

LP Pattern Intelligence Report v2

Pillow / sleep-accessory competitive landing-page audit, 17-variable deep analysis.

0. Methodology & Dataset

Dataset: 255 unique competitor landing pages (LPs) extracted with structured persuasion variables in `outputs/phase1_extractions/`. Each LP joined to the underlying Meta-ad observable metrics from `outputs/ad_features.csv` and `raw_ads/apify_meta_ads_library_pillows_v2.json`.

Observable metrics available per LP (best across all ads pointing to that LP):

- `days_running` (max across linked ads) — **available for 100% of LPs**
- `active_variants` (collationCount per linked ad) — **available**
- `placements_count` (count of publisher platforms: facebook / instagram / audience_network / messenger) — **available**
- `reach` — **NOT available** (Meta only exposes reachEstimate for political/issue ads in this dataset; 0 coverage)
- `impressions` — **NOT available** (same reason; 0 coverage)

Scoring formula adjustment (reach + impressions missing):

Original spec was 35/25/20/10/10 (days / variants / placements / reach / impressions). With reach + impressions absent, weight redistributed proportionally:

Metric	Original	Adjusted
Days running	35%	44%
Active variants	25%	31%
Placements	20%	25%
Reach	10%	0%
Impressions	10%	0%

Each metric is converted to a 0–100 percentile rank against the full pool (n=255), then averaged across all LPs in a category, then weighted. Final **Observed Strength Score** ranges 0–100.

Confidence caveat: Days-running is necessarily the dominant signal. This biases the score toward "this ad cluster has survived" rather than "this is currently scaling." Variants and placements partially correct for that, but a high score still cannot prove ROAS — only that competitors are leaving the pattern up and diversifying it.

Reference thresholds (computed from this dataset):

- Long-running = `days_running` \geq **173 days** (top quartile)
- Multi-variant = `variants` \geq **2** (top quartile)
- Median days running across dataset: **113**
- Median variants: **1**
- Median placements: **5** (i.e., most ads run on all 4 Meta platforms; FB+IG+AN+Messenger is the default)

Brand concentration warning: A few advertisers run very large LP/ad portfolios. Notable concentration: mellowsleep-com (multi-variant, advertorial-Curiosity), saybrooksleep-com (Direct-Offer, 840 days), sidneysleep-com (590 days), theorthocushion-com (892 days), retailers-mediflow-com (financing focus). Where a "strong" pattern is $\geq 30\%$ from one brand, flagged as **advertiser-specific** inflation.

Funnel mix: final_lp 151 (59%), standalone 51 (20%), bridge 46 (18%), unknown 7 (3%). **LP page type mix:** product_page 112 (44%), advertorial 36 (14%), lead_capture 28 (11%), collection_page 20 (8%), marketplace 15 (6%), listicle 15 (6%), landing_page 13 (5%), other 11, quiz 5. **Advertorial bridges identified:** 54 of 255 (21%).

VARIABLE 1 — Copywriting Framework

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Copywriting Framework (primary_framework)
- **Unique categories:** 14
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Direct-Offer	97	38.0%	44.6%	30.8%	116	1	5	63.3	Common but neutral
2	Problem-Solution	47	18.4%	18.5%	23.1%	95	1	5	65.1	Common and neutral
3	FAB (Feature-Advantage-Benefit)	24	9.4%	13.8%	6.4%	138	1	5	69.4	Common and strong
4	Story-Problem-Solution	20	7.8%	6.2%	7.7%	128	1	5	67.3	Common and strong
5	News-Hook-Problem-Solution	17	6.7%	4.6%	7.7%	106	1	5	64.9	Common but neutral
6	Other	16	6.3%	4.6%	7.7%	85	1	4	53.3	Common but weak
7	Curiosity	15	5.9%	6.2%	12.8%	129	2	5	75.3	Common and strong (outlier risk)

8	Reason-List (3/5/7)	12	4.7%	0.0%	1.3%	127	1	5	67.5	Common but niche-saturated
9	Authority-Driven	2	0.8%	1.5%	0%	163	1	3.5	62.0	Rare
10	Ranking-List	1	0.4%	0%	0%	63	1	2	33.2	Rare

Strongest co-occurring: Direct-Offer ↔ Discount offer (88%), Add-to-Cart CTA, Benefit headline, product_page; Problem-Solution ↔ Problem-Callout opening, Comfort-Concerns objection; Story-Problem-Solution ↔ advertorial page type, Empathetic/Journalistic tone. **Weakest co-occurring:** Direct-Offer ↔ Story-Open opening, advertorial page type.

Practical note: Direct-Offer dominates because most LPs are product pages (44% of dataset are product_pages). Product pages = direct-offer by default.

Synthesis after Top 10:

- *Default market behavior:* Direct-Offer (38%) + Problem-Solution (18%) = 56% of all LPs. This is the floor — everyone does it.
- *Overused:* Direct-Offer. Score (63.3) is below the median strong-pattern score even though frequency is 2x the runner-up. Pure ubiquity, not strength.
- *Common AND strong:* FAB, Story-Problem-Solution. These have meaningful adoption (24 + 20 LPs) AND score above the dataset median.
- *Frequent but weak:* "Other" and the very-rare singletons. Direct-Offer is *not* weak (mid-pack) but is undifferentiated.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns (Observed Strength Score)

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Curiosity	75.3	152 / 129	2.4 / 2	4.5 / 5	Outlier-driven: 5/15 LPs are mellowsleep-com (advertorial cluster running 234 days, 7 variants each). Strong but advertiser-specific.
2	FAB	69.4	161 / 138	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Broad-based. Spread across brands. Strong and repeatable.
3	Reason-List-3-5-7	67.5	130 / 127	1.1 / 1	4.9 / 5	Concentrated on listicle page-type; works inside that format. Strong but niche.
4	Story-Problem-Solution	67.3	174 / 128	1.3 / 1	5.0 / 5	Bound to advertorial format (17/20 are advertorials). Strong inside the advertorial channel only.
5	Problem-Solution	65.1	134 / 95	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Broad-based. Strong and repeatable.

6	News-Hook-Problem-Solution	64.9	150 / 106	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Advertorial-bound (16/17 are advertorials). Strong but format-locked.
7	Direct-Offer	63.3	169 / 116	1.5 / 1	4.6 / 5	Strength comes from long-tail oldies (saybrooksleep 840 days, theorthocushion 892). Median is only 116 days. Strong only at the long tail; weak in median case.
8	Authority-Driven	62.0	163 / 163	1.0 / 1	3.5 / 3.5	n=2 → Sample too small for confidence.
9	Problem-Solution-List	60.3	59 / 59	5.0 / 5	5.0 / 5	n=1 → too small.
10	Testimonial	60.5	78 / 78	1 / 1	5 / 5	n=1 → too small.

Synthesis after Top 10 Strongest:

- *Strong AND highly repeated*: FAB, Story-Problem-Solution, Problem-Solution. The reliable, scalable foundations.
- *Strong but not common*: Curiosity (n=15) — appears strong but inflated by one advertiser; Reason-List (n=12) — only works in listicle LPs.
- *Hidden opportunities*: Authority-Driven only has 2 LPs but both ran 162+ days. White-space worth a test. News-Hook-Problem-Solution sits at strong-and-repeated boundary inside advertorials; if you run advertorial bridges, this is the proven scaffold.
- *Test first*: Story-Problem-Solution (proven in advertorials, lots of competitors hold it, can be modeled directly).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both repeated AND strong**: FAB, Story-Problem-Solution, Problem-Solution, News-Hook-Problem-Solution. **These are the safe-bet frameworks.**
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Direct-Offer (38% of LPs, only mid-pack on score). Frequency ≠ effectiveness here.
3. **Strong but not repeated**: Authority-Driven (n=2). Curiosity is borderline — moderately repeated, strong score but advertiser-inflated.
4. **Inflated by one advertiser/campaign**: Curiosity framework — 5/15 from mellowssleep-com (33% concentration). Strip those out and the score collapses.
5. **White-space**: Authority-Driven, true Reason-List on non-listicle LPs, and Curiosity used outside the advertorial template.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings (≥173 days)**: Direct-Offer + Benefit headline + Direct-Offer/Benefit-Promise opening + Add-to-Cart + Money-Back-Guarantee. This is the "evergreen product-page rig."
- **Multi-variant pairings (≥2 variants)**: Curiosity framework + Curiosity-Open + Bundle offer + Empathetic tone (≈ the advertorial cluster).
- **Placement breadth**: FAB, Problem-Solution, News-Hook-Problem-Solution all run on ≥5 placements consistently. Direct-Offer drops a placement on average — partly because lead_capture LPs are sometimes desktop-leaning.
- **Common but weak pairing**: Direct-Offer × Sign-Up CTA × lead_capture page (mid-funnel popups not built to scale).

- **Rare but strong pairing:** Curiosity framework × advertorial × Empathetic tone × Bundle offer (mellowsleep template).

By awareness level: Direct-Offer concentrates in product_aware (most product pages); Problem-Solution skews problem_aware; Story-Problem-Solution dominates problem_aware via advertorial. **By format:** Listicle → Reason-List. Advertorial → Story-Problem-Solution or News-Hook-Problem-Solution. Product page → Direct-Offer or FAB.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but unexpectedly strong:** Authority-Driven (n=2, both >162 days). Both LPs are doctor-recommended single-product pages — worth verifying as a copywriting angle.
- **Common but underwhelming:** "Other" framework (n=16, score 53). Likely a bucket for poorly-classifiable copy with no clear strategy.
- **Distorted by outliers:** Direct-Offer's mean days (169) is pulled up by 4 LPs running >550 days (theorthocushion, saybrooksleeep ×3, www-amazon, getnora). Median (116) is the more honest read.
- **Pattern-breaking:** plutopillow-com runs Problem-Solution-List with 5 variants but only 59 days — recent push, not yet evergreen.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Direct-Offer for product pages, Problem-Solution for any other page type.
- **Strongest data-backed:** FAB and Story-Problem-Solution (both broad-based, both above-median scores).
- **Overused:** Direct-Offer pure plays without proof scaffold. Half the LPs are this; only the best 25% survive.
- **Underused but promising:** Authority-Driven, News-Hook-Problem-Solution outside advertorials, Reason-List on non-listicle LPs.
- **Misleading by frequency alone:** Direct-Offer (looks dominant; isn't actually winning).
- **Model:** FAB and Story-Problem-Solution. They have volume AND staying power AND multi-advertiser adoption.
- **Test carefully:** Curiosity framework — strip the mellowsleep template, what's left? Test independently with your own creative.
- **Avoid over-copying:** Pure Direct-Offer with no mechanism, no proof, no objection handling.

H. Confidence Level

High confidence. 100% data coverage, large sample size, signals consistent across multiple observable metrics, top patterns broad-based (not single-brand).

VARIABLE 2 — Headline Formula

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Headline Formula
- **Unique categories:** 15
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Benefit	143	56.1%	67.7%	48.7%	128	1	5	63.8	Common but saturated
2	Other	23	9.0%	9.2%	11.5%	85	1	5	59.1	Common but weak
3	Curiosity	21	8.2%	10.8%	14.1%	106	2	5	73.7	Common and strong
4	Number-List	16	6.3%	0%	6.4%	88	1	5	64.4	Common but short-lived
5	News-Journalistic	15	5.9%	4.6%	7.7%	114	1	5	63.2	Common but neutral
6	Problem	9	3.5%	1.5%	2.6%	107	1	5	65.8	Rare
7	Secret-Revelation	7	2.7%	1.5%	1.3%	128	1	5	67.5	Rare but solid
8	Story-Teaser	6	2.4%	1.5%	2.6%	82	1	5	63.0	Rare
9	Question	5	2.0%	1.5%	0%	113	1	5	70.0	Rare but strong
10	Warning	4	1.6%	1.5%	1.3%	127	1	5	73.8	Rare but strong

Strongest co-occurring: Benefit ↔ Direct-Offer framework, Add-to-Cart, Money-Back-Guarantee; Curiosity ↔ Curiosity framework + Curiosity-Open + advertorial; Warning ↔ Problem-Callout + Empathetic tone + Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief. **Weakest co-occurring:** Benefit ↔ Curiosity-Open, Story-Open openings (mismatched).

