Scott Tischler

FOUNDER & CHAIRMAN · AIRECOMMEND.AI

STRATEGY

The Switching Query: How AI Answers “Should I Leave My Current Provider?”

By Scott Tischler · October 18, 2026 · 9 min read

The switching query is its own animal, and most businesses optimize for the wrong one. When someone asks an AI "should I switch from [the provider I already use]?" they are not asking for alternatives and they are not asking for a neutral comparison. They've already committed to an incumbent. They're asking the AI to tell them whether leaving is worth the pain. That is a risk-and-regret calculation, not a feature chart — and if you understand what the AI is actually weighing, you can win the switch (or, if you're the incumbent, keep the customer the AI tells them to keep).

I think switching queries are one of the most under-served opportunities in AEO right now. Everybody writes "alternatives to X" pages and "X vs Y" pages. Almost nobody writes honestly for the person standing with one foot out the door. Here's how I'd approach it.

Why "switching" isn't "alternatives" or "comparison"

These three query types feel similar and are genuinely different, and the AI treats them differently:

- **The alternatives query** — "alternatives to X" — comes from someone who is shopping with an open mind. They may not use X at all. The AI's job is to produce a slate of options.
- **The comparison query** — "X vs Y" — comes from someone weighing two specific options, often before they've bought anything. The AI's job is to lay out trade-offs neutrally.
- **The switching query** — "should I switch from X," "is it worth leaving X," "X is frustrating me, what else is there" — comes from someone who already pays for X, has data in X, has habits built around X. The AI's job here is different: it's assessing whether the gain from leaving outweighs the cost and risk of the move.

That last framing is everything. The switcher has switching costs — migration effort, a learning curve, the risk the new thing is worse, the sunk cost of what they've already built. A good answer to a switching query doesn't just say "here's a better option." It says "here's whether leaving is worth it for someone in your situation." The AI is modeling regret, not just features.

What the AI is really doing: a risk calculation

When I read how engines handle switching questions, the answer almost always organizes itself around a few implicit factors, whether or not the user named them:

- **How painful is the move?** Can you migrate your data, keep your workflow, bring your history? The harder the move looks, the more the AI hedges toward "stay unless the problem is serious."
- **How real is the problem with the incumbent?** The AI wants to know if this is a genuine dealbreaker or mild annoyance. It weighs whether the frustration the user mentioned is actually solved by leaving.
- **Is the switch-to a safe landing?** A challenger with thin reputation, unclear track record, or no obvious migration path reads as risky, and the AI will warn the user accordingly.
- **Is this a known, well-trodden switch?** If "moving from X to Z" is a documented, common path with guides and real accounts of people doing it, the AI treats it as low-risk. If it's novel, it hedges.

So the AI is not asking "which product is better?" It's asking "will this specific person be glad they switched, or will they regret it?" Your content either answers that question for them or it doesn't.

If you're the challenger: become the safe place to land

If you want to win people away from an incumbent, your job is to lower perceived risk, not just raise perceived upside. The upside is the easy part — everyone claims it. The risk is what actually keeps people stuck. What I'd build:

- **An honest "switching from [incumbent]" page** for each major competitor people realistically leave. Not a hit piece — a clear-eyed account of who should switch, who shouldn't, what you gain, what you give up, and what the move actually involves. Honesty here is a competitive weapon, because the AI rewards content that acknowledges trade-offs over content that only sells.
- **A concrete migration path.** Spell out how data comes over, how long it takes, what breaks, what support exists. The single biggest switching cost is uncertainty. Remove it on the page and you remove it from the AI's risk calculation.
- **Proof that the switch goes well.** Real accounts of people who left X for you and were glad — because "is this a known, successful switch" is one of the factors the AI leans on. You want the move to look well-trodden, not experimental.
- **Clarity on who should NOT switch.** This sounds backwards and it's the strongest move you can make. When you tell the AI "if you need these three things, stay where you are," it trusts your recommendation for everyone else. Overclaiming gets you discounted; honest scoping gets you recommended.

My read: the challenger who writes the most honest switching content usually beats the challenger with the better feature list, because the AI is adjudicating regret, and honesty is the best regret-reducer there is.

If you're the incumbent: be the one AI says to keep

The switching query cuts both ways. For every customer an AI helps leave, it talks another one out of leaving. If you're the established player, you are not defenseless here — but you have to earn the "stay" recommendation. How:

- **Make your strengths legible.** If the reasons to stay with you aren't clearly stated somewhere the AI can read them, the AI can't cite them when someone's wobbling. Document what you're genuinely best at.
- **Address the common frustrations head-on.** The frustrations that trigger switching queries are usually predictable. Have honest content that acknowledges them and explains the fix, the roadmap, or the trade-off. Unaddressed complaints become the AI's reason to recommend leaving.
- **Own your switching-cost story.** It's legitimate to be clear about what a customer has invested and would have to rebuild. Framed honestly, that's not lock-in spin — it's the exact risk factor the AI is already weighing.

