

Documentation Review Guide: Marketing

Why you're reviewing

You own the brand voice and know how the product is positioned externally. The technical writer has structured the content for task completion — your job is to verify that the doc is **consistent with brand and terminology standards** and doesn't conflict with what customers see in marketing materials.

These docs serve both human readers and AI systems (chatbots, search, retrieval-augmented tools). AI systems surface individual sections, not full pages — so branded terms need to appear in their canonical form in every section, not just on first use.

What to look for

- **Product and feature names:** Are they capitalized, spelled, and used the way Marketing has defined them? Flag any inconsistencies with current naming conventions.
- **Terminology alignment:** Does the doc use the same terms customers see in the website, sales materials, and UI? If Marketing calls it "Smart Sync" and the doc says "automatic synchronization," that's a disconnect.
- **Canonical naming in every section:** Check that branded terms appear in their official form in each section, not just on first mention. AI-powered search and chatbots surface individual sections. If the official name is "DataBridge" but the doc says "the bridge" after paragraph one, an AI response may never use the correct term.
- **Tone:** Documentation is direct and task-oriented by design — it won't match marketing copy. But it shouldn't contradict the brand either. Flag anything that feels off-brand in a way that would confuse a customer moving between the website and the docs.
- **Customer-facing links:** If the doc links to marketing pages, landing pages, or external resources, verify the URLs are current and point to where they should.

How to review

1. Skim the full document, but focus on headings, feature names, and introductory sentences where naming and positioning surface.
2. Cross-reference against current naming conventions or brand guidelines if you have them.
3. Check the reviewer instructions or cover note for specific sections flagged for your input.

How to leave comments

- Use the review tool specified in the reviewer instructions (e.g., PR comments, shared doc comments, review platform).
- **Be specific.** "This doesn't sound right" isn't actionable. "We rebranded this feature to 'DataBridge' in Q2 — the doc still says 'Data Connector.'"
- If a naming decision is in flux, flag it and note the current status so the writer can follow up.

Turnaround

Complete your review by **[DATE]**. If you need more time, let the writer know before the deadline — not after.

What NOT to do

- **Don't rewrite documentation as marketing copy.** Docs exist to help users complete tasks, not to sell. "Leverage our powerful integration engine" belongs on the website, not in a setup guide.
- **Don't flag technical accuracy issues.** That's the SME's job. If something looks technically wrong, note it as a question — don't try to fix it.
- **Don't request structural changes.** If you think a doc should be organized differently, raise it with the writer directly rather than rearranging sections in your comments.
- **Don't add promotional CTAs or upsell language.** Documentation is not a sales channel. If there's a natural place to reference a higher-tier feature, the writer will handle it with a factual note, not a pitch.
- **Don't collapse information into tables or lists without context sentences.** AI retrieval systems often extract tables poorly or lose column headers. If critical information lives only in a table with no surrounding prose, flag it.