Practical note: Benefit headlines are the default because they are the lowest-risk choice and Meta-compliant. Everyone defaults here.

Synthesis after Top 10:

- *Default:* Benefit (56%). Floor.
- *Overused:* Benefit. Holds the largest share AND the median position. No edge.
- *Common AND strong:* Curiosity headlines (n=21, 73.7 score) — only formula with both volume and high score.
- *Frequent but weak:* "Other" (n=23, score 59) — catch-all garbage bucket; Number-List headlines have 0% long-runners (none survive past 173 days).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Warning	73.8	130 / 127	1.0 / 1	4.8 / 5	n=4 → Sample small but consistent. All run 127–135 days. Promising.
2	Curiosity	73.7	142 / 106	2.7 / 2	4.9 / 5	Outlier-amplified (mellowsleep, hiquo, benifabrics cluster). Still broad-based enough.
3	Testimonial	72.5	117 / 117	2 / 2	5 / 5	n=2 → too small.
4	Question	70.0	137 / 113	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=5 → small but coherent.
5	Secret-Revelation	67.5	142 / 128	1.0 / 1	4.9 / 5	n=7 → solid. Strong but niche.
6	Problem	65.8	113 / 107	1.0 / 1	4.9 / 5	n=9. Modest strength, broad base.
7	Number-List	64.4	96 / 88	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Tied to listicle LPs. Short median life.
8	Benefit	63.8	168 / 128	1.4 / 1	4.6 / 5	Mid-pack despite volume. Tail-dragged by oldies.
9	News-Journalistic	63.2	121 / 114	1.7 / 1	4.7 / 5	Advertorial-bound.
10	Story-Teaser	63.0	92 / 82	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	Weakest among true-headline types. Doesn't survive.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Curiosity, Benefit (volume version). Benefit is the only one with both mass and acceptable score.
- *Strong but not common*: Warning, Question, Secret-Revelation. White-space candidates if scaled.
- *Hidden opportunity*: Warning headlines (only 4 LPs, but all are doctor/expert-toned, all long-running, all on 5 placements). Worth modeling.
- *Test first*: Curiosity (validate without copying mellowsleep), Warning (treat as new white-space).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Curiosity. The only frequent + strong formula.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Benefit (saturated), Number-List (short median life), News-Journalistic (mid-score).
3. **Strong but rare**: Warning, Question, Secret-Revelation.
4. **Inflated**: Curiosity (mellowsleep cluster influence). Warning, Question are too small to inflate.
5. **White-space**: Warning headlines on product pages (vs the advertorial-only default), Question-headline product pages.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Benefit + Direct-Offer + Money-Back-Guarantee (the evergreen rig). Curiosity + Story-Problem-Solution + advertorial.
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Curiosity (var_med=2), Testimonial (var_med=2). All other headline types median variant = 1.
- **Cross-placement:** All top headline formulas run 5 placements consistently — placement is not the differentiator.
- **Common but weak:** Benefit + Sign-Up CTA + lead_capture (popups don't scale).
- **Rare but strong:** Warning + Problem-Callout + Empathetic + Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Warning (n=4) running 127+ days each.
- **Common but underwhelming:** Number-List (16 LPs but 0% in the long-running bucket — clearly a short-life format).
- **Outlier-distorted:** Curiosity's mean days (142) inflated by mellowsleep's 234-day cluster. Median 106 is the honest read.
- **Pattern-breaking:** "Testimonial" headlines (n=2) — score 72.5 looks great but n is too small.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Benefit headline (everywhere).
- **Strongest data-backed (broad):** Curiosity, then Benefit by volume.
- **Overused:** Benefit alone. Mediocre.
- **Underused but promising:** Warning, Question, Secret-Revelation — all small but coherent, with above-median days running.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Benefit dominates the dataset but doesn't dominate the score sheet.
- **Model:** Benefit (as floor) + Curiosity (as differentiator), with Warning and Question as next-test candidates.
- **Test carefully:** Curiosity (without mellowsleep's exact wording).
- **Avoid:** Generic Benefit headlines with no specificity (most LPs).

H. Confidence Level

High confidence on Benefit, Curiosity, Number-List (large samples). **Medium confidence** on Warning, Question, Secret-Revelation (small but coherent samples). **Low confidence** on Testimonial, Comparison (n≤2).

VARIABLE 3 — Opening Type

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Opening Type
- **Unique categories:** 14
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Benefit-Promise	70	27.5%	33.8%	25.6%	102	1	5	62.4	Common but saturated
2	Problem-Callout	57	22.4%	20.0%	23.1%	126	1	5	68.6	Common and strong
3	Direct-Offer	53	20.8%	24.6%	19.2%	129	1	5	63.7	Common but neutral
4	Curiosity-Open	14	5.5%	4.6%	12.8%	95	3	5	74.4	Outlier-driven
5	Story-Open	11	4.3%	4.6%	6.4%	105	1	5	67.8	Common but niche
6	Direct-Hook	10	3.9%	1.5%	1.3%	97	1	4	56.9	Weak
7	Other	9	3.5%	3.1%	2.6%	92	1	5	57.1	Weak
8	Personal-Experience	7	2.7%	0%	1.3%	128	1	5	60.8	Rare
9	Question-Open	7	2.7%	1.5%	1.3%	129	1	5	69.0	Rare but strong
10	Testimonial-Open	5	2.0%	1.5%	0%	137	1	5	65.6	Rare

Strongest co-occurring: Benefit-Promise ↔ Direct-Offer framework, Benefit headline, product_page; Problem-Callout ↔ Problem-Solution framework, Comfort-Concerns/Doesnt-Work objection, Pain-Relief desire; Curiosity-Open ↔ advertorial + Empathetic tone + Bundle. **Weakest co-occurring:** Direct-Hook ↔ no strong partner (often appears as outlier copy without scaffold).

Practical note: The top 3 openings (Benefit-Promise / Problem-Callout / Direct-Offer) account for 71% of all LPs. Everything else is the long tail.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Benefit-Promise (28%) + Direct-Offer (21%) ≈ half the market.
- *Overused:* Benefit-Promise (lots of LPs, mid-pack score).
- *Common AND strong:* Problem-Callout (22% AND 68.6 score). The most data-validated opening style.
- *Frequent but weak:* Direct-Hook, "Other" — both score below 60 with negligible long-running share.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/med	Var mean/med	Plac mean/med	Notes

1	Curiosity-Open	74.4	138 / 95	4.0 / 3	4.7 / 5	9/14 LPs are mellow-sleep-com (64%). Score driven entirely by one advertiser's 7-variant template. Advertiser-specific.
2	Question-Open	69.0	153 / 129	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=7. Small but coherent, broad-based. Strong but niche.
3	Problem-Callout	68.6	158 / 126	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong AND repeated. Cleanest signal in this variable. Spread across many brands.
4	Story-Open	67.8	124 / 105	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	Bound to advertorial format. Strong inside that channel.
5	News-Hook	66.2	67 / 61	1.2 / 1	4.8 / 5	n=5. Days median is only 61 — short-lived hook.
6	Testimonial-Open	65.6	144 / 137	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=5. Small but stable.
7	Direct-Offer	63.7	172 / 129	1.4 / 1	4.5 / 5	Score tail-dragged by oldies.
8	Benefit-Promise	62.4	156 / 102	1.3 / 1	4.8 / 5	Mid-pack despite volume.
9	Personal-Experience	60.8	121 / 128	1.0 / 1	4.9 / 5	Rare, neutral.
10	Other	57.1	116 / 92	1.2 / 1	4.4 / 5	Bucket of weak/poorly-classified opens.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND highly repeated:* **Problem-Callout** — the only opening type with both meaningful frequency (22%) AND a top-tier score. **Model this.**
- *Strong but not common:* Question-Open, Story-Open, Testimonial-Open.
- *Hidden opportunity:* Question-Open (n=7) is broad-based and runs 129+ days median. Worth modeling.
- *Test first:* Problem-Callout (high volume + high strength = lowest-risk to copy).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both:** Problem-Callout. Top of the class.
2. **Repeated but not strong:** Benefit-Promise (saturated), Direct-Offer (mid).
3. **Strong but not repeated:** Question-Open, Story-Open, Testimonial-Open.
4. **Inflated:** Curiosity-Open is the most extreme inflation in this entire report — 64% concentration in one brand. Discount its score heavily.
5. **White-space:** Question-Open on product pages (currently rare), Personal-Experience openings (n=7 but median 128 days — undertested).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Problem-Callout + Problem-Solution framework + Money-Back-Guarantee + Skepticism objection.
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Curiosity-Open (variants median = 3, all mellowsleep). Outside that, Problem-Callout and Story-Open occasionally have 2 variants.
- **By page type:** Benefit-Promise → product page; Problem-Callout → product page or landing_page; Curiosity-Open → advertorial; Story-Open → advertorial; Direct-Offer → product page or lead_capture.
- **By tone:** Problem-Callout → Empathetic or Direct-Salesy; Curiosity-Open → Empathetic; Direct-Offer → Direct-Salesy.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Question-Open.
- **Common but underwhelming:** Benefit-Promise — half the LPs use it, score is below median.
- **Distorted by outliers:** Curiosity-Open (mellowsleep). Direct-Offer (theorthocushion 892 days).
- **Pattern-breaking:** A few Personal-Experience opens running 128+ days suggest the format has legs, but volume is too low to confirm.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Benefit-Promise / Direct-Offer opens on product pages.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Problem-Callout.
- **Overused:** Benefit-Promise.
- **Underused but promising:** Question-Open, Personal-Experience, Testimonial-Open.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Direct-Offer.
- **Model:** Problem-Callout first; Question-Open or Story-Open for differentiation.
- **Test carefully:** Curiosity-Open — without mellowsleep's exact template, may collapse.
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic Benefit-Promise openings.

H. Confidence Level

High confidence on Problem-Callout, Benefit-Promise, Direct-Offer (large samples, broad-based). **Low confidence** on Curiosity-Open (heavy concentration in one brand). **Medium confidence** on Question-Open and Story-Open.

VARIABLE 4 — Big Idea Cluster

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Big Idea Cluster (normalized from raw big_idea text via keyword pattern matching)
- **Unique categories:** 13
- **Usable records:** 253 (99.2%)
- **Missing:** 2 (0.8%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
------	---------	---	---	-----	-----	----------	---------	----------	-------	-------

1	Sleep-Quality	74	29.0%	35.4%	34.6%	110	1	5	67.0	Common and strong
2	Other-Big-Idea	67	26.3%	23.1%	21.8%	95	1	5	58.6	Common but weak
3	NeckPain-Relief	57	22.4%	23.1%	19.2%	128	1	5	66.6	Common and strong
4	Discount-Savings	30	11.8%	7.7%	15.4%	110	1	5	67.4	Common and strong
5	Travel-Portable	7	2.7%	1.5%	1.3%	85	1	5	59.6	Rare
6	Pressure-Relief	5	2.0%	1.5%	3.8%	128	2	5	74.2	Rare but strong
7	Luxury-Premium	4	1.6%	3.1%	0%	155	1	2.5	60.8	Rare
8	Snoring-Stop	2	0.8%	0%	0%	165	1	5	77.9	Too small, but median days = 165
9	Memory-Foam-Tech	2	0.8%	1.5%	0%	529	1	4.5	75.6	Too small but extreme tenure
10	Pregnancy-Body	2	0.8%	1.5%	1.3%	412	2	2	60.5	Too small but long tenure

Strongest co-occurring: Sleep-Quality ↔ Better-Sleep desire, Hope emotion; NeckPain-Relief ↔ Spine-Alignment mechanism, Pain-Relief desire, Empathetic tone; Discount-Savings ↔ Direct-Offer framework, Get-Discount CTA. **Weakest co-occurring:** Big-idea consistency is low for "Other" bucket (no consistent pairings).

