

Carlo Bellati

Public profile snapshot

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/carlobellati>

Retrieved 2026-09-14T19:23:47.826Z · 3 public posts · Profile: Bright Data · Posts: Bright Data

Profile presentation grade

100/100 · Grade A+ · 30% coverage · Partial grade. Rubric profile-2026.09.1.

A transparent presentation checklist, not a LinkedIn ranking, talent assessment or prediction of reach.

Grade thresholds: A+ 90, A 80, B 65, C 50, D 35, F below 35.

Score = earned points ÷ assessed points × 100. Coverage is assessed weight out of 100. Unavailable and masked data are excluded. Scores with different coverage are not directly comparable.

Truncated text earns only checks already demonstrated in the visible excerpt; the unseen remainder is not marked wrong. Text rules measure structure, not factual accuracy, writing quality or every language equally.

Photo and banner grades cover image availability, decoding and shape only. Face framing, lighting, expression, visual style and authenticity require a human review. No appearance, identity or personality judgments are made.

An education entry is evidence of profile context, not verified credentials. School prestige, age, degree level and background do not affect the score.

Profile picture: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/15 points assessable

Profile image supplied: Unknown

No usable image URL was returned; absence on LinkedIn is unconfirmed.

Action: Choose a current, recognizable photo. Preview the circular crop at comment size and leave space around your head.

Image decodes and fits its display shape: Unknown

The source image could not be inspected. This is not evidence that the profile has no image.

Action: Use a square original, check sharpness at full size, and preview the circular crop. A small provider thumbnail does not prove your original upload is low resolution.

Cover & visual identity: A+ · 100/100 · 10/10 points assessable

Cover image supplied: 5/5 points

The source supplied an image URL.

Action: Use a simple cover that says who you help and what you do. Keep important text clear of the profile-

photo overlay.

Image decodes and fits its display shape: 5/5 points

Returned image: 800 × 199px. Dimensions and decoding were measured on the returned image, which may be a resized LinkedIn thumbnail. Original resolution, face framing, lighting and professional suitability were not assessed automatically.

Action: Preview your cover on desktop and mobile. Start with a 1584 × 396 canvas and keep the message readable without tiny text.

Name & identity: A+ · 100/100 · 10/10 points assessable

Readable display name: 5/5 points

Source text: "Carlo Bellati"

Action: Use the name people know you by, consistently across your profile and other professional channels. Single names and all writing systems are supported.

Name field stays focused on identity: 5/5 points

Source text: "Carlo Bellati"

Action: Move URLs, contact details and sales calls to action into About or Contact info. Keep your actual name unchanged.

Headline & positioning: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/15 points assessable

Headline supplied: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: State your role or specialty in the headline, using terms your intended reader understands.

Enough context to explain your work: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Use this structure: [role or specialty] · Helping [audience] achieve [outcome]. Replace every bracket with a truthful detail.

Headline is concise enough to scan: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Keep the headline focused on one main promise. Move your longer story into About.

About & descriptions: A+ · 100/100 · 5/20 points assessable

Readable introduction: 5/5 points

Truncated source excerpt: "Founder/CRO of Zipchat.ai Zipchat.ai: AI-Powered Chat That Turns Ecommerce..."

Action: Lead with who you help, the problem you solve and the work you do today.

An introduction with supporting detail: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Founder/CRO of Zipchat.ai Zipchat.ai: AI-Powered Chat That Turns Ecommerce..."

Action: Add a specific example of your work, your approach, and the kinds of opportunities you welcome.

Length is a structure check, not a quality guarantee.

Easy-to-scan paragraph structure: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Founder/CRO of Zipchat.ai Zipchat.ai: AI-Powered Chat That Turns Ecommerce..."

Action: Break About into short paragraphs: current focus, relevant proof, then how to connect.

A clear next step: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Founder/CRO of Zipchat.ai Zipchat.ai: AI-Powered Chat That Turns Ecommerce..."

Action: End with one relevant next step, such as who should message you and what to include. This automated check recognizes English phrases and links; review other languages manually.

Experience & proof: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/15 points assessable

Professional experience identified: Unknown

No readable entries were returned. We cannot conclude this section is empty.

Action: List relevant roles with an accurate title and organization. Connect them to the work you want to do next.

Experience includes useful descriptions: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: For each relevant role, explain your responsibility, a concrete contribution, and an outcome you can substantiate. Do not invent numbers. Masked source descriptions need manual review.

Education & learning: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/10 points assessable

Education or learning entry identified: Unknown

No readable entries were returned. We cannot conclude this section is empty.

Action: Add relevant education or structured learning you want to share. Name the institution or course accurately; formal degrees are not required for a strong professional story.

Learning context is described: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Describe your subject, course or qualification and one relevant project or skill. Use the full qualification name where helpful. We assess clarity, never institution prestige or degree level.

Location & context: A+ · 100/100 · 5/5 points assessable

Readable location: 5/5 points

Source text: "Genoa"

Action: Use an accurate city or region if you want it visible. Do not add a home address. Omitted provider data is not penalized.