One thing I'd caution incumbents against: don't try to win switching queries by being defensive or by quietly disparaging the challengers. The AI reads that and discounts it, the same way it discounts a challenger who only sells upside. The incumbent that holds the line is the one that says, plainly, "here's who we're genuinely the best fit for, here's who might be better served elsewhere, and here's what you'd be giving up if you left." That kind of honesty is what makes the AI comfortable telling a wavering customer to stay — because it trusts a source that's willing to point some people toward the door. Defensiveness loses the recommendation; candor keeps it.

The signals that tell AI a switch is safe

Since the whole query turns on risk, it's worth being specific about the signals that make a move read as low-risk to an engine. These are the things I'd deliberately put in front of the AI if I wanted it to green-light switching to me:

- **Documented precedent.** Content that describes people making exactly this move — "we moved from X and here's how it went" — turns a scary, novel decision into a known path. The AI leans on the fact that others have done it and survived.

- **Reversibility.** If leaving you later would be easy — you don't trap data, there's an export, no punitive lock-in — say so. Counterintuitively, making it easy to leave you makes the AI more comfortable recommending that someone come to you, because the downside of being wrong is small.
- **Specific timelines and effort estimates.** "Most teams are fully migrated in a weekend" does more to defuse risk than any feature claim. Vagueness reads as risk; specificity reads as a solved problem.
- **Named support for the transition.** Migration help, a dedicated onboarding path, a checklist. The AI treats hand-holding during the move as a strong signal that the switch won't blow up on the user.

Every one of those is a risk-reducer, and risk is the currency of the switching query. Notice that none of them are about being better than the incumbent. They're about being *safer to move to*. That's a different content brief than most marketing teams are used to writing, and it's precisely why the slot is open.

The content that wins switching queries

If I had to reduce this to a single instruction: write for the person with one foot out the door, honestly, from both directions. Build the "switching from X" page and the "should you stay with us" case, and make both of them tell the truth about trade-offs. The switching query rewards candor more than almost any other query type, because it's the one where the user has the most to lose by believing a sales pitch — and the AI knows it.

This is still an early, under-contested space. Most of your competitors are busy fighting over "alternatives to" and "vs" pages while the highest-intent query — the person actively deciding whether to leave — goes unanswered. Answer it well and honestly, and you can own a slot that barely anyone is even trying for. That's my read, not a guarantee, but it's where I'd put the effort.

Key takeaways

- The switching query (“should I leave X?”) is distinct from alternatives and comparison queries: the user is already committed and is weighing regret, not shopping.
- AI answers switching queries as a risk calculation — how painful the move is, how real the problem is, how safe the landing is, and whether it's a well-trodden path.
- As the challenger, win by lowering perceived risk: honest “switching from X” pages, a concrete migration path, proof the switch goes well, and clarity on who shouldn't switch.

- Telling the AI who should NOT switch to you makes it trust your recommendation for everyone else. Overclaiming gets you discounted.
- As the incumbent, earn the “stay” recommendation by making your strengths legible and addressing predictable frustrations head-on.
- Switching queries reward candor more than any other query type — and almost nobody is optimizing for them yet.

Frequently asked questions

What is a switching query in AI search?

A switching query is when someone asks an AI whether they should leave a provider or product they already use — phrased as “should I switch from X,” “is it worth leaving X,” or “X is frustrating me, what else is there.” Unlike an alternatives or comparison query, the user is already committed, so the AI weighs the cost and risk of moving, not just which option is better.

How is a switching query different from a comparison query?

A comparison query (“X vs Y”) comes from someone weighing options before buying, and the AI lays out trade-offs neutrally. A switching query comes from an existing customer of X who has data, habits, and switching costs tied up in it. The AI's job shifts from comparing features to assessing whether the person will be glad they left or regret it.

How do I win switching queries as a smaller competitor?

Lower the perceived risk of moving to you. Publish an honest “switching from [incumbent]” page for each competitor people realistically leave, spell out a concrete migration path, show real proof that the switch goes well, and clearly state who should not switch. AI adjudicates regret on these queries, so candor about trade-offs beats a longer feature list.

About the author. Scott Tischler is the Founder & Chairman of AIrecommend.ai and a practitioner-authority on AI search and Answer Engine Optimization. With 20+ years in marketing technology — including American Express, MetLife, and UBS — and executive and professional study at Wharton, Harvard, and Oxford, he helps businesses become the ones AI recommends.

© 2026 Scott Tischler · scotttischler.com
scott@airecommend.ai · AIrecommend.ai