

A review response policy your locations can actually use

A shared policy should answer practical questions: who reads a new review, who checks the facts, who approves the wording and who handles the promised next step. It should also make clear when a location must stop drafting and involve a responsible manager. Use the following policy as an editable starting point for Google reviews. The bracketed fields are deliberate fill-in fields for your business, not recommended commitments or claims about Replio settings. Have the owner confirm the completed policy before putting it into use.

Policy record and scope

Copyable policy: "This policy applies to Google review replies for [included locations]. The policy owner is [name and role]. The current approved version is [version and review date]. Each location uses [shared record or approved system] to track a review's status without copying unnecessary personal information into team channels."

List the locations explicitly so a new manager does not assume the policy covers a separate brand or franchise agreement. Decide where the approved version lives and how people will learn about changes. If a location has additional operating or brand requirements, record the responsible person who resolves conflicts before a reply is posted.

Roles, approval and coverage

Copyable policy: "[Assigned reviewer] checks for unhandled reviews during [locally agreed review window]. [Location manager] checks location-specific facts and identifies any operational follow-up. [Owner name or designated business owner] approves the final reply before posting. [Authorized poster] posts only the approved text. If the approver is unavailable, the draft stays pending and [coverage contact] is notified."

These roles may be held by the same person in a smaller business, but the approval decision still needs to be explicit. Access to a review account is not approval to publish every draft. Keep a record of the approved wording and approver. If someone edits that wording materially, send it back for approval instead of treating the earlier decision as permission for a new message.

Drafting rules

Copyable policy: "Our replies acknowledge the concern the guest actually described, use plain language and offer a practical next step when needed. We do not guess the cause, disclose private order or employee information, promise unsupported fixes, or offer compensation without authority. We do not ask a guest to revise a review in exchange for assistance. Every draft is checked against the original review before approval."

A template is a starting point, not evidence that something happened. Replace its fill-in fields and remove statements that the team cannot confirm. Do not include a public promise to contact a reviewer unless the business already has an appropriate contact route and someone owns that follow-up. Keep disagreements about facts out of a prolonged public exchange.

Sensitive concerns and private escalation

Copyable policy: "Concerns involving allergies, possible food-safety incidents, threats, discrimination, payment disputes or sensitive personal information go to [responsible manager and approved escalation route]. The team follows existing business procedures. Staff do not diagnose, share medical details, make legal conclusions or promise an outcome outside their authority in a review reply."

A review response policy your locations can actually use

Identify a real coverage contact before approving this section. An inbox that nobody monitors is not an escalation route. Keep necessary case details in the business's approved private record. The public reply can acknowledge the concern and provide a suitable contact route without describing the internal investigation or requesting sensitive information in public.

Separate the reply from the operational follow-up

Copyable policy: "A published reply closes the response task only. If a review identifies work to investigate or perform, [responsible manager] records the issue, named owner, next action and agreed due time separately. The assigned owner records what was observed or changed. [Reviewing manager] checks whether the stated action occurred and records any uncertainty. We do not describe a guest problem as solved solely because someone completed a task."

This distinction prevents a polished reply from hiding an unresolved handoff. A complaint may require more information, a process check or no change after review. Preserve that outcome honestly. Later comments can inform a new review of the issue, but they do not prove that one action caused a change in guest experience.

Local commitments, handover and review

Copyable policy: "Each location records a review window and follow-up coverage it can staff: [local commitments]. At handover, pending approvals and promised contacts transfer to [incoming owner or role]. The policy owner reviews unclear cases, missed commitments and access changes at [chosen cadence]. Departing staff lose access through the business's existing account process."

Choose commitments from actual staffing and responsibilities. This template deliberately supplies no universal response deadline. Test the completed policy against an ordinary complaint and a sensitive escalation before adoption. If the team cannot explain who acts next, simplify the handoff rather than adding another status label.

Fill every bracketed field with a responsible person, route or locally chosen commitment.

Have the owner approve the policy and its coverage arrangements.

Share the approved version with anyone who can draft or post.

Revisit the policy when responsibilities or account access change.

Source: <https://www.repliohq.com/resources/review-response-policy>