Executive summary

Carlo Bellati's audit covers 3 public posts, including 3 with both reaction and comment counts. The measured median is 18 interactions. AI & building products is the most represented detected theme (1/3; themes can overlap). Start with a concrete follow-up to an existing subject, then test the opening and reply invitation across a consistent four-week sample.

Measured performance

Followers: 11,844. Posts: 3. Fully measured: 3.

Engagement by current followers: 0.17%. Average reactions: 18. Median reactions: 16.

Average comments: 2.3. Comments per 100 reactions: 13.

Observed cadence: 3.7 posts/week. Sample window: 3.8 days.

Strengths, watch points and context

STRENGTH: A usable personal baseline

3 of 3 posts have both public counts. Their median is 18 interactions. Compare future experiments with your own sample rather than an unrelated peer score.

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

STRENGTH: A concrete post to learn from

"Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do." has 27 visible interactions. That is 1.5× the sample median. Its topic and opening are candidates for a follow-up experiment; this does not identify why it performed.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

CONTEXT: Conversation is observable; quality is not

1 of 3 posts contain a question. Measured posts generated 13 comments per 100 reactions. Counts can include the author's replies and do not measure lead quality or sentiment.

Evidence: post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

CONTEXT: Understand the gaps in this sample

The median gap between sampled dates is 1.9 days; the longest is 3 days (2 intervals). Missing posts can exaggerate gaps, so this is not a complete publishing calendar.

Evidence: post 3, post 2, post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Performance and publishing rhythm

At least six measured posts across two publication dates are needed for an early/recent comparison.

Typical measured interactions: 18. Highest: 27.

Median gap 1.9 days; longest 3 days across 2 intervals.

2026-09-07T14:59:16.888Z: 24 reactions + 3 comments = 27 interactions.

2026-09-10T15:13:44.395Z: 14 reactions + 4 comments = 18 interactions.

2026-09-11T09:47:40.538Z: 16 reactions + 0 comments = 16 interactions.

UTC publishing days — descriptive, not recommended times:

Mon UTC: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Thu UTC: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 18, average 18 interactions.

Evidence: post 2. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Fri UTC: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 16, average 16 interactions.

Evidence: post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Older posts have had more time to accumulate interactions. Different publication-day groups have different sample sizes and topics.

Content pillars and format performance

Overlapping English keyword themes, not semantic certainty:

AI & building products: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 16, average 16 interactions.

Evidence: post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Business & entrepreneurship: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Careers & leadership: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Other / not classified by these rules: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 18, average 18 interactions.

Evidence: post 2. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Source-reported formats; unknown is not text-only:

image: 2 posts / 2 measured; median 17, average 17 interactions.

Evidence: post 1, post 2. Full text and links are in Source posts.

text: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Small or unequal groups cannot establish a winning format.

Hooks and writing structure

Il 17 Settembre a Focus Fashion & Beauty (Netcomm Forum , Milano) non farò il solito panel sull'Agentic Commerce.

Hook: Number-led; 52 words; 3 paragraphs; final CTA detected; question detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

I couldn't wait the monthly update for this milestone. [U+1F389]

Hook: Personal opening; 22 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA not detected; question not detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.

Hook: Statement; 109 words; 7 paragraphs; final CTA not detected; question not detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

Hook uses the first nonempty line. Paragraphs use blank-line breaks. Final CTA uses the last content line, ignoring tag-only lines, with question or action-phrase detection. Text rules can miss meaning and linked mentions.

Hashtag patterns

Up to 20 most-used tags. Each post is counted once per tag. Tags travel with topics and formats; their isolated effect cannot be measured.

Prioritized action plan

1. Develop a specific follow-up

Observation: The sample includes “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.”. Its visible interaction total is 27.

Action: Build a follow-up to “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.”. Add a concrete example, a decision you made and one lesson. Keep the format similar so topic development is the main experiment.

Potential impact: Test repeatable interest in an existing subject. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Reactions and comments after the same seven-day window; compare with the baseline median

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

2. Test a sharper opening

Observation: Median text length is 52 words with 3 paragraphs. 1 of 3 openings are classified as statements.

Action: For the next post related to “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.”, open with a specific problem and a concrete outcome you can substantiate. Move context into the second paragraph. Avoid invented results or curiosity gaps that the post does not resolve.

Potential impact: Improve clarity; any engagement effect remains to be tested. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Median interactions across at least three comparable posts per opening approach

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

3. Make the reply invitation concrete

Observation: 1 of 3 final content lines contain a detected question or action phrase; 1 posts contain a question anywhere. These are text rules, not semantic judgments.

Action: End one upcoming post with a focused trade-off question connected to ai & building products. Ask readers to share a decision and why. Read replies before deciding whether the discussion was useful.

Potential impact: Test whether a clearer invitation supports useful discussion. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Public comments per post and manual review of reply relevance

Evidence: post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

4. Choose a sustainable publishing experiment

Observation: 3 dated posts span 3.8 days. Observed cadence is 3.7 posts per week.