Practical note: 81% of all LPs cluster into just 4 big ideas (Sleep, Neck-Pain, Discount, "Other"). Big-idea differentiation is nearly absent.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Sleep-Quality OR NeckPain-Relief OR Discount-as-Promise.
- *Overused:* Sleep-Quality, NeckPain-Relief — both saturated at ~25% each.
- *Common AND strong:* All three top non-"Other" buckets are strong (66+ scores).
- *Frequent but weak:* "Other-Big-Idea" — large bucket but the lowest score in the top 5.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Snoring-Stop	77.9	165 / 165	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=2 → too small.

2	Memory-Foam-Tech	75.6	529 / 529	1.0 / 1	4.5 / 4.5	n=2 → distorted by 1+ very-old LP.
3	Pressure-Relief	74.2	154 / 128	1.6 / 2	5.0 / 5	n=5 → small but coherent.
4	Discount-Savings	67.4	138 / 110	1.5 / 1	5.0 / 5	Strong and repeated.
5	Sleep-Quality	67.0	152 / 110	1.7 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated.
6	NeckPain-Relief	66.6	167 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated.
7	Luxury-Premium	60.8	207 / 155	1.0 / 1	2.5 / 2.5	n=4 → small, low placements.
8	Travel-Portable	59.6	124 / 85	1.4 / 1	4.6 / 5	Niche.
9	Other-Big-Idea	58.6	124 / 95	1.4 / 1	4.4 / 5	Bucket of weak / unclassifiable ideas.
10	Pregnancy-Body	60.5	412 / 412	1.5 / 2	2.0 / 2.0	n=2 → small but extremely long tenure on 1 brand.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND highly repeated*: Sleep-Quality, NeckPain-Relief, Discount-Savings. The three core hooks.
- *Strong but not common*: Pressure-Relief (n=5), Snoring-Stop and Memory-Foam-Tech (each n=2 — undertested but extreme tenure).
- *Hidden opportunities*: Pressure-Relief (only 5 LPs but 128-day median); Snoring-Stop (only 2 but 165-day tenure each). Both look like underutilized but proven angles.
- *Test first*: Sleep-Quality (highest combination of frequency + score), then Pressure-Relief as differentiated wedge.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Sleep-Quality, NeckPain-Relief, Discount-Savings.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: "Other-Big-Idea" — 26% of dataset, lowest score among top buckets.
3. **Strong but rare**: Pressure-Relief, Snoring-Stop, Memory-Foam-Tech, Pregnancy-Body.
4. **Inflated**: Memory-Foam-Tech (1 of 2 LPs runs 720 days). Pregnancy-Body (1 brand at 412 days).
5. **White-space**: Snoring-Stop, Pressure-Relief, Pregnancy-Body specifically — all underused with proven tenure.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: NeckPain-Relief + Spine-Alignment + Pain-Relief + Money-Back-Guarantee. The pain-product canonical rig.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Sleep-Quality + Bundle. Pressure-Relief slightly skewed to multi-variant.
- **By awareness**: Sleep-Quality → problem_aware; NeckPain-Relief → problem_aware or solution_aware; Discount-Savings → product_aware.
- **By tone**: NeckPain-Relief → Empathetic; Discount-Savings → Direct-Salesy/Urgent.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Pressure-Relief, Snoring-Stop.
- **Common but underwhelming:** "Other" bucket (catch-all weak ideas).
- **Distorted by outliers:** Memory-Foam-Tech (one 720-day LP). Pregnancy-Body (one 552-day LP).
- **Pattern-breaking:** Luxury-Premium runs ≈ 155 days at only 2.5 placement median — suggests a focused-channel strategy.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Sleep, neck pain, discount — three big ideas split the market.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Sleep-Quality (volume + score).
- **Overused:** All three top buckets are crowded.
- **Underused but promising:** Snoring, Pressure-Relief, Pregnancy-Body, Memory-Foam-Tech-as-mechanism-hook.
- **Misleading by frequency:** "Other-Big-Idea" — large but low-strength.
- **Model:** Sleep + Neck-Pain as foundation.
- **Test carefully:** Snoring-Stop and Pressure-Relief (small samples, but signals are loud).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic "better sleep" promises with no specificity.

H. Confidence Level

High for Sleep-Quality, NeckPain-Relief, Discount-Savings (large samples). **Medium** for Pressure-Relief, Travel-Portable (n=5–7). **Low** for Snoring-Stop, Memory-Foam-Tech, Luxury-Premium, Pregnancy-Body (n \leq 4).

VARIABLE 5 — Unique Mechanism

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Unique Mechanism (mechanisms; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 21
- **Usable records:** 248 (97.3%)
- **Missing:** 7 (2.7%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Contoured-Shape	74	29.0%	40.0%	34.6%	95	1	5	68.1	Common and strong
2	Memory-Foam	69	27.1%	33.8%	23.1%	130	1	5	62.6	Common but neutral

3	Other	63	24.7%	20.0%	24.4%	98	1	5	60.4	Common but weak
4	Spine-Alignment	55	21.6%	21.5%	23.1%	129	1	5	69.0	Common and strong
5	None-Stated	48	18.8%	20.0%	17.9%	128	1	5	66.8	Common but neutral
6	Adjustable-Loft	40	15.7%	15.4%	10.3%	128	1	5	65.8	Common and neutral
7	Orthopedic-Alignment	32	12.5%	13.8%	19.2%	128	1	5	70.4	Common and strong
8	Neck-Cradle	31	12.2%	7.7%	11.5%	125	1	5	67.8	Common and neutral
9	Cooling-Gel	31	12.2%	12.3%	12.8%	128	1	5	61.4	Common but neutral
10	Breathable-Cover	23	9.0%	9.2%	12.8%	105	1	5	67.8	Common and neutral

Strongest co-occurring: Memory-Foam ↔ Contoured-Shape (frequently bundled), Spine-Alignment; Spine-Alignment ↔ Orthopedic-Alignment, NeckPain-Relief big idea, Doctor-Endorsed claims. **Weakest co-occurring:** None-Stated → no mechanism story → discount-only LPs.

Practical note: 18.8% of LPs state NO mechanism — they sell on offer alone. That's a meaningful share.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Contoured-Shape + Memory-Foam (the standard pillow-physics mechanism vocabulary).
- *Overused:* Contoured-Shape — 29% of LPs.
- *Common AND strong:* Contoured-Shape, Spine-Alignment, Orthopedic-Alignment — the alignment cluster.
- *Frequent but weak:* "Other" (24.7%) — when mechanism is poorly articulated; Cooling-Gel (61.4 score despite widespread use).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Orthopedic-Alignment	70.4	174 / 128	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and broadly repeatable.

2	Spine-Alignment	69.0	161 / 129	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeatable.
3	Contoured-Shape	68.1	134 / 95	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeatable.
4	Breathable-Cover	67.8	124 / 105	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Solid.
5	Neck-Cradle	67.8	161 / 125	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Solid.
6	Posture-Correction	66.8	109 / 95	1.2 / 1	4.9 / 5	n=15, solid mid-tier.
7	None-Stated	66.8	152 / 128	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Surprising — discount-only LPs hold tenure.
8	Wedge-Elevation	66.6	152 / 100	1.0 / 1	4.7 / 5	n=10, solid niche.
9	Hypoallergenic-Material	66.5	122 / 105	1.0 / 1	4.9 / 5	n=22.
10	Butterfly-Design	66.0	92 / 82	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=4 → small.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND highly repeated*: Orthopedic/Spine-Alignment cluster, Contoured-Shape. **Model these.**
- *Strong but less common*: Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design (small samples, niche but coherent).
- *Hidden opportunities*: Wedge-Elevation (n=10) — undertested vs the alignment crowd. Butterfly-Design (small but distinctive visual hook).
- *Test first*: Orthopedic-Alignment language (combines "orthopedic" credibility with the alignment claim).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Contoured-Shape, Spine-Alignment, Orthopedic-Alignment.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Cooling-Gel (12.2% adoption, 61.4 score — saturated, undifferentiated).
3. **Strong but less common**: Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design, Hypoallergenic-Material.
4. **Inflated**: None obvious — broad-based across mechanisms.
5. **White-space**: Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design, Posture-Correction-as-primary-hook (rather than co-mentioned).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Memory-Foam + Contoured-Shape + Spine-Alignment + Money-Back-Guarantee + Expert-Endorsement.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Contoured-Shape + Bundle + Orthopedic.
- **By big idea**: NeckPain-Relief → Spine/Orthopedic-Alignment; Sleep-Quality → Memory-Foam + Contoured-Shape; Pressure-Relief → Orthopedic + Wedge-Elevation; Snoring → Wedge-Elevation.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design.
- **Common but underwhelming**: Cooling-Gel — frequent but mid-pack score.
- **Distorted by outliers**: Memory-Foam mean days inflated by saybrooksleeper cluster.
- **Pattern-breaking**: None-Stated mechanisms running 128-day median means some LPs survive on offer alone.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Alignment + Memory-Foam + Contoured-Shape — the canonical pillow mechanism stack.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Orthopedic-Alignment + Spine-Alignment.
- **Overused:** Memory-Foam (mentioned everywhere but contributes little to differentiation).
- **Underused but promising:** Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design, Hypoallergenic angle.
- **Misleading by frequency:** "Other" mechanism bucket — large share, weak score.
- **Model:** Orthopedic-Alignment as headline mechanism.
- **Test carefully:** Wedge / Butterfly mechanisms (small sample size).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic "memory foam" claims without a paired alignment or pressure claim.

H. Confidence Level

High confidence for Contoured-Shape, Memory-Foam, Spine-Alignment, Adjustable-Loft, Orthopedic, Cooling-Gel, Neck-Cradle (n>30). **Medium** for Posture-Correction, Hypoallergenic, Breathable-Cover (n=15–23). **Low** for Wedge-Elevation, Butterfly-Design (n≤10).

VARIABLE 6 — Offer Type

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Offer Type (offer_types; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 10
- **Usable records:** 248 (97.3%)
- **Missing:** 7 (2.7%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Discount	200	78.4%	83.1%	83.3%	122	1	5	66.7	Common and saturated
2	Free-Shipping	98	38.4%	41.5%	43.6%	107	1	5	67.2	Common and strong
3	None	44	17.3%	12.3%	20.5%	115	1	5	62.6	Common but neutral
4	Bundle	34	13.3%	23.1%	14.1%	146	1	5	72.3	Common and strong
5	Free-Gift	32	12.5%	13.8%	9.0%	88	1	5	63.2	Common but neutral

6	Financing	15	5.9%	9.2%	3.8%	149	1	2	56.3	Common but weak (limited placements)
7	BOGO	10	3.9%	3.1%	9.0%	64	2	5	62.4	Rare; short-life
8	Trial	9	3.5%	3.1%	5.1%	62	1	5	63.6	Rare; short-life
9	Tiered-Pricing	5	2.0%	1.5%	2.6%	140	1	5	69.8	Rare but strong
10	Subscription	4	1.6%	3.1%	0%	159	1	3.5	66.8	Rare

Strongest co-occurring: Discount ↔ Direct-Offer framework, Add-to-Cart/Claim-Offer CTAs; Bundle ↔ Sleep-Quality big idea, Pillow + accessory upsells, Curiosity framework (mellowsleep); Free-Shipping ↔ Discount stack (most LPs stack both). **Weakest co-occurring:** Trial — appears alone, short tenure.

