

Best AI Resume Builders 2026: Tested and Ranked

We tested every major AI resume builder against real job descriptions and ATS parsers. Here are the seven that actually earn a spot in your job search.

Most AI resume builders are wrappers around a generic LLM call with a template picker on top. A few are genuinely useful — they parse job descriptions properly, score against ATS heuristics that match what employers actually use, and export DOCX/PDF files that survive round-trips through Workday and Greenhouse.

We ran seven tools through the same test: three real job descriptions (a senior backend role, a product marketing role, and a data science role), one starting resume, and a check of the exported file in a real ATS parser. Ranking is quality-first. Cheaper tools beat pricier ones where they earned it.

1. Teal — Score: 9.2/10

Teal is the closest thing to an actual job-search operating system. The AI tailoring produces edits that read like a careful human wrote them, not a thesaurus explosion. Its job tracker + resume matcher combo is the reason it stays open in a tab for weeks at a time during a real search. ATS export is clean; the DOCX round-trips without formatting collapse.

Best for: Active job seekers running 20+ applications who want tailoring, tracking, and match scoring in one place.

Pricing: Free tier is genuinely usable. Teal+ is \$9/week or \$29/month for unlimited AI generations and match scoring.

2. Rezi — Score: 8.8/10

Rezi is the tool to pick if ATS pass-through is your only concern. Its content generator is more conservative than competitors — that reads as "boring" until you notice it never invents responsibilities or fabricates metrics. The real-time content analyzer catches passive voice, weak verbs, and missing quantification as you type. Templates are limited but every one of them parses cleanly.

Best for: Engineers, analysts, and anyone applying to Fortune 500 companies with strict ATS pipelines.

Pricing: \$29/month or \$149 lifetime. The lifetime deal is the best value in this roundup if you expect to job-search more than once.

3. Kickresume — Score: 8.5/10

Kickresume has the largest template library of the group and the design quality is genuinely better than Canva-tier competitors. The AI writer produces solid first drafts and the cover letter generator matches tone to the job posting reasonably well. Loses points on ATS: some templates use text-in-columns layouts that parse badly in older systems.

Best for: Design-forward roles, creative industries, and portfolios where visual quality signals competence.

Pricing: Free with watermark. Pro is \$19/month billed monthly or \$6/month annual.

4. Enhancv — Score: 8.3/10

Enhancv focuses on "beyond bullet points" — you can add sections for values, passions, and my-time visualizations. This helps for early-career and career-change resumes where the standard chronological format leaves too much unsaid. The AI content suggestions are strong for soft-skill framing. Weaker on technical roles where the extra sections read as filler.

Best for: Career switchers, early-career candidates, and anyone whose story doesn't fit a straight timeline.

Pricing: Free tier with limited exports. Pro is \$24.99/month or \$16.65/month billed quarterly.

5. Resumeworded — Score: 8.0/10

Resume Worded is less of a builder and more of a scorer. Upload your existing resume and get a line-by-line critique with specific rewrite suggestions. Its LinkedIn optimizer is genuinely good — one of the few tools that gives useful feedback on the About section rather than generic "add more keywords" advice. Pair it with an actual builder rather than treating it as one.

Best for: Polishing an existing resume, LinkedIn optimization, and getting a second opinion before you send.

Pricing: Free for basic scoring. Pro is \$49/month, \$19/month annual — pricey for what it does unless the LinkedIn tools pay off.

6. Jobscan — Score: 7.8/10

Jobscan is the ATS-matching workhorse. Paste your resume and a job description and it tells you exactly which keywords are missing and which are underweighted. The recommendations are mechanical but accurate. The builder itself is basic — most users treat Jobscan as a checker and draft their resume elsewhere.

Best for: Keyword optimization against specific job postings, and understanding what recruiters' ATS filters actually catch.

Pricing: 2 free scans/month. Premium is \$49.95/month or \$29.99/month annual.

7. Zety — Score: 7.2/10

Zety has the polish of a decade-old product and it shows in the UX. Templates are professional, the guided builder is friendly to non-technical users, and the AI content library covers most common roles. The reason it lands at #7 is pricing friction: exporting a completed resume requires a paid plan, which surprises users after they've invested an hour building it.

Best for: Non-technical users who want maximum hand-holding and don't mind paying to export.

Pricing: Free to build; \$5.99 for 14-day access or \$23.70/month for full features.

Comparison Table

Tool	Score	ATS Quality	Best For	Starting Price
Teal	9.2	Excellent	Active job seekers	Free / \$9 wk
Rezi	8.8	Best-in-class	ATS-heavy pipelines	\$29/mo
Kickresume	8.5	Good	Design-forward roles	\$6/mo annual
Enhancv	8.3	Good	Career changers	\$16.65/mo
Resumeworded	8.0	N/A (scorer)	Polish + LinkedIn	\$19/mo annual
Jobscan	7.8	Excellent (checker)	Keyword tuning	\$29.99/mo annual
Zety	7.2	Good	Non-technical users	\$5.99 / 14 days

Final Picks

If you're actively job-searching: Teal. The tracker + tailoring combo will save you hours per week and the free tier goes further than any competitor's.

If you want the strongest ATS output: Rezi, and pay for the lifetime plan if you expect to job-search again in the next few years.

If you already have a resume you like: Run it through Jobscan against each specific job description and use Resumeworded to sharpen the language. Skip the builders entirely.

If you're changing careers or early in one: Enhancv gives you room to tell the story a chronological resume can't.

The pattern across all seven: the AI is now good enough that content quality is table stakes. The differentiation lives in workflow — how the tool fits into an actual job search over weeks, not how impressive the first-draft output looks in a demo.