Action: Choose two slots per week for the four-week experiment below, or reduce the schedule if your capacity is lower. Keep the slots consistent and log every published post. Two slots are a planning choice, not a LinkedIn benchmark.

Potential impact: Create comparable records and a manageable learning loop. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Planned versus published posts, time spent, and median interactions at seven days

Evidence: post 3, post 2, post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

5. Use tags and mentions with a purpose

Observation: 0 of 3 posts contain hashtags and 0 contain visible @mentions. LinkedIn may return linked mentions as plain text, so detection can undercount.

Action: Use relevant topic labels only when they clarify the subject. Mention people only when they contributed or are directly relevant. Test a consistent tagging approach on comparable posts; do not attribute performance changes to tags alone.

Potential impact: Keep context and attribution useful. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Median interactions for tagged/untagged samples, with sample sizes and topic differences

6. Test presentation without changing the subject

Observation: image: 2 posts (2 measured); text: 1 posts (1 measured).

Action: Turn one idea related to “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.” into a

concise checklist or document post. Keep a similar topic and ask the same type of question. Label this a new format experiment, not a proven winning format.

Potential impact: Learn whether a different presentation helps explain the same idea. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Public interactions at the same post age; at least three posts in each format before comparison

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Basic content ideas

1. The next chapter

Follow up on “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.”: what changed since publishing, what stayed difficult, and the next step. Only include outcomes you can verify.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

2. Show the process

Break the work behind “Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.” into three decisions. Add an example or screenshot you have permission to share.

Evidence: post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

3. A useful trade-off

Describe two approaches to ai & building products, explain your constraint, and ask which constraint readers face.

Evidence: post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Basic writing outline

Open with one specific point. Show your reasoning with a supported example. End with a focused question.

Peer comparison, private AI strategy, extensive schedules and downloadable writing skills are coming with Profilyst Pro. They are not included in this public report.

Source posts

POST 1

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/carlobellati_il-17-settembre-a-focus-fashion-beauty-activity-7504113426399612928-Zvn-

Published: 2026-09-11T09:47:40.538Z. Reactions: 16. Comments: 0. Format: image.

Il 17 Settembre a Focus Fashion & Beauty (Netcomm Forum , Milano) non farò il solito panel sull'Agentic Commerce.

Intervisterò dal vivo Lanfranco Tartarelli che racconterà come Piquadro, Lancel e The Bridge usano Zipchat

ogni giorno sul loro ecommerce e di come sta ridisegnando l'esperienza d'acquisto nel Fashion con agenti AI.

Ci vediamo lì? [U+1F447]

POST 2

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/carlobellati_i-couldnt-wait-the-monthly-update-for-this-activity-7503833095297568769-ns2b

Published: 2026-09-10T15:13:44.395Z. Reactions: 14. Comments: 4. Format: image.

I couldn't wait the monthly update for this milestone. [U+1F389]

Zipchat now handles more than 1m conversations a month. Goal: 3 Comma club [U+1F680]

POST 3

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/carlobellati_some-days-as-a-founder-are-just-bad-no-matter-activity-7502742293112877056-sNpi

Published: 2026-09-07T14:59:16.888Z. Reactions: 24. Comments: 3. Format: text.

Some days as a founder are just bad. No matter what you do.

You hit a wall you didn't see coming.

You feel like you don't have what it takes to get to the next level.

You look back at the day and feel like you wasted it.

Nothing worked. Nothing moved.

Then one small win shows up. A customer reply. A number that ticked up. A "this actually works" from someone on the team.

And suddenly the whole day flips.

Not because the problem went away. Because you remembered why you're doing this.

The bad days aren't a bug in the journey. They're part of it.

Keep pushing.

Saved audit comparison

This export represents one saved snapshot. No earlier comparable snapshot was selected.

Methodology and limits

Read 3 of up to 8 requested posts. Unreturned or unverifiable posts are not included in the analysis.

The source returned a shortened About section. Suggestions use only the visible excerpt.

Some profile sections were not returned by the source. They remain unknown, not confirmed missing from

LinkedIn.

Selected URLs may omit recent or low-performing posts. This is a sample, not a complete feed.

Reaction and comment totals are snapshots. Older posts had more time to accumulate interactions.

Themes can overlap and use English keyword rules. Hooks, CTAs and mentions are text heuristics and may miss context or other languages.

Timing is UTC publishing history, not audience activity or an optimal posting time.

Recommendations and potential impact are hypotheses. No impressions, revenue, private demographics, peer percentile or causal attribution are available.

Engagement = average visible reactions plus comments / current followers × 100, requiring at least three measured posts. Missing values remain unavailable. Cadence uses the intervals between sampled dates. No uncalibrated score or private metric is inferred.

Independent public-data analysis. Not affiliated with LinkedIn or the profile owner. <https://profilyst.com/methodology>

Unsupported glyphs are preserved as Unicode code points [U+...]. Full original text is available in the online report.