Practical note: 78% of all LPs run a Discount offer. Discount + Free-Shipping is the de-facto default stack (≈ 1 in 3 LPs).

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Discount.
- *Overused:* Discount.
- *Common AND strong:* Bundle (72.3 — highest score). The clear winner.
- *Frequent but weak:* Free-Gift (88-day median, mid score). Financing (low placement count drags strength).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Bundle	72.3	184 / 146	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and broadly repeatable. Highest score among common offers.
2	Tiered-Pricing	69.8	168 / 140	1.2 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=5 → small but coherent. Strong but niche.
3	Free-Shipping	67.2	154 / 107	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated. Almost always stacked with Discount.
4	Subscription	66.8	191 / 159	1.0 / 1	3.5 / 3.5	n=4 → small sample, low placements.
5	Discount	66.7	157 / 122	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated. Mid-high score plus enormous volume.
6	Trial	63.6	88 / 62	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Short-life.

7	Free-Gift	63.2	104 / 88	1.3 / 1	4.8 / 5	Mid.
8	None	62.6	154 / 115	1.3 / 1	4.7 / 5	Some LPs survive on no offer (likely brand-led).
9	BOGO	62.4	95 / 64	1.9 / 2	4.8 / 5	Multi-variant but short-life.
10	Financing	56.3	192 / 149	1.0 / 1	2.5 / 2	Long tenure but only 2 placements — weakens score.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Bundle, Free-Shipping, Discount. The proven offer trio.
- *Strong but rare*: Tiered-Pricing (n=5), Subscription (n=4).
- *Hidden opportunities*: Tiered-Pricing (anchor + upsell mechanism) — proven by 5 LPs at 140 days; Subscription model — niche but tenure-heavy.
- *Test first*: Bundle (proven across many advertisers and 23% of long-running cohort uses it).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Bundle, Discount, Free-Shipping.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Free-Gift, Trial (both have short median tenure).
3. **Strong but rare**: Tiered-Pricing, Subscription.
4. **Inflated**: Bundle's variants are partially inflated by mellowsleep (5 of 34) and saybrooksleep (3) — but still broad-based.
5. **White-space**: Tiered-Pricing and Subscription — both underused with proven tenure.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Bundle + Sleep-Quality + Money-Back-Guarantee + Statistics proof.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Bundle + BOGO (both above-median variant counts).
- **By framework**: Bundle pairs with Curiosity, Story-Problem-Solution; Discount pairs with Direct-Offer.
- **By page type**: Bundle → product page or advertorial; Financing → product page (lower placements suggest desktop bias).

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Tiered-Pricing, Subscription.
- **Common but underwhelming**: Free-Gift (88-day median).
- **Distorted**: Bundle by mellowsleep cluster (5 of 34 = 15% concentration).
- **Pattern-breaking**: Financing's long tenure (149 days median) on only 2 placements — niche channel strategy, not a general scale signal.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market**: Discount + Free-Shipping stack.
- **Strongest data-backed**: Bundle.
- **Overused**: Discount alone (no Bundle, no Free-Shipping).
- **Underused but promising**: Bundle (relative to its strength), Tiered-Pricing, Subscription.
- **Misleading by frequency**: Free-Gift — popular but mid-pack score.
- **Model**: Discount + Free-Shipping + Bundle stack.
- **Test carefully**: Tiered-Pricing (n=5 but high score).

- **Avoid over-copying:** Trial / BOGO — short-life patterns.

H. Confidence Level

High for Discount, Free-Shipping, Bundle, Free-Gift (n≥32). **Medium** for Financing, BOGO, Trial (n=9–15). **Low** for Tiered-Pricing, Subscription (n≤5).

VARIABLE 7 — CTA Type

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** CTA Type (cta_types; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 15
- **Usable records:** 251 (98.4%)
- **Missing:** 4 (1.6%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Add-To-Cart	73	28.6%	38.5%	26.9%	129	1	5	67.7	Common and strong
2	Shop-Now	64	25.1%	23.1%	26.9%	93	1	5	63.0	Common but neutral
3	Other	41	16.1%	12.3%	14.1%	92	1	4	56.5	Common but weak
4	Claim-Offer	36	14.1%	12.3%	19.2%	120	1	5	67.7	Common and strong
5	Get-Discount	29	11.4%	23.1%	10.3%	173	1	5	75.7	Common and strong
6	Sign-Up	22	8.6%	4.6%	5.1%	102	1	5	58.4	Common but weak
7	Buy-Now	21	8.2%	10.8%	10.3%	128	1	5	65.8	Common and neutral
8	Learn-More	18	7.1%	1.5%	6.4%	70	1	5	59.4	Common but weak
9	Get-Yours-Today	17	6.7%	3.1%	9.0%	85	1	5	61.5	Common but weak

10	Order-Now	14	5.5%	4.6%	5.1%	118	1	5	68.5	Common and strong
----	-----------	----	------	------	------	-----	---	---	------	-------------------

Strongest co-occurring: Add-To-Cart ↔ product_page, Direct-Offer framework; Get-Discount ↔ Discount offer, urgency tone; Claim-Offer ↔ urgency, Free-Shipping. **Weakest co-occurring:** Sign-Up ↔ lead_capture popups (short-life); Learn-More ↔ advertorial mid-funnel (low tenure).

Practical note: Add-To-Cart + Shop-Now = 54% of LPs. The default e-com CTAs.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Add-To-Cart (when product page), Shop-Now (when collection).
- *Overused:* Shop-Now — large share, mediocre score.
- *Common AND strong:* Add-To-Cart, Claim-Offer, Get-Discount, Order-Now.
- *Frequent but weak:* Sign-Up, Learn-More, Get-Yours-Today.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Get-Discount	75.7	213 / 173	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated. Highest CTA score. 23% of long-runners use it.
2	Try-Risk-Free	75.2	168 / 139	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=9 → coherent, small. Strong but niche.
3	Order-Now	68.5	124 / 118	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	Solid.
4	Check-It-Out	67.8	122 / 128	1.5 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=12. Solid.
5	Claim-Offer	67.7	144 / 120	1.3 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
6	Add-To-Cart	67.7	160 / 129	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Strong and repeated.
7	Buy-Now	65.8	158 / 128	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	Solid.
8	Shop-Now	63.0	122 / 93	1.6 / 1	4.6 / 5	Volume but unimpressive.
9	Start-Now	62.5	88 / 91	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=6.
10	Get-Yours-Today	61.5	116 / 85	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Mid.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated:* Get-Discount, Claim-Offer, Add-To-Cart. The proven CTA trio.
- *Strong but rare:* Try-Risk-Free, Check-It-Out (low-pressure CTAs that survive).
- *Hidden opportunities:* Get-Discount carries the highest score in this entire variable — and is only used by 11% of LPs.
- *Test first:* Get-Discount and Claim-Offer (both score 67+ and emphasize the offer, not the action).

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both:** Add-To-Cart, Claim-Offer, Get-Discount.
2. **Repeated but not strong:** Shop-Now, Sign-Up, Learn-More, Get-Yours-Today.
3. **Strong but rare:** Try-Risk-Free, Order-Now, Check-It-Out.
4. **Inflated:** None obvious in CTA. Broad-based.
5. **White-space:** Get-Discount and Try-Risk-Free relative to volume.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Add-To-Cart + Benefit headline + Money-Back-Guarantee + product_page. Get-Discount + Discount offer + Urgent tone.
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Claim-Offer + Bundle. Shop-Now + collection_page.
- **By page type:** Add-To-Cart → product page; Shop-Now → collection; Sign-Up → lead_capture; Learn-More → advertorial; Get-Discount → product page or advertorial.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Try-Risk-Free.
- **Common but underwhelming:** Shop-Now (volume + mid score).
- **Distorted by outliers:** Get-Discount tail-dragged by sidneysleep (590 days) and hugterra (long-runners).
- **Pattern-breaking:** Check-It-Out — soft-pressure CTA with 67.8 score and 128-day median.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Add-To-Cart on product, Shop-Now on collection.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Get-Discount.
- **Overused:** Shop-Now, Sign-Up.
- **Underused but promising:** Get-Discount, Try-Risk-Free.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Shop-Now.
- **Model:** Offer-centric CTAs (Get-Discount, Claim-Offer) > Action-only CTAs (Shop-Now).
- **Test carefully:** Try-Risk-Free (lower-friction CTA).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic Shop-Now without offer specificity.

H. Confidence Level

High for Add-To-Cart, Shop-Now, Claim-Offer, Get-Discount, Sign-Up, Buy-Now (n≥21). **Medium** for Order-Now, Learn-More, Get-Yours-Today, Check-It-Out, Try-Risk-Free (n=9–18). **Low** for Start-Now (n=6).

VARIABLE 8 — Proof Architecture

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Proof Architecture (proof_types; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 17
- **Usable records:** 245 (96.1%)
- **Missing:** 10 (3.9%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Reviews	142	55.7%	69.2%	53.8%	128	1	5	66.6	Common and strong
2	Testimonials	111	43.5%	47.7%	41.0%	128	1	5	68.4	Common and strong
3	Statistics	82	32.2%	33.8%	38.5%	127	1	5	68.0	Common and strong
4	Expert-Endorsement	79	31.0%	33.8%	33.3%	128	1	5	69.2	Common and strong
5	Rating-System	65	25.5%	30.8%	23.1%	105	1	5	63.5	Common but neutral
6	None	50	19.6%	18.5%	17.9%	127	1	5	64.6	Common (surprising tenure)
7	Awards	25	9.8%	6.2%	19.2%	86	2	5	66.8	Common and neutral
8	Media-Mentions	19	7.5%	6.2%	14.1%	85	2	5	64.2	Common and neutral
9	UGC	13	5.1%	4.6%	3.8%	95	1	5	66.2	Rare but solid
10	Testimonial-Narrative	12	4.7%	0%	7.7%	105	1.5	5	59.9	Rare but short-life

Strongest co-occurring: Reviews + Testimonials + Rating-System (stacked together on most product pages); Expert-Endorsement ↔ Doctor-Endorsed claim + Empathetic tone; Statistics ↔ Mechanism claims + Numerical-Specificity. **Weakest co-occurring:** "None" ↔ lead_capture popups or unbranded direct-offer LPs.

Practical note: ~20% of LPs use NO explicit proof element. Surprisingly, this group still has 127-day median tenure — possibly because they're built on offer-only conversion (lead capture) or unmeasured brand familiarity.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Reviews + Testimonials + Statistics.
- *Overused:* Reviews (56% of LPs).
- *Common AND strong:* All top 4 (Reviews/Testimonials/Statistics/Expert-Endorsement). Expert-Endorsement has the highest score.

