

● SITE TEARDOWN · MWJSAUTOMATIONS

Mwjsautomations: a phone-and-desktop teardown

We loaded <https://mwjsautomations.com/> 4 times on a simulated iPhone and 2 more on a 1366px desktop, and wrote down what a real visitor would see on each. No login, no insider access, no Harvv pixel needed. Here is what repeated visits already show, sorted by how we know it.

August 2, 2026 · External scan · 4 MOBILE + 2 DESKTOP LOADS · NO PIXEL DATA

TL;DR

What jumped out

Of everything we found on this scan, this is the one to start with: **3 form fields have no label**. Screen readers can't announce these fields, and a sighted user who clears the placeholder can't recover the prompt. Wrap each input in `<label>...</label>` or add `aria-label`.

10%

TAP TARGETS UNDER THE
44PX MINIMUM (1 OF 10)

170ms

LARGEST CONTENTFUL PAINT
(LAB MEDIAN)

0.0 MB

TOTAL PAGE WEIGHT (MEDIAN)

Below: what's already working, every finding ranked by impact and tagged with the screen it affects, the speed numbers on phone and desktop, and a checklist of what to fix first.

00

What's already working

Start here so the problems below are in context. These held up across the test loads:



Speed is good. Google Lighthouse scores this page 99/100 for performance on mobile. Loading is not what is costing you visitors here.

- **Light page weight.** The page is about 0.0 MB across 6 requests. That keeps it quick on mobile data and cheap to load repeatedly.
- **No JavaScript errors on load.** Nothing threw a script error across the test loads, so buttons and tracking are not silently breaking mid-session.
- **Search basics are in place.** Lighthouse scores SEO 100/100. The fundamentals Google looks for are present.
- **Layout holds on phone and desktop.** Nothing spilled past the edge at either 390px (phone) or 1366px (desktop), so the structure is responsive.

01

Findings, ranked by what hurts conversion most

SEVERITY	FINDING	HOW WE KNOW
HIGH	3 form fields have no label BOTH ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG) CONVERSION TRACKING	
	3 ELEMENTS Screen readers can't announce these fields, and a sighted user who clears the placeholder can't recover the prompt. Wrap each input in <code><label>...</label></code> or add <code>aria-label</code>. ----- THE EXACT ELEMENTS WE FOUND: • <code>name="name" (input) placeholder="John Smith"</code> • <code>name="email" (input) placeholder="john@yourbusiness.com"</code> • <code>name="message" (textarea) placeholder="What does your business do? Wh"</code>	
HIGH	Some text is low-contrast and hard to read BOTH ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG)	
	Text that does not stand out enough from its background is hard to read for many visitors, and fails accessibility guidelines Google checks.	
HIGH	Some buttons have no accessible name BOTH ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG) TRACKING	
	A button with only an icon and no label is announced as "button" by screen readers, giving no idea what it does.	

SEVERITY	FINDING	HOW WE KNOW
MEDIUM	Security headers are missing or weak BOTH SECURITY The server response is missing browser-hardening headers that protect visitors and are a standard security and agency checklist item. Missing or weak here: Content-Security-Policy (the main defense against injected and cross-site scripts); clickjacking protection (X-Frame-Options or a CSP frame-ancestors rule); a stronger HSTS policy (max-age at least 180 days plus includeSubDomains); X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff (stops MIME-type sniffing attacks). These are set at the server, CDN, or host level (most platforms expose them in settings or a config file) and do not change how the site looks or performs.	
MEDIUM	AI search crawlers are blocked BOTH SEO 8 EXAMPLES Your robots.txt blocks 8 AI crawlers (gptbot, google-extended, claudebot, ccbot, bytespider, applebot-extended, amazonbot, meta-externalagent). Those engines (ChatGPT, Perplexity, Google AI Overviews, Claude) cannot read your site, so your content cannot be cited or shown in AI search. ----- THE EXACT EXAMPLES WE FOUND: • gptbot • google-extended • claudebot • ccbot • bytespider • applebot-extended • amazonbot • meta-externalagent	
MEDIUM	No XML sitemap found BOTH No sitemap.xml at the standard location and none listed in robots.txt. A sitemap tells search engines every page you want indexed; without it they rely on link discovery and may miss pages.	
LOW	Search-result title is leaving room on the table BOTH SEO Google gives you about 60 characters of headline space in search results. This page is using 16. Adding the value proposition or a relevant keyword gives someone one more reason to click.	
LOW	No canonical tag, so duplicate URLs split the page's ranking BOTH When the same content is reachable at multiple URLs (think tracking parameters or session IDs), Google can split your ranking signal across them. A single canonical tag tells Google which version counts.	

