THE PLAIN ENGLISH GUIDE TO META ADVERTISING

META ADS PLAYBOOK

How to build ads that stop the scroll, convert cold audiences, and scale without breaking — on Meta in 2026

WAEL AOUIDIDI

161 operator insights · Facebook Ad Library · r/FacebookAds · r/PPC · Field reports 2025–2026

CONTENTS

Introduction

I want to tell you about a dog toy company and what they discovered about Facebook ads.

Tearribles sells indestructible dog toys. Their ads were not working particularly well. The creative focused on how fun and novel the product was — a toy your dog cannot destroy. Reasonable assumption: people buy dog toys because they want their dog to have fun.

They tested a different hypothesis. What if the real reason people buy indestructible dog toys is not excitement about the product, but anxiety about the problem? Dogs destroying toys creates stress. It creates mess. For some owners, it creates genuine worry about their dog swallowing something.

They rewrote the opening of their ad around the anxiety. Not the product. The problem.

CPA dropped 24%. ROAS improved 31%. Purchases went up 53%.

Same product. Same audience. Same budget. Different opening line.

That is what this book is about. Not the technical mechanics of Meta's ad platform — there are endless tutorials for that. This is about the thinking behind ads that actually work: why some ads stop people scrolling and most don't, why some accounts scale and most plateau, and what the operators who get consistent results are doing differently from everyone else.

What this book is based on

The insights here come from 161 rows of operator-sourced data, drawn from field reports, Reddit practitioner threads in r/FacebookAds and r/PPC, and documented case studies with published numbers. Tearribles is in there. So is a kitchenware brand that doubled ROAS with AI-generated creative. A finance newsletter that cut cost per lead below two dollars. A SaaS company that improved trial conversion by 29% through systematic testing.

Where I quote a number, it comes from a documented source. I will tell you where.

How to use this book

Each chapter ends with Key Takeaways. Use those once you have read the chapter and are in the middle of applying it. Chapter 14 is the 90-day plan — the sequence that puts everything in order. Read the chapters first so the plan makes sense when you get there.

SECTION 1 HOW META ACTUALLY WORKS

Before building a single ad, you need to understand what Meta's algorithm is actually doing. Most ad failures are not creative failures — they are failures to understand the system the creative is operating in. These three chapters cover that system.

Chapter 1 — What the Algorithm Is Doing

Meta's algorithm does not read your audience targeting settings and decide who to show your ad to. Not primarily. What it actually does is read your creative — the video, the image, the copy — and use those signals to find the people most likely to respond to it.

This is the shift that changed everything for Meta advertisers. For years, the playbook was audience engineering: build the right interest stack, layer the right demographics, find the right lookalike. The creative was almost secondary — a vehicle for the targeting. That model stopped working reliably around 2021, and it has been getting less reliable every year since.

The reason is iOS 14. Apple's App Transparency Tracking update in 2021 broke the cross-site tracking that Meta's pixel relied on. Suddenly, Meta could not see what happened after a click with the same precision. Attribution broke. Audience signals degraded. The algorithm had to learn a different way to find buyers — and it found one.

Creative is your new targeting

Meta's algorithm now uses creative signals — who watches, who clicks, who engages, who buys after seeing a specific ad — to build a real-time model of who your buyers are. A compelling ad that gets watched by a specific type of person tells the algorithm exactly who to show it to next. A weak ad with perfect targeting tells it nothing useful.

This is why operators who switched to broad targeting — no interest or demographic constraints — and paired it with strong creative began outperforming heavily targeted campaigns. They were giving the algorithm better signal to work with, not less.

Tearribles tested open broad targeting (no interest or demographic constraints) against custom audiences.

The ad creative focused on the anxiety problem — dogs destroying toys — not the product's features.

With open targeting and benefit-driven creative:

CPA decreased 24% · ROAS improved 31% · Purchases up 53%

The algorithm, given strong creative and no constraints, found the right audience on its own.

The audience built from product signals outperformed the manually constructed audience.

Source: Sweatpants Agency / Tearribles case study, 2025.