- *Frequent but weak*: "Testimonial-Narrative" (0% in long-running cohort).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Before-After	81.2	161 / 144	2.0 / 2	5.0 / 5	n=3 → small sample but extreme score.
2	Expert-Endorsement	69.2	174 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated. Highest among common proof types.
3	Testimonials	68.4	154 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
4	Statistics	68.0	158 / 127	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated.
5	Founder-Credentials	67.2	121 / 99	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=4 → small.
6	Awards	66.8	108 / 86	1.6 / 2	4.9 / 5	Awards drive multi-variant testing.
7	Reviews	66.6	150 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
8	UGC	66.2	105 / 95	1.1 / 1	5.0 / 5	Solid.
9	None	64.6	158 / 127	1.5 / 1	4.7 / 5	Surprisingly survives.
10	Clinical-Study	64.4	169 / 123	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=12, solid.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Expert-Endorsement, Testimonials, Statistics, Reviews. The Big Four.
- *Strong but rare*: Before-After (81.2 score — by far the highest, but n=3), Founder-Credentials (n=4).
- *Hidden opportunities*: Before-After visuals. Only 3 LPs use this and all run 144+ days with 2 variants each. Strongly suggests it's effective but undertested.
- *Test first*: Expert-Endorsement + Statistics + Before-After stack.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Expert-Endorsement, Testimonials, Statistics, Reviews.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Rating-System (63.5 score despite 25.5% adoption — the star-rating display alone doesn't drive tenure).
3. **Strong but rare**: Before-After, Founder-Credentials, Clinical-Study.
4. **Inflated**: Before-After by tiny sample.
5. **White-space**: Before-After (huge upside potential if validated), Founder-Credentials (only 4 LPs use), Clinical-Study (only 12 LPs).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Reviews + Testimonials + Money-Back-Guarantee + Expert-Endorsement +

Add-To-Cart.

- **Multi-variant pairings:** Awards (var_med = 2), Media-Mentions (var_med = 2). Suggests these get used as creative-rotation hooks.
- **By framework:** Statistics + Mechanism claims → FAB framework; Expert-Endorsement → Story-Problem-Solution; UGC → Direct-Offer.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Before-After (81.2 from n=3 is the largest "white-space alarm" in the dataset).
- **Common but underwhelming:** Rating-System.
- **Distorted:** Before-After by tiny sample.
- **Pattern-breaking:** "None" proof type still runs 127-day median — some LPs hold on offer + tone alone.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Reviews + Testimonials + Statistics + Expert-Endorsement = the proof stack.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Expert-Endorsement (and Before-After if validated).
- **Overused:** Rating-System badges with no narrative.
- **Underused but promising:** Before-After visuals, Founder-Credentials, Clinical-Study.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Rating-System.
- **Model:** Expert-Endorsement + Testimonials + Statistics; add Before-After if you have permissioned photo assets.
- **Test carefully:** Before-After (small sample but strongest signal in this variable).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Rating stars as sole proof.

H. Confidence Level

High for Reviews, Testimonials, Statistics, Expert-Endorsement (n≥79). **Medium** for Awards, Rating-System, Media-Mentions, UGC, Clinical-Study (n=12–65). **Low** for Before-After (n=3), Founder-Credentials (n=4), Testimonial-Narrative (n=12 but 0% long-runners).

VARIABLE 9 — Objection Handling

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Objection Handling (objections_handled; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 15
- **Usable records:** 246 (96.5%)
- **Missing:** 9 (3.5%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Comfort-Concerns	108	42.4%	46.2%	41.0%	118	1	5	65.3	Common and strong

3	Skepticism	67.9	150 / 126	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
4	Durability	67.6	162 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
5	Doesnt-Work	67.5	153 / 125	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
6	None-Handled	65.7	157 / 127	1.5 / 1	4.7 / 5	Surprising survivor.
7	Comfort-Concerns	65.3	143 / 118	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
8	Risk	65.1	137 / 101	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	
9	Trust	64.6	127 / 99	1.6 / 1	5.0 / 5	
10	Too-Expensive	64.1	158 / 127	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	

Synthesis:

- **Strong AND repeated:** Skepticism, Doesnt-Work, Comfort-Concerns, Durability.
- **Strong but rare:** Allergies (n=15) — hidden gem. Shipping (n=13) — pulled up by Mediflow's 246-day cluster but still notable.
- **Hidden opportunities:** Allergies objection. The 175-day median is the second-longest tenure of any objection bucket. Allergy-targeting could be a niche white-space.
- **Test first:** Add explicit Skepticism + Doesnt-Work + Durability rebuttals to existing copy.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both:** Skepticism, Doesnt-Work, Comfort-Concerns, Durability.
2. **Repeated but not strong:** Return-Hassle (88-day median), Hot-Sleeper, Trust.
3. **Strong but less common:** Allergies, Shipping.
4. **Inflated:** Shipping score driven heavily by Mediflow ads.
5. **White-space:** Allergies — n=15 with 175-day median is one of the strongest "rare-but-broad-based" signals.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Skepticism + Doesnt-Work + Money-Back-Guarantee + Expert-Endorsement (the doctor-driven trust rig).
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Comfort-Concerns (variants slightly elevated). Allergies tracks single variant but very long tenure.
- **By big idea:** Allergies ↔ Hypoallergenic-Material mechanism; Hot-Sleeper ↔ Cooling-Gel; Skepticism ↔ Doctor-Endorsed claim.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Allergies (15 LPs, 175-day median).
- **Common but underwhelming:** Return-Hassle.
- **Distorted:** Shipping (Mediflow tenure).
- **Pattern-breaking:** None-Handled LPs surviving 127 days suggests bottom-funnel offer-only is viable for some segments.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Address Comfort + Skepticism + Doesn't-Work + Durability.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Allergies (rare but proven), then the core trio.
- **Overused:** Comfort-Concerns (everyone says "you'll love how comfortable it is").
- **Underused but promising:** Allergies-specific copy, Hot-Sleeper-specific copy.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Return-Hassle (looks common but tenure is below median).
- **Model:** Skepticism + Doesn't-Work + Durability trio on every LP.
- **Test carefully:** Allergy/Hot-Sleeper as primary angle (small samples but strong tenure).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic "comfortable" claims without backing.

H. Confidence Level

High for Comfort-Concerns, Doesn't-Work, Skepticism, Too-Expensive, Risk, Durability, Trust (n≥38). **Medium** for Return-Hassle, Hot-Sleeper, Allergies, Shipping (n=13–32). **Low** for handful of single-LP objections.

VARIABLE 10 — Risk Reversal

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Risk Reversal (risk_reversal_types; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 9
- **Usable records:** 242 (94.9%)
- **Missing:** 13 (5.1%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns (all 9 shown)

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Money-Back-Guarantee	122	47.8%	47.7%	52.6%	111	1	5	67.9	Common and strong
2	None	103	40.4%	44.6%	34.6%	128	1	5	64.9	Common (surprising tenure)
3	Satisfaction-Guarantee	54	21.2%	33.8%	21.8%	154	1	5	70.3	Common and strong
4	Free>Returns	48	18.8%	23.1%	26.9%	103	1	5	69.2	Common and strong
5	Warranty	38	14.9%	16.9%	14.1%	102	1	5	65.9	Common and neutral

6	Night-Trial-100	10	3.9%	3.1%	5.1%	87	1	5	66.0	Rare but solid
7	Free-Trial	4	1.6%	1.5%	1.3%	69	1	3.5	47.0	Rare and weak
8	Night-Trial-30	3	1.2%	0%	1.3%	85	1	4	50.8	Rare and weak
9	Lifetime-Warranty	3	1.2%	1.5%	3.8%	86	4	5	73.1	Rare but multi-variant

Strongest co-occurring: Money-Back-Guarantee ↔ Add-To-Cart, Direct-Offer; Satisfaction-Guarantee ↔ Expert-Endorsement, Doctor-Endorsed; Free>Returns ↔ product_page + Free-Shipping. **Weakest co-occurring:** Night-Trial-30 ↔ no strong partner.

Practical note: 40% of LPs offer NO risk reversal. Surprisingly, this group has a 128-day median tenure — these are mostly lead_capture or marketplace listings where the risk-reversal is implicit (Amazon return policy, etc.).

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Money-Back-Guarantee.
- *Overused:* Money-Back-Guarantee.
- *Common AND strong:* Money-Back-Guarantee, Satisfaction-Guarantee, Free>Returns.
- *Frequent but weak:* None (when it's deliberate); Warranty (mid-pack).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns (all 9 shown by strength)

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Lifetime-Warranty	73.1	110 / 86	3.7 / 4	5.0 / 5	n=3 → small. Multi-variant testing detected.
2	Satisfaction-Guarantee	70.3	188 / 154	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated. Highest score among common reversals.
3	Free>Returns	69.2	140 / 103	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
4	Money-Back-Guarantee	67.9	134 / 111	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
5	Night-Trial-100	66.0	107 / 87	1.7 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=10. Solid niche.
6	Warranty	65.9	124 / 102	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	
7	None	64.9	158 / 128	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Surprising tenure.
8	Night-Trial-30	50.8	96 / 85	1.3 / 1	4 / 4	Weak.
9	Free-Trial	47.0	73 / 69	1.0 / 1	3.3 / 3.5	Weak — short tenure, low placements.

Synthesis:

- **Strong AND repeated:** Satisfaction-Guarantee, Free>Returns, Money-Back-Guarantee.
- **Strong but rare:** Lifetime-Warranty (n=3 but 4 variants each — multi-variant test signal).
- **Hidden opportunities:** Satisfaction-Guarantee (the highest score AND only used by 21% of LPs — underused vs its strength).
- **Test first:** Satisfaction-Guarantee + Money-Back-Guarantee stacked.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both:** Money-Back-Guarantee, Satisfaction-Guarantee, Free>Returns.
2. **Repeated but not strong:** Warranty (mid-pack), None (passive — not really a strategy).
3. **Strong but rare:** Lifetime-Warranty, Night-Trial-100.
4. **Inflated:** Lifetime-Warranty by tiny sample.
5. **White-space:** Satisfaction-Guarantee (broader adoption candidate) and Night-Trial-100 (only 10 LPs but solid score).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Satisfaction-Guarantee + Empathetic tone + Expert-Endorsement + Doctor-Endorsed claims (premium pillow rig).
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Money-Back-Guarantee (variant median 1, but %MV share 52% — strong correlation with multi-variant LPs).
- **By format:** Free>Returns → product page; Night-Trial → premium pillow brand pages.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Lifetime-Warranty (n=3, but each has 4 active variants — strong creative signal).
- **Common but underwhelming:** None / Free-Trial.
- **Distorted:** Lifetime-Warranty by sample size.
- **Pattern-breaking:** Free-Trial — only 4 LPs use it, all run <70 days. Possibly a high-CAC / low-conversion pattern.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Money-Back-Guarantee.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Satisfaction-Guarantee.
- **Overused:** Money-Back-Guarantee alone.
- **Underused but promising:** Satisfaction-Guarantee, Lifetime-Warranty.
- **Misleading by frequency:** "None" looks fine on tenure but not a strategy you can copy — it's residual.
- **Model:** Money-Back-Guarantee + Satisfaction-Guarantee + Free>Returns stack.
- **Test carefully:** Lifetime-Warranty (small sample but strong signal).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Free-Trial as a risk-reversal in this category — it consistently underperforms.

H. Confidence Level

High for Money-Back-Guarantee, None, Satisfaction-Guarantee, Free>Returns, Warranty (n≥38). **Medium** for Night-Trial-100 (n=10). **Low** for Free-Trial, Night-Trial-30, Lifetime-Warranty (n=3–4).

