

Growth Diagnostic — sample report

An illustrative example of the output of a Growth Diagnostic. The business, figures and findings below are hypothetical and constructed for illustration. This is not a client report.

ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Business

UK home and interiors retailer. £22m group revenue, roughly 70% online. £1.8m annual marketing investment across paid search, paid social, affiliates and email, delivered by two agencies and a two-person in-house team.

Question the work had to answer

Revenue has been flat for five quarters while media investment has risen 18%. Three plans compete internally: increase paid budget, replatform the site, or rebuild the CRM programme. Which one, and why.

Shape

Three weeks. Seven lenses. Nine stakeholder interviews, platform and warehouse data, outside-in discovery review.

1. Growth System Scorecard

Each lens scored 1–5 on evidence, with the constraint marked.

Demand — 4 / 5

Category demand is stable and search volume for core ranges is growing modestly. There is room to grow into; demand is not the ceiling.

Discovery — 2 / 5 (contributing constraint)

Organic visibility is concentrated in low-intent content. Category and range pages are outranked by three competitors and two marketplaces. Brand search is flat, which caps everything downstream.

Acquisition — 3 / 5

Efficiency looks acceptable in-platform, but 41% of reported paid conversions are brand or returning-customer led. Genuinely incremental new-customer cost is materially higher than the reported figure.

Conversion — 3 / 5

Site conversion is at category norms. The considered-purchase journey (multi-visit, multi-device, offline validation) is not measured, so improvements are invisible in current reporting.

Retention — 2 / 5 (primary constraint)

Second-order rate is 19% against a 28–34% peer range for this category and price point. Contribution margin on returning revenue is 2.4× first-order margin, so the gap is expensive.

Measurement — 2 / 5

Three sources of truth disagree by up to 30%. Decisions are effectively being made on platform-reported returns.

Capability — 3 / 5

Delivery capability is adequate. Prioritisation is not owned by anyone above channel level, so each supplier optimises its own metric.

2. Growth Constraint Map

Primary constraint

Retention. The business is acquiring adequately and converting acceptably, then failing to earn a second order at the rate the category supports. Every acquisition improvement is therefore being spent to replace customers rather than to grow the base.

Downstream of it

Acquisition efficiency (lifetime value cannot support higher bids), measurement (no cohort view means the gap has stayed invisible), and the paid-budget case itself (more spend into a leaking base compounds the problem).

Explicitly ruled out

Replatforming. Site performance and conversion are at category norms; a replatform would consume two quarters of capacity and address none of the binding constraint. Documented so the argument does not return next quarter.

3. Opportunity Stack

Ranked by annual contribution value against effort and confidence. Values are illustrative.

01 — Lifecycle programme rebuilt around second order (High value / Medium effort / High confidence)

Moving second-order rate from 19% to 26% is worth an estimated £780k additional annual contribution at current volumes.

02 — Category and range page discovery (High value / Medium effort / Medium confidence)

Closing the visibility gap on the top 14 commercial terms is worth an estimated £310k annual contribution, and reduces paid dependency.

03 — Incrementality-based paid measurement (Medium value / Low effort / High confidence)

Reallocating spend away from non-incremental brand capture releases an estimated £190k of working media without reducing revenue.

04 — Single commercial reporting layer (Medium value / Medium effort / High confidence)

Not directly revenue-generating; it is the precondition for trusting the other three.

05 — Considered-purchase journey measurement (Medium value / Medium effort / Medium confidence)

Makes multi-visit behaviour readable, so conversion work stops being judged on a single-session model.

4. Stop / Fix / Scale / Test

Stop

Broad-match prospecting at current cost. Affiliate voucher placements that intercept existing intent. The replatform business case.

Fix

Lifecycle programme. Reporting layer. Post-purchase experience through to first replenishment or complementary purchase.

Scale

Paid search on non-brand commercial terms where incrementality holds. Range-level content that already ranks and converts.

Test

Second-order incentive structure. Geo-based paid social holdout. Category page depth on two ranges before rolling out.

5. 90-Day Growth Plan

Weeks 1–4

Stand up the commercial reporting layer and cohort view. Agree the second-order metric as the company-level growth measure. Stop the two lowest-value spend lines. Owner: Marketing Director.

Weeks 5–8

Rebuild the first-90-days lifecycle sequence around replenishment and complementary purchase. Launch the geo holdout on paid social. Owner: CRM lead with senior direction.

Weeks 9–13

Category and range page discovery work on the top 14 terms. Read the holdout and reallocate working media. Owner: Head of Digital.

What should have moved by day 90

Second-order rate on the most recent cohort, incremental new-customer cost, and a single reported contribution figure the leadership team agrees on.

6. 12-Month Roadmap

Quarter 2

Extend lifecycle to full customer value programme. Complete discovery work across remaining categories.

Quarter 3

Reallocate the media plan on incrementality evidence. Address the considered-purchase journey properly.

Quarter 4

Capability: prioritisation owned above channel level, supplier scorecards tied to contribution rather than channel metrics.

7. What we would have said no to

A retained engagement. With the constraint established and internal capability adequate, the honest recommendation was a 90-day sprint on the lifecycle programme, then a review. Reported here because the same standard applies to every diagnostic we run.

Illustrative sample only. Figures are constructed to demonstrate structure and reasoning, not drawn from any client engagement.