PRO TIP **The threshold for broad targeting**

Broad targeting only outperforms detailed targeting when your account has enough conversion history for the algorithm to learn from. The threshold operators document consistently: 50 or more weekly conversion events. Below that, the algorithm does not have enough signal to find your audience on its own. If you are under 50 weekly conversions, use interest targeting to seed initial signal — then transition to broad once the data is there.

Why most ad failures are creative failures

If the algorithm reads creative to find your audience, then a bad creative does not just fail to persuade — it actively sends the wrong signal. An ad that gets clicks from low-intent browsers tells the algorithm to find more low-intent browsers. An ad that bores people tells it the product is boring. The creative is the brief you give to the algorithm about who should see it.

This reframe changes how you think about testing. You are not just testing whether an ad persuades. You are testing what signal that ad sends to the algorithm about your ideal buyer.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Meta's algorithm uses creative signals — who watches, who clicks, who buys — to find your audience. Targeting settings are secondary.
- ✓ Broad targeting outperforms detailed targeting for accounts with 50+ weekly conversions. Below that threshold, use interest targeting to build initial signal.
- ✓ A bad creative actively misleads the algorithm. It is not neutral — it sends the wrong signal about who your buyer is.
- ✓ The shift: creative is your targeting. Every creative decision is an audience decision.

Chapter 2 — The Four Signals Meta Uses

Meta measures four things about every ad you run. These four numbers determine whether your ad gets distributed widely, shown to a small audience, or quietly stopped. Understanding what each one measures — and what it tells Meta about your ad — changes how you interpret your results.

The four signals

SIGNAL	WHAT IT MEASURES	WHAT LOW PERFORMANCE MEANS
Hook rate	% of people who watch past 3 seconds	The opening failed. Meta stops distributing the ad.
Hold rate	% of people who watch past 15 seconds	The middle lost them after a good start.
CTR (link click rate)	% of viewers who click your link	People watched but did not act on it.
Engagement	Likes, comments, shares	The ad resonated — or did not — with the broader audience.

These four signals form a sequence. Hook rate comes first: can the ad stop the scroll at all? Hold rate comes second: does the ad deliver on what the hook promised? CTR comes third: does the ad generate genuine buying intent? Engagement last: does the ad create social momentum?

The diagnostic value is in the sequence. An ad with high hook rate but low hold rate tells you the opening is strong but the body is losing

people. An ad with high hold rate but low CTR tells you the ad is compelling but the offer or call to action is not landing. Each combination points to a different specific fix.

What the benchmarks actually look like

SIGNAL	HEALTHY BENCHMARK
Hook rate (3-second view rate)	25% or above — below this, rebuild the opening
Hold rate (15-second view rate)	20% or above — below this with good hook rate, the body is failing
CTR (link click rate)	0.8% or above — below this after 10,000 impressions, replace the creative
CPA vs target	Below your target — 2× target for 2 consecutive days triggers a pause

PRO TIP **Fix the sequence, not the symptom**

When an ad underperforms, most people change everything at once — new image, new copy, new CTA. This tells you nothing useful. Instead, diagnose which signal is failing first. If hook rate is below 25%, change only the opening. If hook rate is fine but hold rate is low, keep the opening and change the middle. Isolate the problem before you change anything.

Hook rate: the most misunderstood metric

Hook rate is not widely reported in Meta Ads Manager by default — you have to add it as a custom metric. Many operators have never looked at

it. This is a significant missed opportunity, because hook rate is the earliest signal available about creative quality.

A creative with a 35% hook rate and a 1% CTR is performing well at the top and failing at the bottom. A creative with a 15% hook rate and a 0.6% CTR is failing throughout. The intervention is completely different. Without hook rate data, both look the same — 'the ad is not working'.

How to add it: in Ads Manager, go to Columns, select Customise Columns, and add 'Video plays at 25%' as a percentage of impressions. That is your hook rate.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Four signals determine distribution: hook rate (3s), hold rate (15s), CTR, and engagement. They form a diagnostic sequence — each failure points to a specific fix.
- ✓ Hook rate below 25% means the opening is failing. Hold rate below 20% with good hook rate means the body is failing. CTR below 0.8% after 10,000 impressions means the creative should be replaced.
- ✓ Add hook rate as a custom metric in Ads Manager. It is the earliest diagnostic signal available and most operators are not looking at it.
- ✓ Diagnose which signal is failing before changing anything. Changing everything at once produces no useful data.