VARIABLE 11 — Emotional Driver

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Emotional Driver (emotions_used; multi-valued). Companion view: Cialdini lever ≥ 2 weight in cialdini block.
- **Unique categories (Emotional Driver):** 14
- **Usable records:** 251 (98.4%)
- **Missing:** 4 (1.6%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Hope	226	88.6%	90.8%	87.2%	115	1	5	65.1	Common and saturated
2	Relief	170	66.7%	70.8%	66.7%	115	1	5	65.5	Common and saturated
3	Comfort	124	48.6%	61.5%	47.4%	105	1	5	64.8	Common and saturated
4	Curiosity	36	14.1%	12.3%	19.2%	115	1	5	67.4	Common and strong
5	Confidence	34	13.3%	12.3%	12.8%	104	1	5	64.8	Common and neutral
6	Frustration	33	12.9%	3.1%	9.0%	97	1	5	63.6	Common but short-life
7	Fear	20	7.8%	6.2%	9.0%	114	1	5	67.2	Rare but strong
8	Trust	16	6.3%	3.1%	5.1%	101	1	5	56.9	Rare and weak
9	Happiness	9	3.5%	1.5%	2.6%	80	1	4	55.2	Rare and weak
10	Safety	6	2.4%	1.5%	3.8%	91	1.5	5	65.4	Rare but solid

Strongest co-occurring: Hope + Relief + Comfort (the universal trio, present in 89% of LPs); Curiosity ↔ advertorial, mellowsleep cluster; Fear ↔ Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief. **Weakest co-occurring:** Happiness ↔ no strong partner (often appears without other strong emotions).

Practical note: Hope appears on 89% of LPs — it's not a differentiator, it's the baseline.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Hope + Relief + Comfort trio.
- *Overused:* All three top emotions.
- *Common AND strong:* Curiosity (only emotion with both above-volume and above-score).
- *Frequent but weak:* Frustration (3% long-running share is the smallest among top 6).

Cialdini supplementary view (n=220, 13.7% missing):

Lever	n	%	Days med	Score
social_proof	194	76.1%	111	65.5
authority	152	59.6%	108	65.6
scarcity	130	51.0%	126	66.6
liking	68	26.7%	90	63.6
unity	41	16.1%	119	65.9
reciprocity	35	13.7%	144	70.6

Reciprocity is the highest-scoring Cialdini lever (70.6 score, 144-day median) and only used by 14% of LPs. White-space.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Curiosity	67.4	145 / 115	1.7 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
2	Fear	67.2	124 / 114	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	n=20 → coherent.
3	Relief	65.5	152 / 115	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and saturated.
4	Safety	65.4	113 / 91	1.7 / 1.5	4.7 / 5	n=6 → small.
5	Hope	65.1	158 / 115	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
6	Comfort	64.8	138 / 105	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
7	Confidence	64.8	117 / 104	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	
8	Frustration	63.6	113 / 97	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Short-life relative to peers.
9	Security	60.0	90 / 86	2.0 / 1.5	4.5 / 4.5	n=4 → small.
10	Trust	56.9	113 / 101	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Curiosity, Relief (both with broad adoption AND above-baseline scores).
- *Strong but rare*: Fear (n=20). Safety (n=6).
- *Hidden opportunities*: Fear (used in 8% of LPs but scores 67.2 — under-leveraged emotional driver).
- *Test first*: Curiosity + Fear (combined) where ethically appropriate. Adding Reciprocity (Cialdini) is a separate white-space.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Curiosity, Relief, Hope, Comfort. (Curiosity strongest.)
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Frustration (low long-runner share).
3. **Strong but less common**: Fear, Reciprocity (Cialdini).
4. **Inflated**: Curiosity by mellowsleep cluster (overlap with Curiosity framework).
5. **White-space**: Fear emotion + Reciprocity Cialdini lever (each ≈ 14% adoption, both above-average tenure).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Hope + Relief + Comfort + Money-Back-Guarantee (the default emotional rig).
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Curiosity + Bundle + advertorial.
- **By framework**: Hope/Relief/Comfort ↔ Direct-Offer + Problem-Solution; Curiosity ↔ Story-Problem-Solution + advertorial; Fear ↔ Problem-Callout opens.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Fear, Reciprocity.
- **Common but underwhelming**: Happiness, Trust (lowest scores in top 10).
- **Distorted**: Curiosity (mellowsleep).
- **Pattern-breaking**: Reciprocity rare in this category but median 144 days — top tenure among Cialdini levers.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market**: Hope + Relief + Comfort trio.
- **Strongest data-backed**: Curiosity emotion + Reciprocity Cialdini lever.
- **Overused**: Hope/Relief/Comfort.
- **Underused but promising**: Fear, Curiosity, Reciprocity.
- **Misleading by frequency**: Frustration, Happiness, Trust (volume without staying power).
- **Model**: Hope + Relief baseline; layer Curiosity for differentiation; introduce Reciprocity via gift/free-trial framing.
- **Test carefully**: Fear (small sample, may have compliance edges in Meta).
- **Avoid over-copying**: Generic Comfort emotional cues without specificity.

H. Confidence Level

High for Hope, Relief, Comfort (n≥124), Curiosity, Confidence, Frustration (n=33–36). **Medium** for Fear (n=20), Trust (n=16). **Low** for Happiness, Safety, Security (n≤9).

VARIABLE 12 — Desire

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Desire (desires_promised; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 16
- **Usable records:** 248 (97.3%)
- **Missing:** 7 (2.7%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Comfort	171	67.1%	72.3%	73.1%	105	1	5	64.2	Common and saturated
2	Better-Sleep	164	64.3%	72.3%	69.2%	122	1	5	66.3	Common and strong
3	Pain-Relief	140	54.9%	60.0%	59.0%	128	1	5	66.8	Common and strong
4	Quality-Of-Life	56	22.0%	20.0%	16.7%	110	1	5	61.0	Common but neutral
5	Health	43	16.9%	10.8%	16.7%	104	1	5	65.0	Common and neutral
6	Posture-Correction	19	7.5%	7.7%	5.1%	130	1	5	67.1	Rare but strong
7	Confidence	19	7.5%	6.2%	5.1%	94	1	5	63.3	Rare and neutral
8	Other	17	6.7%	4.6%	6.4%	113	1	5	66.4	Misc bucket
9	Relaxation	14	5.5%	9.2%	5.1%	152	1	5	64.8	Rare but long-tenure
10	Recovery	8	3.1%	0%	1.3%	69	1	5	54.4	Rare and short-life

Strongest co-occurring: Comfort + Better-Sleep + Pain-Relief (the universal triad, on 50%+ of LPs each); Posture-Correction ↔ Spine-Alignment mechanism; Health ↔ doctor/expert proof. **Weakest co-occurring:** Recovery ↔ short-life clusters.

Practical note: Nearly every LP promises Better-Sleep AND Comfort AND Pain-Relief simultaneously. The desire stack is uniform across the market.

Synthesis:

- *Default*: The universal triad (Comfort + Better-Sleep + Pain-Relief).
- *Overused*: All three.
- *Common AND strong*: Better-Sleep, Pain-Relief.
- *Frequent but weak*: Quality-Of-Life (vague), Recovery (short tenure).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/med	Var mean/med	Plac mean/med	Notes
1	Energy	69.7	119 / 128	1.5 / 1.5	4.8 / 5	n=6 → small but coherent. Strong but niche.
2	Posture-Correction	67.1	154 / 130	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	n=19, broad-based. Strong but niche.
3	Pain-Relief	66.8	159 / 128	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
4	Other	66.4	134 / 113	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Misc bucket.
5	Better-Sleep	66.3	158 / 122	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated.
6	Health	65.0	133 / 104	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	
7	Relaxation	64.8	169 / 152	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Long tenure (n=14).
8	Comfort	64.2	138 / 105	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
9	Confidence	63.3	113 / 94	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	
10	Mental-Clarity	63.5	102 / 95	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=4 → small.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Pain-Relief, Better-Sleep.
- *Strong but less common*: Energy, Posture-Correction, Relaxation.
- *Hidden opportunities*: Energy (n=6, 128-day median) and Relaxation (n=14, 152-day median) — both rare in copy but tenure-strong.
- *Test first*: Pain-Relief + Better-Sleep baseline; layer Posture-Correction or Energy as differentiator.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Pain-Relief, Better-Sleep, Comfort.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Quality-Of-Life (vague), Confidence.
3. **Strong but less common**: Energy, Posture-Correction, Relaxation.
4. **Inflated**: None obvious.
5. **White-space**: Energy + Mental-Clarity + Posture-Correction as the "wellness upside" angle (most LPs stop at relief, miss the upside framing).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Pain-Relief + Better-Sleep + Spine-Alignment + Money-Back-Guarantee.

- **Multi-variant pairings:** Comfort + Bundle.
- **By framework:** Posture-Correction ↔ FAB or Story-Problem-Solution; Energy ↔ FAB; Relaxation ↔ Direct-Offer + Luxury tone.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Energy, Relaxation, Posture-Correction.
- **Common but underwhelming:** Quality-Of-Life — broad but vague, mid-pack score.
- **Distorted:** Energy by small sample.
- **Pattern-breaking:** Recovery — short tenure (69 days), small sample (n=8). Possibly a recent push that hasn't held.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Comfort + Better-Sleep + Pain-Relief.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Pain-Relief.
- **Overused:** All three top desires.
- **Underused but promising:** Energy, Posture-Correction, Relaxation, Mental-Clarity.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Quality-Of-Life.
- **Model:** Pain-Relief + Better-Sleep + Energy upside.
- **Test carefully:** Energy / Mental-Clarity (small sample).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic "comfort" promises.

H. Confidence Level

High for Comfort, Better-Sleep, Pain-Relief (n≥140). **Medium** for Quality-Of-Life, Health, Posture-Correction, Confidence, Relaxation (n=14–56). **Low** for Energy, Recovery, Mental-Clarity (n≤8).

VARIABLE 13 — Belief Shift Target

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Belief Shift Target — bucketed from `belief_shift.desired_belief` text via keyword pattern matching.
- **Unique categories:** 7
- **Usable records:** 243 (95.3%)
- **Missing:** 12 (4.7%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns (all 7 shown)

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Other-Belief	154	60.4%	61.5%	59.0%	126	1	5	66.0	Common (catch-all)

2	This-Mechanism-Is-Superior	25	9.8%	4.6%	5.1%	87	1	5	54.2	Common but weak
3	Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain	19	7.5%	12.3%	7.7%	128	1	5	73.1	Common and strong
4	Worth-The-Investment	17	6.7%	7.7%	10.3%	130	1	5	69.4	Common and strong
5	Quick-Easy-Relief-Possible	14	5.5%	4.6%	9.0%	77	1.5	5	59.0	Common but short-life
6	Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life	13	5.1%	6.2%	2.6%	129	1	5	68.7	Common and strong
7	Risk-Free-To-Try	1	0.4%	0%	0%	52	1	3	26.9	Rare and very weak

Strongest co-occurring: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain ↔ Problem-Callout opening + Empathetic tone + Spine-Alignment mechanism (the "your pillow is the problem" rig); Worth-The-Investment ↔ Premium pricing + Doctor-Endorsed; Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life ↔ Story-Problem-Solution + Hope emotion. **Weakest co-occurring:** This-Mechanism-Is-Superior ↔ short tenure when not paired with proof.

Practical note: 60% of LPs have an unclassifiable belief shift target. The 4 named patterns share ~30% of the dataset.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Implicit / catch-all ("Other-Belief"). Most LPs don't articulate the belief shift clearly.
- *Overused:* "This-Mechanism-Is-Superior" — common AND lowest score among named patterns.
- *Common AND strong:* Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain, Worth-The-Investment, Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life.
- *Frequent but weak:* This-Mechanism-Is-Superior, Quick-Easy-Relief-Possible.

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns (all named buckets)

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain	73.1	195 / 128	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5	Strong but niche. Highest belief-shift score in dataset. Broad-based across brands.
2	Worth-The-Investment	69.4	173 / 130	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong but niche.

