



Market Lense

Clarity before action. Evidence before recommendation.

SPEC / INDEPENDENT SAMPLE

Combined GBP + Conversion Journey Audit

Reflect Clearly. Measure What Matters.

This demonstration shows how Mirror & Metric would apply the Market Lense Combined Audit to a fictional premium dental clinic. All business facts, competitor records, rankings, owner-access information and outcomes are fictional scenario data created solely to demonstrate methodology and reporting quality.

BUSINESS	Aurelia Dental Studio — fictional
LOCATION	Pune, Maharashtra — 2 locations
AUDIT	Combined GBP + Conversion Journey Audit
AUDIT DEPTH	67 GBP checks + 43 Conversion checks = 110 checks
STATUS	SPEC / Independent Sample
COMPANION FILE	Market Lense Spec Audit Support Workbook (.xlsx)

02 Executive Summary

The fictional audit shows a credible digital foundation, but material gaps remain across Google Business Profile completeness, local visibility, reputation activity, booking-path consistency, lead handling and measurement. The strongest constraint is not simply generating interest; it is reliably converting and measuring that interest after discovery.

GBP HEALTH SCORE	CONVERSION READINESS SCORE
61.4 / 100	48.4 / 100
Needs Optimisation	Weak

HOW THE NUMBERS ARE GENERATED

The companion Excel workbook is the calculation source. Each of the 110 checks is recorded as Binary, Quality or Numeric evidence. The workbook converts the selected response into applicable points and points earned, calculates section scores, and rolls those results into the two underlying 100-point audit scores. N/A checks are excluded rather than treated as failures.

Important: these scores are Mirror & Metric's audit methodology, not an official Google score. The Combined Audit keeps the GBP and Conversion scores separate; it does not invent a single combined score.

MOST IMPORTANT SIGNAL

The customer-facing presence is credible enough to generate interest, but booking-path consistency, lead ownership, follow-up and measurement are materially weaker. Increasing marketing volume before these gaps are addressed could increase leakage rather than solve it.

03 Google Business Profile — Section Results

The GBP audit covers 67 checks across 12 sections. The section table below is taken directly from the populated companion workbook.

Section	Score	Assessment	Issues
Business Identity	93.8	Excellent	0
Categories	78.0	Strong	1
NAP & Contact	77.1	Strong	2
Description	66.3	Needs Optimisation	1
Services & Products	48.8	Weak	3
Profile Features & Completeness	61.4	Needs Optimisation	3
Photos & Visuals	64.5	Needs Optimisation	2
Reviews & Reputation	44.7	Weak	5
Posts & Activity	30.0	Critical	4
Policy & Risk	95.0	Excellent	0
Competitor Positioning	56.5	Weak	3
Local Visibility	48.0	Weak	3

INTERPRETATION

Strong identity and policy hygiene provide a stable base. The main GBP weaknesses are service coverage, reputation depth, posting/activity, competitor position and local visibility. These are not cosmetic findings; they affect how clearly the clinic is represented and how competitively it appears in local discovery.

04 Conversion Journey — Section Results

The Conversion Journey audit covers 43 checks across 7 sections and evaluates what happens after a potential patient discovers the business.

Section	Score	Assessment	Issues
Action Paths & CTAs	59.2	Weak	3
Website & Landing Experience	65.7	Needs Optimisation	2
Contact & Booking Friction	69.4	Needs Optimisation	2
Lead Response & Routing	13.3	Critical	6
Trust & Objection Handling	66.0	Needs Optimisation	2
Follow-Up & Nurture	42.5	Weak	4
Measurement & Attribution	8.0	Critical	5

INTERPRETATION

Website and booking usability are not fundamentally broken, but lead response/routing and measurement are critical weaknesses. Follow-up is also inconsistent. This means the business may generate legitimate interest without reliably capturing, owning, recovering or attributing that interest.

05 Priority Findings

These findings are prioritised by customer impact, evidence strength and practical importance. The detailed workbook contains the underlying check-level responses and evidence notes.