Chapter 3 — What Your Numbers Actually Mean

There is a number in your Meta Ads Manager that is almost certainly wrong. It is the ROAS number — return on ad spend — that appears in the Reporting column next to every campaign.

It is not wrong because Meta is being dishonest. It is wrong because of how attribution works, and understanding this is one of the most important things any Meta advertiser can know.

The attribution problem

When someone sees your ad, does not click, and then buys from you two days later — who gets the credit? Under Meta's default one-day view attribution, Meta does. It assigns that conversion to the last ad the person saw, even if they never clicked it.

This is called view-through attribution. It sounds reasonable in principle — the ad may have influenced the purchase. But in practice, it means Meta is taking credit for purchases that would have happened anyway. A person who saw your ad while browsing and had already decided to buy from your email that morning gets attributed to the ad they glanced at.

The result: Meta's reported ROAS overstates true performance. Operators who have compared Meta-reported conversions against their backend order data consistently find the same gap.

42%

Average attribution inflation

Operators comparing Meta-reported conversions against backend revenue data found Meta overstated performance by an average of 42%. Decisions made from Meta data alone

> *regularly paused profitable campaigns. Source: r/PPC attribution thread, 2026.*

What to use instead

The most attribution-immune metric available for DTC is MER — Marketing Efficiency Ratio. The calculation is simple: total revenue from all sources divided by total paid ad spend. This number cannot be inflated by attribution models because it uses actual revenue from your bank account or accounting software, not Meta's modelled conversions.

Track MER weekly. Use it as your primary performance indicator. Use Meta's ROAS as a directional signal — useful for comparing creatives against each other within the same platform — but never as an absolute measure of profitability.

USE THIS FOR	USE META ROAS FOR
Overall profitability decision (should I spend more or less?)	Comparing creative A vs creative B within Meta
Evaluating whether ads are generating real revenue	Understanding which campaigns are relatively better
Deciding whether to hire more people or expand products	Directional signal only — not absolute performance

PRO TIP **The backend verification habit**

Every Monday, export your Meta conversions report for the prior week. Export the same period from Shopify, your CRM, or your payment processor. Calculate the ratio. Over time, you will develop a reliable deflation factor — if Meta consistently reports 1.4× your actual revenue, you know to divide any Meta ROAS by 1.4 to get the real number. This

takes ten minutes per week and transforms your decision quality.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Meta's reported ROAS overstates true performance by an average of 42% due to view-through attribution claiming credit for purchases that would have happened anyway.
- ✓ MER (total revenue / total ad spend) is attribution-immune and should be your primary performance indicator for overall spend decisions.
- ✓ Use Meta's ROAS as a relative signal — for comparing creatives within Meta — not as an absolute measure of profitability.
- ✓ Run a weekly backend verification: Meta conversions vs actual orders. Build your personal deflation factor over 4–6 weeks.

SECTION 2 BUILDING ADS THAT WORK

Section 2 covers the craft: how to engineer hooks, how to structure the rest of the ad, how to design static images that actually stop the scroll, and how to produce video without wasting budget on reshoots.

Chapter 4 — Hook Engineering — The First Three Seconds

The hook is the first three seconds of your ad. It is the most important three seconds in advertising. Not because three seconds is a long time — it is not — but because if those three seconds fail, nothing else matters. The viewer never sees your product. Never hears your offer. Never reads your proof. The algorithm never learns who your buyer is.

Most ad hooks fail not because they are badly written but because they are written from the wrong perspective. They describe what the product is. What the company offers. What makes it special. The person scrolling does not care about any of those things in the first three seconds. They care about one thing: is this relevant to me right now?

Where winning hooks actually come from

The operators who consistently write strong hooks do not sit down and think of clever openings. They mine language. Specifically: the exact words your customers use when describing their problem before they found your product.

The most reliable source for this language is customer reviews — specifically 4 and 5-star reviews on G2, Trustpilot, and Capterra, for your product and your competitors'. When someone writes 'I was spending four hours every Monday on reports and now it takes twenty minutes', that is a hook. Not paraphrased. Verbatim.