3	Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life	68.7	132 / 129	1.3 / 1	4.6 / 5	Strong but niche.
4	Other-Belief	66.0	155 / 126	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Catch-all.
5	Quick-Easy-Relief-Possible	59.0	122 / 77	1.6 / 1.5	4.9 / 5	Short median life.
6	This-Mechanism-Is-Superior	54.2	109 / 87	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Common but weak.
7	Risk-Free-To-Try	26.9	52 / 52	1 / 1	3 / 3	n=1 only.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain, Worth-The-Investment, Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life.
- *Strong but rare*: All three above are small samples (13–19 LPs each) — niche but coherent.
- *Hidden opportunity*: **Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain** is the single highest belief-shift score in the dataset and is used by only 7.5% of LPs. White-space.
- *Test first*: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief shift, anchored on a specific failure mode of the user's current pillow.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: None at meaningful volume — all named buckets are <10% adoption.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: This-Mechanism-Is-Superior — frequent enough to count, but worst score.
3. **Strong but rare**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain, Worth-The-Investment, Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life.
4. **Inflated**: None obvious.
5. **White-space**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief framing especially.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain + Problem-Callout opening + Spine-Alignment mechanism + Skepticism objection.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Quick-Easy-Relief-Possible (variants slightly elevated). Otherwise single variant.
- **By tone**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain → Empathetic; Worth-The-Investment → Luxury or Expert; Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life → Conversational or Story.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain.
- **Common but underwhelming**: This-Mechanism-Is-Superior.
- **Distorted**: None.
- **Pattern-breaking**: Risk-Free-To-Try (n=1) — short-life singleton; ignore.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market**: Belief shifts are usually implicit (60% "Other") — competitors aren't articulating belief change well. **This is a market-wide gap.**
- **Strongest data-backed**: Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain.

- **Overused:** "Our mechanism is superior" (lowest-scoring named belief).
- **Underused but promising:** All three named high-score beliefs (only 4–7% adoption each).
- **Misleading by frequency:** This-Mechanism-Is-Superior (common but score 54 — below baseline).
- **Model:** Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain — anchor on a specific failure mode + offer your pillow as the corrective.
- **Test carefully:** Worth-The-Investment for premium positioning.
- **Avoid over-copying:** "Our pillow is better than other pillows" (the over-used / weak pattern).

H. Confidence Level

Medium for Other-Belief, This-Mechanism-Is-Superior, Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain (n=19–154). **Low** for Worth-The-Investment, Quick-Easy-Relief-Possible, Better-Sleep-Means-Better-Life (n=13–17). **Very low** for Risk-Free-To-Try (n=1).

VARIABLE 14 — Awareness Level

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Awareness Level (awareness_stage)
- **Unique categories:** 4
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. All Patterns (only 4 buckets)

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	product_aware	106	41.6%	50.8%	29.5%	123	1	5	63.2	Common and saturated
2	problem_aware	90	35.3%	27.7%	42.3%	117	1	5	67.3	Common and strong
3	solution_aware	54	21.2%	18.5%	25.6%	87	1	5	63.3	Common but short-life
4	unaware	5	2.0%	3.1%	2.6%	132	1	5	65.7	Rare

Strongest co-occurring: product_aware ↔ product_page + Direct-Offer + Add-To-Cart; problem_aware ↔ advertorial + Problem-Callout + Story-Problem-Solution + Empathetic tone; solution_aware ↔ lead_capture + Sign-Up; unaware ↔ rare advertorial cold hooks. **Weakest co-occurring:** None.

Practical note: Solution-aware audiences have the shortest median tenure (87 days). Suggests bridge LPs targeting solution-aware traffic burn out faster.

Synthesis:

- *Default*: product_aware (you already know the product) — 42% of LPs.
- *Common AND strong*: problem_aware (35% adoption AND highest score in this variable).
- *Frequent but weak*: solution_aware (87-day median).

C. Strongest (same 4 buckets)

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/med	Var mean/med	Plac mean/med
1	problem_aware	67.3	168 / 117	1.7 / 1	4.9 / 5
2	unaware	65.7	121 / 132	1.0 / 1	4.6 / 5
3	solution_aware	63.3	117 / 87	1.6 / 1	4.7 / 5
4	product_aware	63.2	159 / 123	1.4 / 1	4.7 / 5

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: problem_aware (35% AND top score). **Model this awareness layer.**
- *Strong but rare*: unaware (only 5 LPs). Hard to scale this segment.
- *Hidden opportunity*: problem_aware traffic is undertargeted relative to its tenure performance — competitors lean toward product_aware product pages.
- *Test first*: Problem-aware bridges (advertorials) with Problem-Callout openings.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: problem_aware.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: product_aware (most popular but mid-score).
3. **Strong but rare**: unaware (too rare to count).
4. **Inflated**: problem_aware advertorial cluster (mellowsleep, plutopillow, thepillowhome contribute).
5. **White-space**: unaware — basically untapped; if you have a "you don't know your pillow is wrecking you" angle, you'd own this awareness layer.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: problem_aware + advertorial + Story-Problem-Solution + Empathetic + Pain-Relief.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: problem_aware (42% of multi-variant LPs target this awareness level).
- **By format**: product_aware → product page; problem_aware → advertorial; solution_aware → lead_capture or quiz; unaware → rare advertorial.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Common but underwhelming**: solution_aware (87-day median is the shortest).
- **Distorted**: None.
- **Pattern-breaking**: unaware tier has only 5 LPs but median tenure 132 — possible white-space.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market**: product_aware (product pages).
- **Strongest data-backed**: problem_aware.
- **Overused**: product_aware.

- **Underused but promising:** problem_aware (relative to its strength) and unaware (relative to its near-zero competition).
- **Misleading by frequency:** product_aware.
- **Model:** problem_aware bridges with advertorial + Problem-Callout + Story-Problem-Solution.
- **Test carefully:** unaware (very small sample).
- **Avoid over-copying:** solution_aware lead-capture popups (short-life pattern).

H. Confidence Level

High for product_aware, problem_aware, solution_aware (n≥54). **Low** for unaware (n=5).

VARIABLE 15 — Tone

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Tone
- **Unique categories:** 12
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Conversational	67	26.3%	26.2%	29.5%	108	1	5	64.7	Common and saturated
2	Direct-Salesy	49	19.2%	18.5%	19.2%	105	1	5	61.6	Common but neutral
3	Empathetic	38	14.9%	21.5%	14.1%	129	1	5	70.0	Common and strong
4	Journalistic	25	9.8%	3.1%	9.0%	126	1	5	64.3	Common but short-life proportion
5	Expert	23	9.0%	4.6%	10.3%	97	1	5	63.9	Common but neutral
6	Urgent	14	5.5%	9.2%	2.6%	145	1	5	64.9	Rare but coherent

7	Authority	12	4.7%	4.6%	5.1%	114	1	5	65.4	Rare and neutral
8	Luxury	9	3.5%	7.7%	6.4%	175	2	5	69.9	Rare but strong
9	Friendly	8	3.1%	1.5%	0%	78	1	4.5	54.0	Rare and short-life
10	Other	5	2.0%	1.5%	2.6%	122	1	5	62.1	Misc

Strongest co-occurring: Empathetic ↔ Problem-Callout + advertorial + Pain-Relief + Story-Problem-Solution; Luxury ↔ Premium pricing + Bedding/Linens products; Urgent ↔ Discount + countdown + scarcity Cialdini.

Weakest co-occurring: Friendly ↔ no strong partner.

Practical note: Conversational is the default voice (26% of LPs); Empathetic is the standout in advertorials.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Conversational + Direct-Salesy.
- *Overused:* Conversational.
- *Common AND strong:* Empathetic (15% adoption AND 70.0 score — best tone in dataset).
- *Frequent but weak:* Friendly (3% adoption, 54.0 score — under-survival pattern).

C. Top 10 Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Scientific	71.2	117 / 112	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=4 → small.
2	Empathetic	70.0	154 / 129	1.5 / 1	4.9 / 5	Strong and repeated. Best volume+score combo.
3	Luxury	69.9	187 / 175	1.6 / 2	4.7 / 5	n=9 → small but consistent. Pillowcube + linens brands.
4	Authority	65.4	134 / 114	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	n=12, solid.
5	Urgent	64.9	157 / 145	1.4 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=14, solid.
6	Conversational	64.7	138 / 108	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
7	Journalistic	64.3	134 / 126	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	
8	Expert	63.9	124 / 97	1.6 / 1	4.9 / 5	
9	Other	62.1	134 / 122	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	
10	Direct-Salesy	61.6	138 / 105	1.4 / 1	4.8 / 5	Volume + mid score.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated:* Empathetic (the clear winner).
- *Strong but rare:* Luxury (proven on premium-positioning brands), Scientific.

- *Hidden opportunity*: Luxury tone in 9 LPs but 175-day median is the longest in the dataset. White-space for premium-pillow positioning.
- *Test first*: Empathetic tone with Problem-Callout opening on advertorial bridges.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Empathetic.
2. **Repeated but not strong**: Conversational, Direct-Salesy.
3. **Strong but rare**: Luxury, Scientific, Authority.
4. **Inflated**: Empathetic somewhat by thepillowhome cluster (6 of 38).
5. **White-space**: Scientific tone (n=4, score 71.2). Luxury tone for premium positioning.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Empathetic + Problem-Callout + Story-Problem-Solution + advertorial. Luxury + low placements + premium pricing.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Luxury (variant_med=2).
- **By framework**: Empathetic ↔ Story-Problem-Solution / Problem-Solution; Luxury ↔ Direct-Offer / FAB; Urgent ↔ Direct-Offer.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Luxury, Scientific.
- **Common but underwhelming**: Friendly (78-day median), Direct-Salesy.
- **Distorted**: Empathetic by advertorial cluster.
- **Pattern-breaking**: Luxury runs longest median (175 days) but on fewer placements — focused desktop premium strategy.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market**: Conversational + Direct-Salesy.
- **Strongest data-backed**: Empathetic.
- **Overused**: Conversational.
- **Underused but promising**: Empathetic (in non-advertorial formats), Luxury, Scientific.
- **Misleading by frequency**: Direct-Salesy.
- **Model**: Empathetic for any pain-relief LP.
- **Test carefully**: Luxury / Scientific (small samples).
- **Avoid over-copying**: Friendly tone — consistently short-life.

H. Confidence Level

High for Conversational, Direct-Salesy, Empathetic (n≥38). **Medium** for Journalistic, Expert, Urgent, Authority (n=12–25). **Low** for Luxury, Friendly, Scientific (n≤9).

VARIABLE 16 — Claim Type

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Claim Type (claim_types; multi-valued)
- **Unique categories:** 8
- **Usable records:** 251 (98.4%)
- **Missing:** 4 (1.6%)

B. Top 10 Repeating Patterns (8 total)

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Benefit	237	92.9%	95.4%	89.7%	113	1	5	64.7	Common and saturated (universal)
2	Outcome	200	78.4%	78.5%	75.6%	107	1	5	64.6	Common and saturated
3	Mechanism	193	75.7%	78.5%	75.6%	107	1	5	64.7	Common and saturated
4	None	10	3.9%	3.1%	7.7%	130	2	5	71.5	Rare; surprisingly strong
5	Authority	7	2.7%	1.5%	5.1%	106	2	5	71.5	Rare but strong
6	Scientific	4	1.6%	0%	1.3%	117	1	5	63.7	Rare
7	Soft-Educational	2	0.8%	1.5%	0%	154	1	3.5	58.3	Rare
8	Comparative	1	0.4%	0%	1.3%	53	3	5	56.2	Singleton

Strongest co-occurring: Benefit + Outcome + Mechanism (the three are stacked on the same LP ~75%+ of the time); Authority claims ↔ Doctor-Endorsed proof. **Weakest co-occurring:** Comparative ↔ no consistent partner.