SEVERITY	FINDING	HOW WE KNOW
LOW	Links to this page will look bare when shared BOTH	
	The page is missing its Open Graph title and image, so when someone shares it on Facebook, LinkedIn, iMessage, or Slack the preview has no title and image. A flat grey link gets far fewer clicks than one with an image and headline.	
LOW	2 form fields missing autocomplete hint BOTH CONVERSION	
	ACCESSIBILITY (WCAG) 2 ELEMENTS	
	Browsers can autofill name, email, phone, address from the user's saved profile only when you tell them which field is which via autocomplete="email", autocomplete="name", etc. Faster checkout, fewer typos.	
	THE EXACT ELEMENTS WE FOUND:	
	- name="name" (type=text) - name="email" (type=email)	
LOW	No third-party analytics tag detected BOTH TRACKING	
	No Google Analytics, GA4, or other third-party analytics tag was found in the page. If you rely only on platform or server-side analytics that is fine; but if not, a third-party tag is the baseline way to see how many visitors arrive, where they come from, and what converts. First-party or server-side analytics are not detectable from the outside, so this may already be handled.	
LOW	No email capture or newsletter detected BOTH CONVERSION	
	No email-marketing tag (Klaviyo, Mailchimp, etc.) was found. If capturing visitors is relevant to this site, an email signup builds an owned audience you keep regardless of ad costs. Not every site needs one.	
LOW	No /lms.txt file BOTH SEO	
	No /lms.txt. This emerging standard gives AI search engines a clean, structured map of your most important content, improving how they understand and cite your site.	

Accessibility findings are automated checks against Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 and 2.2. They flag potential barriers and legal risk, not a certification or a determination of compliance with the ADA, Section 508, or EN 301 549. Automated testing catches only a subset of issues; a full conformance review needs manual and assistive-technology testing by a qualified reviewer.

FROM FINDING TO FIX

Want the fix, not just the finding?

Install Harvv and we turn each issue above into a ready-to-paste prompt for your AI coding assistant. Drop it into Cursor, Claude, or Copilot and the diagnosis becomes a concrete code change, written against this exact page.

Get the fix prompts

"How we know": **unlabeled** = a deterministic fact, identical on every load (e.g. element sizes). Most findings are this kind, so we only mark the exceptions: **median across loads** = a noisy lab metric, reported as a median. **real-user field data** = Google CrUX, actual Chrome visitors.

Structural and AI-search checks crawl up to 8 pages from your sitemap (a sample, not your full site). "Broken" means a link returned 404, 410, or 5xx, or did not respond; access-controlled pages (401, 403) are not counted.

02

Performance: phone, desktop, and real visitors

METRIC	MOBILE	DESKTOP	READ
TTFB (lab median)	63 ms	88 ms	LAB
FCP (lab median)	170 ms	206 ms	LAB
LCP (lab median)	170 ms	206 ms	GOOD
Page weight (median)	0.0 MB	0.0 MB	OK

Google Lighthouse (lab): Performance **99** mobile / **100** desktop, SEO **100**, Accessibility **83**, Best Practices **100**.

Lab numbers are from a headless mobile browser on an unthrottled connection: treat them as a floor, not a typical experience. Add a Google API key to light up real-user field data (CrUX) and Lighthouse scores.