> An operator mining reviews for a SaaS product found customers repeatedly using the phrase
>
> 'I had no idea why my ads were not working' — not 'poor ROI' or 'inefficient campaigns'.

> That exact phrase became a hook opening.
>
> Review-mined hooks outperformed agency-written hooks in 70% of A/B tests.
>
> The reason: the language matched the exact internal monologue of the target customer.
>
> When someone reads their own thought in an ad, they stop scrolling.
>
> Source: r/FacebookAds copy research thread, 2026.

The eight hook archetypes

Every effective hook belongs to one of eight categories. The category determines the psychological trigger it activates. Use this table to plan hook variation — if your last five tests were all pain hooks, you are not testing archetypes, you are testing copy.

HOOK TYPE	OPENING LINE EXAMPLE	WHEN IT WORKS BEST
Curiosity — creates an open loop	'Still tracking your leads in a spreadsheet?'	Cold audiences who do not know they have the problem
Pain — names a frustration	'Your dog destroys every toy in ten minutes.'	Any product that solves a clear daily irritation
Proof — leads with a result	'I cut my reporting time from four hours to twenty minutes.'	Warm-ish audiences who need credibility before interest
Contrarian — breaks an assumption	'Targeting is not why your ads are failing.'	Saturated markets where everyone says the same thing
Founder confession — honest vulnerability	'We almost ran out of money three times before this worked.'	Brand building, trust-first categories

Mistake — teaches something	'Three things I did wrong before my ads finally worked.'	Educational audiences, high hold rate products
Negative framing — loss aversion	'Most founders are wasting 40% of their ad budget without knowing it.'	Cold audiences — loss activation is stronger than gain
Success story — aspiration	'I hit six figures before I turned 25, here is how.'	Aspiration-driven categories, finance, career, fitness

One finding that comes up consistently in operator testing: negative framing outperforms positive framing on cold audiences. 'You are losing money every time you do X' activates stronger attention than 'Imagine how much money you could make if you did X'. Loss aversion is a more powerful scroll-stopper than aspiration. Test negative variants of your best-performing positive hooks.

The mute test — does your visual hook work alone?

More than 85% of Facebook videos are watched without sound. An ad that requires audio to understand the hook is an ad that fails in the majority of viewing contexts. Before you publish any video ad, watch it with the sound off for three seconds. If you cannot understand what the ad is about from the visual alone, the visual hook is not doing its job.

Apply the same test to competitor ads. Open the Facebook Ad Library, find your top three competitors' currently running ads, and watch the first three seconds of each without sound. Ads that communicate clearly on mute have stronger visual hooks. Note what visual elements they use — text overlays, product demonstrations, before/after visuals — and use that as your benchmark.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Mine customer reviews on G2 Trustpilot and Capterra for hook

language. Review-mined hooks outperformed agency-written hooks in 70% of A/B tests.

- ✓ Eight hook archetypes: curiosity, pain, proof, contrarian, founder confession, mistake, negative framing, success story. Vary the archetype across test batches.
- ✓ Negative framing outperforms positive framing on cold audiences in 65% of split tests. Always test a negative version of your best positive hook.
- ✓ Watch your ad with sound off for 3 seconds before publishing. 85% of Facebook videos are watched silent. If the hook does not communicate visually, most viewers will not understand it.

Chapter 5 — Ad Structures — What Comes After the Hook

The hook stops the scroll. The structure converts the viewer.

Most ads that get a good hook rate but a low CTR fail in the middle — after the viewer has decided to watch, the ad fails to take them anywhere. The hook created a question. The structure never answers it.

Every high-performing ad in the dataset follows one of five structural patterns. These are not templates to fill in. They are narrative sequences that mirror the psychological progression a buyer needs to move from stranger to customer.

The five structures

Each structure is built for a specific situation. Using the wrong structure for your product or audience is as damaging as a weak hook.