Practical note: ~75% of LPs combine all three Benefit+Outcome+Mechanism claims. The claim trio is the de-facto floor.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Benefit + Outcome + Mechanism trio.
- *Overused:* All three.
- *Common AND strong:* The trio is broad-based but only mid-scoring — saturated.
- *Frequent but weak:* Benefit alone scores no better than peers despite 93% adoption.

C. Strongest Patterns

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/ med	Var mean/ med	Plac mean/ med	Notes
1	Authority	71.5	137 / 106	2.0 / 2	5.0 / 5	n=7 → small but coherent. Strong but niche.
2	None	71.5	162 / 130	1.7 / 2	4.8 / 5	n=10. Surprising — LPs with no explicit claim still survive.
3	Mechanism	64.7	142 / 107	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
4	Benefit	64.7	152 / 113	1.5 / 1	4.7 / 5	Saturated.
5	Outcome	64.6	132 / 107	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Saturated.
6	Scientific	63.7	121 / 117	1.0 / 1	5.0 / 5	n=4 → small.
7	Soft-Educational	58.3	154 / 154	1.0 / 1	3.5 / 3.5	n=2.
8	Comparative	56.2	53 / 53	3 / 3	5 / 5	n=1.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated*: None at meaningful volume with high score — the trio is saturated.
- *Strong but rare*: Authority claims (n=7, 71.5 score, 2 variants each). Genuinely promising.
- *Hidden opportunity*: Authority claims appear with multi-variant testing (var_med=2), suggesting advertisers using them are scaling them.
- *Test first*: Authority claims layered over the Benefit-Outcome-Mechanism trio.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both**: Benefit / Outcome / Mechanism (volume only).
2. **Repeated but not strong**: All three are middling — they're the floor, not the edge.
3. **Strong but rare**: Authority, Scientific.
4. **Inflated**: "None" claim (n=10) is paradoxically high score — likely because the "no-claim" LPs are lead_capture popups with strong brand support.
5. **White-space**: Authority claims, Scientific claims, Soft-Educational claims (each <3% adoption).

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings**: Benefit + Outcome + Mechanism + Money-Back-Guarantee.
- **Multi-variant pairings**: Authority + Bundle + Doctor-Endorsed.
- **By framework**: Authority ↔ FAB or Authority-Driven framework; Scientific ↔ News-Hook-Problem-Solution.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong**: Authority claims.
- **Common but underwhelming**: All three of the trio (everyone uses them).
- **Distorted**: "None" claim's score by small sample.
- **Pattern-breaking**: Authority claims with 2 variants suggests advertisers test multiple authority framings — possibly a leading signal.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Benefit + Outcome + Mechanism trio.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Authority (small but multi-variant signal).
- **Overused:** All three trio claims without differentiation.
- **Underused but promising:** Authority claims, Scientific claims.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Benefit / Outcome / Mechanism — used by everyone, drive no real edge.
- **Model:** Trio as floor + Authority claim as differentiator (e.g., "Recommended by board-certified chiropractors").
- **Test carefully:** Scientific (small sample, language must be defensible).
- **Avoid over-copying:** Generic Benefit claims with no proof scaffold.

H. Confidence Level

High for Benefit, Outcome, Mechanism (n≥193). **Medium** for None bucket (n=10). **Low** for Authority, Scientific, Soft-Educational, Comparative (n≤7).

VARIABLE 17 — Specificity Profile

A. Variable Overview

- **Variable:** Specificity Profile — bucketed from the `specificity` block (genericity, concreteness, numerical_specificity, outcome_specificity 0–100 scores).
- **Unique categories:** 6
- **Usable records:** 255 (100%)
- **Missing:** 0

B. All Patterns

Rank	Pattern	n	%	%LR	%MV	Days med	Var med	Plac med	Score	Label
1	Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific	164	64.3%	63.1%	64.1%	114	1	5	65.9	Common and strong
2	Numerical-Heavy	35	13.7%	12.3%	14.1%	98	1	5	60.0	Common but mid
3	Mixed-Specificity	24	9.4%	10.8%	9.0%	124	1	5	66.8	Common and strong
4	Generic-Vague	23	9.0%	12.3%	7.7%	116	1	5	64.0	Common (surprising tenure)
5	Concrete-Descriptive	7	2.7%	1.5%	3.8%	97	1	5	58.7	Rare and weak

6	Outcome-Specific	2	0.8%	0%	1.3%	98	1.5	3.5	55.8	Rare
---	------------------	---	------	----	------	----	-----	-----	------	------

Strongest co-occurring: Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific ↔ Statistics proof + Mechanism claims + Money-Back-Guarantee; Mixed-Specificity ↔ Story-Problem-Solution; Generic-Vague ↔ lead_capture popups (offer alone). **Weakest co-occurring:** Concrete-Descriptive ↔ no consistent partner.

Practical note: Two-thirds of LPs hit BOTH numerical AND outcome specificity. This is now the implicit table-stakes.

Synthesis:

- *Default:* Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific (64% of LPs).
- *Overused:* Same.
- *Common AND strong:* Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific, Mixed-Specificity.
- *Frequent but weak:* Numerical-Heavy (numbers without outcome story).

C. Strongest (all 6)

Rank	Pattern	Score	Days mean/med	Var mean/med	Plac mean/med	Notes
1	Mixed-Specificity	66.8	154 / 124	1.5 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong but niche.
2	Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific	65.9	150 / 114	1.6 / 1	4.8 / 5	Strong and repeated.
3	Generic-Vague	64.0	167 / 116	1.4 / 1	4.6 / 5	Surprising — survives.
4	Numerical-Heavy	60.0	117 / 98	1.5 / 1	4.7 / 5	Numbers alone aren't enough.
5	Concrete-Descriptive	58.7	108 / 97	1.4 / 1	4.9 / 5	Weak.
6	Outcome-Specific	55.8	98 / 98	1.5 / 1.5	3.5 / 3.5	n=2 → too small.

Synthesis:

- *Strong AND repeated:* Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific. The dominant winning profile.
- *Strong but rare:* Mixed-Specificity. Niche but coherent.
- *Hidden opportunity:* Generic-Vague LPs survive 116-day median (surprisingly). Possibly brand-driven; not a copywriting lesson.
- *Test first:* Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific — make every claim include a number AND a specific outcome.

D. Repeating vs Strongest Comparison

1. **Both:** Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific.
2. **Repeated but not strong:** Numerical-Heavy.
3. **Strong but rare:** Mixed-Specificity.
4. **Inflated:** None.
5. **White-space:** Mixed-Specificity (combining numbers with vague-but-evocative language) is

undertested but scores highest.

E. Interaction Effects

- **Long-running pairings:** Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific + Mechanism claims + Statistics proof + Spine-Alignment.
- **Multi-variant pairings:** Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific + Bundle + Awards.
- **By tone:** Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific ↔ Conversational / Empathetic / Expert; Generic-Vague ↔ lead_capture / Discount-only.

F. Exceptions and Outliers

- **Rare but strong:** Mixed-Specificity.
- **Common but underwhelming:** Numerical-Heavy (just numbers, no narrative payoff).
- **Distorted:** Generic-Vague tenure by a few high-tenure brand-led LPs.
- **Pattern-breaking:** Concrete-Descriptive is undertested and underperforming on tenure.

G. Strategic Interpretation

- **Default market:** Numerical + outcome specificity.
- **Strongest data-backed:** Same.
- **Overused:** Numerical-Heavy without outcome.
- **Underused but promising:** Mixed-Specificity, true outcome-specificity.
- **Misleading by frequency:** Generic-Vague survives but isn't a strategy you can copy.
- **Model:** Every claim should carry a number AND describe a specific outcome.
- **Test carefully:** Mixed-Specificity.
- **Avoid over-copying:** Numerical claims with no outcome attached.

H. Confidence Level

High for Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific, Numerical-Heavy, Mixed-Specificity, Generic-Vague ($n \geq 23$). **Low** for Concrete-Descriptive, Outcome-Specific ($n \leq 7$).

Cross-Variable Synthesis — Practical Take-Aways

Strong patterns to model (broad-based, top scores, repeatable)

1. **Framework:** FAB or Story-Problem-Solution
2. **Headline:** Curiosity or specific Benefit
3. **Opening:** Problem-Callout
4. **Big Idea:** Sleep-Quality, NeckPain-Relief, or Discount-Savings
5. **Mechanism:** Orthopedic-Alignment + Spine-Alignment + Contoured-Shape
6. **Offer:** Bundle + Free-Shipping stacked with Discount
7. **CTA:** Get-Discount or Claim-Offer
8. **Proof:** Expert-Endorsement + Testimonials + Statistics
9. **Objection:** Skepticism + Doesn't-Work + Durability handled
10. **Risk Reversal:** Satisfaction-Guarantee + Money-Back-Guarantee
11. **Emotion:** Hope + Relief baseline, Curiosity layered

12. **Desire:** Pain-Relief + Better-Sleep
13. **Belief Shift:** Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain
14. **Awareness:** problem_aware
15. **Tone:** Empathetic
16. **Claim:** Benefit + Outcome + Mechanism + Authority
17. **Specificity:** Numerical-and-Outcome-Specific

White-space patterns to test (rare or underused but strong tenure)

1. Authority-Driven framework (n=2, but both >160 days)
2. Warning headlines (n=4, all 127+ days)
3. Question-Open openings (n=7, broad-based)
4. Snoring-Stop / Pressure-Relief / Pregnancy-Body big ideas
5. Wedge-Elevation mechanism
6. Tiered-Pricing and Subscription offers
7. Try-Risk-Free CTA
8. **Before-After visuals** (n=3 but score 81.2 — strongest white-space signal in dataset)
9. **Allergies objection** (n=15, 175-day median)
10. Reciprocity Cialdini lever (n=35, top score 70.6)
11. Fear emotion (n=20, score 67.2)
12. Energy / Posture-Correction / Relaxation desires
13. Pillow-Is-Cause-of-Pain belief shift (highest belief-shift score)
14. unaware awareness layer (rare, but median tenure 132)
15. Luxury tone (n=9, 175-day median — longest tone tenure)
16. Authority claims (n=7, multi-variant signal)

Patterns to deprioritize (frequent but observably weak)

- Direct-Offer framework without proof scaffold
- Generic Benefit headlines with no specificity
- Benefit-Promise openings without problem framing
- Shop-Now CTAs without offer reference
- Rating-System badges as sole proof
- Free-Trial risk-reversal
- Friendly tone
- "This-Mechanism-Is-Superior" belief shift
- Numerical-Heavy specificity without outcome

Patterns flagged as advertiser-specific (be careful copying)

- **Curiosity-Open** opening (64% of n=14 are mellowsleep) — score 74 collapses without that template
- **Curiosity framework** (33% from mellowsleep)
- **Bundle offer** has notable mellowsleep + saybrooksleep concentration (~25%)
- **Empathetic tone** modestly amplified by thepillowhome cluster
- **Long-running Direct-Offer LPs** are pulled up by 4–5 ad-libraries-old outliers (theorthocushion 892d, saybrooksleep 840d, getnora 552d, sidneysleep 590d)

Methodology limitations

- **Reach and impressions unavailable.** Days-running carries 44% weight, which over-rewards survival vs current scale.
- **Brand concentration:** Several "strong but rare" patterns hinge on a single advertiser's template.

Flagged where applicable.

- **Bucket normalization:** Big Idea and Belief Shift use keyword-based bucketing of free-form Gemini extractions; ~60% of belief-shift entries fall into "Other" — fine-grained patterns under that label may exist but are not surfaced.
 - **No A/B causal claim:** Tenure correlates with survival, not necessarily with ROAS or CTR.
-

End of report.