

PERFORMANCE CASE STUDY

Some accounts need fixing. *This one needed scaling.*

The brand was already performing. The problem was the ceiling. Over 15 months, Rebel Online tore it off — generating \$2,508,938 across Meta and Google while defending efficiency at 2.5x the prior spend level.

TOTAL REVENUE	BLENDED ROAS	REVENUE GROWTH	TOTAL TRANSACTIONS
\$2.5M Meta + Google combined	7.11x Cross-channel avg.	+128% Monthly avg. vs pre-RO	12,331 Meta + Google combined
META ADS		GOOGLE ADS	
Revenue	\$1,253,042	Revenue	\$1,255,896
Spend	\$211,768	Spend	\$141,314
ROAS	5.92x	ROAS	8.89x
Purchases	5,873	Conversions	6,458
Avg. CPP	\$36.06	Avg. CPA	\$21.88

01

Client Overview

A niche lifestyle eCommerce brand selling premium goth-aesthetic linen bedding — high AOV, fiercely loyal community-driven audience, and strong organic word-of-mouth. A product that sits at the intersection of subculture identity and everyday luxury. The brand doesn't need to convince people to want it. It needs a paid media engine capable of finding the right people at scale, without diluting what makes it worth finding.

02

The Real Problem

When a brand is already generating a healthy ROAS, the brief changes. There's no broken account to fix — the harder question is: why is a brand with this product-market fit and this audience loyalty only spending \$5,500 a month on paid? When we audited in October 2024, the answer was structural. The Meta account was running efficiently at small scale — a 6.60x ROAS over the prior five months — but the architecture couldn't support real growth. No scalable creative testing framework, no clean funnel separation, no brand capture on Google. The account wasn't failing. It was capped. And it had been capped for nearly two years.

The Strategy

We rebuilt the architecture before touching the budget. On Meta: always-on ABO campaigns as a structured creative testing engine, ASC+ as the scaling layer for validated winners, and a dedicated DPA retargeting structure. Creative was tested in batches — UGC, editorial, collection-specific — with fast kill decisions on underperformers. On Google: a Manual CPC brand search campaign was built to intercept high-intent branded queries that organic demand was generating but paid had no infrastructure to capture. That campaign alone delivered a 30.77x ROAS. PMax was then structured to separate prospecting from mixed-intent traffic. Promotional windows — BFCM, clearance, flash sales — each received dedicated campaign builds, not budget reallocations.

"The real test isn't whether you can hold ROAS at \$5K/month. It's whether you can hold it at \$14K/month. That's what we built for."

The Transformation

Spend scaled 2.5x. Revenue scaled 2.3x. ROAS compressed just 10.3%. Most accounts see ROAS fall 30–40% when budgets double. We held it within 10%.

BEFORE REBEL ONLINE — META (5-MONTH AVG, 2024)	WITH REBEL ONLINE — META (15-MONTH AVG)		
Avg. Monthly Revenue	\$36,621	Avg. Monthly Revenue	\$83,536
Avg. Monthly Spend	\$5,552	Avg. Monthly Spend	\$14,118
Meta ROAS	6.60x	Meta ROAS	5.92x
Avg. Cost Per Purchase	\$28.89	Avg. Cost Per Purchase	\$36.06
<i>Performing well — but capped at small scale with no growth architecture in place.</i>		<i>2.3x revenue growth. 2.5x spend growth. Only 10% ROAS compression.</i>	

2.4x more revenue. 25% less time.

Pre-RO (20 months): \$511,534 on Meta → With RO (15 months): \$1,253,042 on Meta alone.

Peak month pre-RO
\$45,767

Peak month with RO
\$339,000+

The Results

Across 15 months, Rebel Online generated **\$2,508,938 in attributed revenue** from \$353,082 in managed spend — a **7.11x blended cross-channel ROAS**. The brand broke its own BFCM record in back-to-back years: November 2024 (month one under Rebel Online) and November 2025, the highest-revenue month in the brand's paid media history. Two consecutive records. One system.

TOTAL REVENUE — META + GOOGLE	\$2,508,938	TOTAL SPEND MANAGED	\$353,082
BLENDED CROSS-CHANNEL ROAS	7.11x	GOOGLE ROAS	8.89x
META ROAS	5.92x	BEST SINGLE CAMPAIGN ROAS	30.77x
BFCM RECORD — BROKEN TWICE	Nov 2024 & Nov 2025	PEAK MONTH: PRE-RO VS WITH RO	\$45K → \$339K

Why It Worked

RIGHT DIAGNOSIS

We identified a ceiling problem, not a performance problem. That distinction drove every structural decision — building for scale from day one rather than optimising what was already near its architectural limit.

**ARCHITECTURE
BEFORE BUDGET**

We rebuilt the account structure before increasing spend. Clean funnel separation, a proper creative testing engine, brand capture on Google. Infrastructure first, budgets second. This is why ROAS held as spend scaled rather than collapsing under the pressure of additional budget.

**BUILT FOR THE
AUDIENCE**

This brand's buyers respond to aesthetic precision. Every batch of ads was built to feel native to the brand's world — which is why conversion rates held as reach expanded. The product sells itself to the right person. Our job was finding them.

**PROMOS AS
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Most agencies shift budgets for BFCM. We build dedicated campaign structures for it. The back-to-back records and the \$45K to \$339K peak growth are a direct result of treating seasonal moments as engineered events, not opportunistic budget shifts.

**SLOW MONTH
DISCIPLINE**

We reduced spend in underperforming months rather than chasing volume targets. Uncomfortable in the short term. Essential for long-term ROAS health. The 7.11x blended average across 15 months was protected, in part, by the months where we chose restraint over activity.