1**Booking-path routing is inconsistent****Priority:** Critical

What we found: One GBP appointment action routes to a generic page rather than the correct location-specific booking path.

Recommended improvement: Correct location-specific appointment destinations and verify the full booking path.

2**Lead ownership is unreliable****Priority:** Critical

What we found: Enquiries are split across WhatsApp, phone logs and email, with inconsistent assignment and missed-call recovery.

Recommended improvement: Define one lead capture record, clear ownership, missed-lead recovery and escalation responsibilities.

3**Measurement is too weak for confident decisions****Priority:** High

What we found: Lead source, funnel stage, response time and source-to-outcome attribution are not captured consistently.

Recommended improvement: Establish practical lead-source, funnel-stage and response-time measurement before judging marketing effectiveness.

06 Priority Findings — Continued

4	Reputation depth trails the local benchmark Priority: High What we found: Review volume, recency and owner-response activity are materially weaker than the fictional local competitor set. Recommended improvement: Create a compliant review-request and response discipline and monitor recurring review themes.
5	Service/profile coverage is incomplete Priority: High What we found: High-value services, action links and customer information are not represented consistently across both locations. Recommended improvement: Complete in-scope service, category, profile-feature and customer-information gaps.
6	Local visibility is weak for priority searches Priority: High What we found: Average fictional rank is 7.0 for core-category tests and 9.0 for high-value service tests versus a top-3 benchmark. Recommended improvement: Strengthen legitimate local relevance and monitor representative location-sensitive searches over time.

EVIDENCE DISCIPLINE

All evidence in this spec sample is fictional and clearly marked as such. In a real Market Lense engagement, Mirror & Metric would use public observations, authorised owner-access evidence and customer-supplied records, recording limitations rather than guessing where evidence is unavailable.

07 Prioritised Action Path

The audit ends with recommendations. It does not implement the fixes. The sequence below separates immediate leakage control from later optimisation.

#	Action	Priority	What changes
1	Fix booking-path routing	Immediate	Correct GBP appointment destinations and verify every location-specific customer action path.
2	Define lead ownership and recovery	Immediate	Create clear capture, assignment, missed-lead recovery and escalation responsibilities on the client side.
3	Establish measurement basics	Immediate	Capture lead source, funnel stage, response time and meaningful outcome consistently.
4	Strengthen reputation operations	High	Improve compliant review-generation cadence, response consistency and review-theme monitoring.
5	Complete service/category/profile coverage	High	Align categories, service entries, action links and profile completeness with genuine priority offerings.
6	Improve local visibility foundations	High	Strengthen relevance and monitor representative category/service searches by location.
7	Refresh profile activity and visuals	Medium	Increase current authentic imagery and maintain useful GBP updates.
8	Clarify trust, pricing and follow-up	Medium	Reduce uncertainty around treatment pricing/process and improve documented follow-up discipline.

08 Recommended Next Step & Service Boundary

RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION ROUTE

Presence Plus is the appropriate Mirror & Metric implementation route for the in-scope digital-foundation issues identified here: Google Business Profile completeness, action-path corrections, service/profile clarity, trust messaging and other approved no-code customer-facing improvements.

IMPORTANT BOUNDARY

Presence Plus does not include CRM implementation, complex lead routing, custom automation, backend redevelopment or operational customer-support management. The fictional lead-ownership, follow-up and measurement weaknesses therefore require client-owned operational correction or separately appropriate systems/process work outside this marketing implementation scope.

MARKET MOMENTUM

Market Momentum should not be assumed automatically from this audit. If the foundation and critical leakage points are addressed and the business then needs ongoing coordinated marketing execution, Market Momentum can be considered based on the client's actual need.

SCORE BANDS USED

90–100	Excellent
75–89	Strong
60–74	Needs Optimisation
40–59	Weak
Below 40	Critical

FINAL STANDARD

Evidence first. Explain clearly. Recommend specifically. Do not overstate certainty. Do not implement under Market Lense.