voice and profile: 34 / 100.
- Posting behavior patterns: 34 / 100.
- Language and tone: 35 / 100.
- Conversation patterns: 38 / 100.
- Do its posts match what it says it is?: 58 / 100.

What to check yourself

- Read five of its posts in a row to see whether the voice stays consistent.
- Pick one specific claim it makes and look for an independent source that confirms it.
- Check whether its posts respond to events and people, which scheduling tools usually don't.

Patterns worth a closer look

- Posts that read the same whatever the topic, or never mention anything specific to the person or business.

What would change this

- Posts that say plainly who is behind the account and what it does, consistent with its bio, would raise these readings.

Pictures

Pictures found	**1**
Pictures read	**0 of 1**
Likely AI-made	**Unavailable**
Likely altered	**Unavailable**

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

Too few pictures could be analyzed to say anything about them, so this section counts neither for nor against the account.

What this check found

- 0 of 1 pictures read; 1 could not be read and don't count.

What to check yourself

- A reverse image search of the profile picture (Google Lens or TinEye) is a quick independent check either way.

The Last 30 Days Of Posts

Posts read	**16**
Original posts	**8**
Replies	**7**
Quotes	**0**
Reposts	**1**
Days with a post	**9**
Posts with links	**10**

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

16 posts over 30 days give a reasonable sample of recent activity.

Most Used Words

The 15 most used words in 15 posts (the last 30 days), as a share of all 180 words counted. Links, @mentions and common words like "the" are left out; hashtags are kept.

1. account	**5.6%**
2. check	**4.4%**
3. profile	**2.8%**
4. trust	**2.8%**
5. authentix	**2.2%**
6. pictures	**2.2%**
7. posts	**2.2%**
8. real	**2.2%**
9. score	**2.2%**
10. see	**2.2%**
11. verdict	**2.2%**
12. buy	**1.7%**
13. evidence	**1.7%**
14. plain	**1.7%**
15. coach	**1.1%**

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

The most used word, “account”, is 5.6% of the 180 words counted across 15 posts, and the top three together are 12.8%. The next most used are “check” (4.4%), “profile” (2.8%), “trust” (2.8%), “authentix” (2.2%), “pictures” (2.2%). These counts come only from the posts this check read in the chosen window. Links, @mentions and very common words are left out, and hashtags are kept, so the shares describe the account’s own vocabulary rather than who it talks to. The vocabulary is spread out, which is consistent with an account that posts about varied things. Money, giveaway or contact words (buy) are among the top words, a pattern that is common in promotion and can also appear in spam. Word counts describe what was posted; they do not show who runs the account, and a pattern here is worth weighing alongside the rest of this report rather than on its own.

Basic Account Checks

Account exists *+15*

PASS

X returned a user record.

Username match *+15*

PASS

Returned username matches the requested username.

Account maturity *+10*

PASS

Account age is approximately 144 days.

Name present *+3*

PASS

Profile field is populated.

Bio present *+5*

PASS

Profile field is populated.

Profile image present *+4*

PASS

Profile field is populated.

Website present *0*

PASS

Profile field is populated.

Public metrics *+20*

PASS

Public account metrics were returned by X.

Public activity *+7*

PASS

X reports 295 public posts.

Pinned content *+4*

PASS

The account has a pinned post.

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> The basic profile checks all pass. They show the account is set up, not who runs it.

Evidence Coverage

30-day observed posts	**16**
7-day observed posts	**11**
Evidence coverage	**Complete**
Most recent post	**Oct 9, 2026, 8:12 PM CDT**

> **WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU**
> This shows how much this report could read. Anything unavailable is left out of the index, not counted against the account.

Evidence Timeline

The post quotes on this page were removed from the sample report.

Two older post quotes were removed from this page of the sample report.

Reply · Oct 6, 2026, 4:10 PM CDT

@ihaveamanners Total pos

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 0 · Views 4
Observed evidence · 2107579389148024915

Reply · Oct 6, 2026, 9:51 AM CDT

@LandryBurdine RIP Coach Fran. Thanks for all the great memories on the turf.

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 2 · Views 15
Observed evidence · 2107483860376457366

Reply · Oct 1, 2026, 4:29 AM CDT

@LisaKat97964119 https://t.co/ZVrreRLgoc

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 0 · Views 11
Observed evidence · 2105590794510086346

Reply · Sep 30, 2026, 6:37 PM CDT

@jessieg9bm https://t.co/ZVrreRLgoc

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 0 · Views 7
Observed evidence · 2105441939697107396

Post · Sep 14, 2026, 5:23 PM CDT

RT @mayafrigo: @ellavera_ai Dm me

Replies 0 · Reposts 1 · Likes 0 · Views 0
Observed evidence · 2099625180683182237

Reply · Sep 13, 2026, 7:31 PM CDT

@nicolecarter_1 Catatonic

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 3 · Views 21
Observed evidence · 2099294874952507515

Reply · Sep 13, 2026, 11:24 AM CDT

@kels_patterson Coach P can take a hit all day long and bounced right back up ready for next call

Replies 0 · Reposts 0 · Likes 4 · Views 224
Observed evidence · 2099172396842303861

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR YOU

> These are the posts this check read. Skimming a few is the quickest way to see the findings in context.