03

Tiny buttons are hard to tap on mobile

1 of 10 tappable items on this page come in below 44×44 pixels, the size Apple and Google both recommend for reliable tapping on a phone. The same ones came up small on every one of the 4 test loads, so this is the page itself, not a fluke.

When customers can't tap what they expect to, they get frustrated and many of them leave. They don't file a bug. They don't try again. They just leave. A desktop dashboard can't see this because it's the difference between a thumb and a cursor.

The buttons measuring below the minimum on this scan:

- a 227x20 "max@mwjsautomations.com"

The fix is CSS-only on most sites: add padding around the icon (don't just change the icon size) so the actual tap area is at least 44×44 pixels. No redesign, no new assets.

04

Technical SEO & structured data

CHECK	RESULT
Title	MWJS Automations (16 chars)
Meta description	120 chars
H1	1 on page
Canonical	MISSING
Structured data (JSON-LD)	1 block(s)
Open Graph	INCOMPLETE

05

The fix checklist

Everything to fix, priority first, each tagged with the screen it affects and a rough effort. Work top to bottom.

☒ 3 form fields have no label BOTH VARIES

☒ Some text is low-contrast and hard to read BOTH VARIES

☒ Some buttons have no accessible name BOTH VARIES

☐ Security headers are missing or weak BOTH VARIES

☐ AI search crawlers are blocked BOTH VARIES

☐ **No XML sitemap found** BOTH VARIES

☐ **Search-result title is leaving room on the table** BOTH 1 LINE

☐ **No canonical tag, so duplicate URLs split the page's ranking** BOTH 1 LINE

☐ **Links to this page will look bare when shared** BOTH 1 LINE

☐ **2 form fields missing autocomplete hint** BOTH VARIES

☐ **No third-party analytics tag detected** BOTH DEV AFTERNOON

☐ **No email capture or newsletter detected** BOTH VARIES

☐ **No llms.txt file** BOTH VARIES

Effort is a rough read from the outside: "CSS only" means no new assets or backend work, "1 line" means a single tag, "Dev afternoon" means a developer needs to touch tracking or scripts.

06

What this report cannot tell you

Everything above is from the outside, looking at the page on a simulated phone and desktop. The questions that actually decide revenue need real visitors. Install the Harvv pixel (one script tag, 16 KB, zero personal data, no engineering project) and within about 72 hours you'd know which buttons real customers tapped and missed, how often Google Analytics is missing visits, and exactly where mobile shoppers stalled and left. This report shows you where to look. The pixel shows you how often it happens, and to whom.

07

How we did this, and what it can't prove

- **4 mobile + 2 desktop loads** of one URL from headless Chrome (iPhone viewport at 390px, desktop at 1366px), August 2, 2026. Enough loads to separate real defects from random noise, not a full-site crawl.

- **Lab numbers, not real-user numbers** (no field data was available for this run). Real devices on real networks run slower.
- **Friction is inferred, not counted.** We can prove a button is small. We can't, from the outside, count how often it causes a missed tap. That requires the pixel on a live page.

About Harvv, the source of this teardown

Harvv is a behavioral UX analytics platform (harvv.com). A lightweight JavaScript pixel captures how real visitors behave on a site (dead clicks, rage clicks, scroll depth, Core Web Vitals, JavaScript errors, and 50+ other signals) and the engine turns them into prioritized, plain-English findings. This teardown is the outside-in version of that: the same detectors run against a public page, with no pixel installed.

How to read it. Every finding here is a reproducible, automated measurement, not an opinion: element sizes, contrast ratios, load metrics, and structured-data checks that anyone can re-run against the same URL. The method is stated in full above. Automated testing catches a subset of issues, so this is a starting point, not a certification.

Full disclosure. Harvv makes the pixel that would measure the friction these findings imply, so we have a commercial interest. That is exactly why the findings are kept to things a reader can verify independently, and why nothing here is inflated: an unreproducible claim would undermine the tool it is meant to demonstrate.

Prepared by Harvv (harvv.com), a behavioral UX analytics platform. Last updated August 2, 2026.