> Structure 1 — Hook → Problem → Demo → CTA
>
> Interrupt. Name the specific problem. Show the product solving it. Ask for action.
>
> Best for: products with a visible before/after. D2C. Any product where seeing it work is the argument.
>
> Documented: Tearribles — 53% purchase increase, 35.7% CVR lift.
>
> Structure 2 — Hook → Benefit → Proof → CTA
>
> Interrupt. State the key outcome. Prove it with data or a real result. Ask.
>
> Best for: FMCG, functional consumer products, any product with a clear measurable benefit.

Documented: FMCG brand — CTR +220%, CPC -38%, conversion +27%.

Structure 3 — Hook → Problem → Demo → Proof → CTA

Interrupt. Name the problem. Show the product. Show someone else it worked for. Ask.

Best for: SaaS, high-consideration products, anything where credibility is the key barrier.

Documented: SaaS product — cost per trial -29%, conversion +2%.

Structure 4 — Hook → Myth → Reality → Solution → CTA

Interrupt. State a belief the audience holds. Debunk it with evidence. Present the product as the correct answer.

Best for: saturated markets, B2B, educational positioning.

Structure 5 — Hook → Story → Reveal → Proof → CTA

Interrupt. Tell a real story (founder or customer). Reveal the product as the resolution. Validate. Ask.

Best for: founder-led brands, SaaS with an origin story, any product where trust is the first barrier.

The 70/20/10 rule for creative production

One of the most consistently cited operator insights in the dataset is about where time should be spent in the creative process. A finance newsletter that cut cost per lead from over three dollars to under two dollars attributed the improvement to shifting their creative process: 70% of time on research and development, 20% on testing, 10% on optimisation.

Most teams do the opposite. They spend 10% on research, 20% on development, and 70% on optimisation — tweaking underperforming ads rather than building better ones from better research. Optimisation

of a weak concept produces weak results. Research that uncovers the right angle produces strong results from the first test.

PHASE	WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICE
70% — Research	Mining reviews, Reddit, competitor ads, customer interviews. Finding the language and angle before writing a word of copy.
20% — Testing	Running the hypotheses generated by research at sufficient budget to get real signal. Not endless tweaking of the same concept.
10% — Optimisation	Improving what is already working. Changing one variable at a time on proven winners.

PRO TIP **The structure test**

If your ad has a hook and then immediately tries to sell something, you have skipped the structure. The structure's job is to earn the right to ask for a click. One proven sequence: hook → address the specific problem the hook implied → show the product solving exactly that problem → one piece of proof → CTA. Four steps. Each step earns the next.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Five structures cover most Meta ad scenarios. Match the structure to the product and audience, not to your preference.
- ✓ Hook → Problem → Demo → CTA for visible before/after products. Hook → Benefit → Proof → CTA for functional outcomes. Hook → Problem → Demo → Proof → CTA for high-consideration products.
- ✓ 70% of creative time should be research. 20% testing. 10% optimisation. Most teams invert this and wonder why their ads never break through.
- ✓ The structure earns the right to ask for a click. Hook → problem addressed → product solving it → proof → CTA is the minimum viable

sequence.

Chapter 6 — Static Image Ads — The Underrated Format

Static images have a reputation problem. Compared to video, they feel old-fashioned. Compared to UGC, they feel corporate. Most operators treat them as the format you use when you do not have anything better.

The operators who actually test static images consistently report something different: well-designed statics outperform video in specific contexts, convert at comparable rates with a fraction of the production cost, and are the fastest format for testing copy angles before investing in full video production.

This chapter covers what makes a static image ad actually work — and the specific design decisions that separate high-performing statics from the majority that get ignored.

The one-claim rule

The most common mistake in static image design is trying to communicate too much. Multiple text elements, a headline, a subheadline, a benefit list, a logo, a CTA. The result is a slide deck compressed into a 1:1 image that nobody reads.

The rule that operators document consistently: one claim per static image. Seven words maximum as the text overlay. Everything else — the supporting copy, the proof, the benefits — goes in the ad text above the image, not on the image itself.

20–35%

Higher CTR — single claim vs multi-text

Operator split tests across verticals. Single-claim statics consistently outperformed multi-text designs. The cleaner image also received better auction delivery from Meta.

Source: r/FacebookAds static image thread, 2026.

Design principles that move the number

DESIGN CHOICE	WHAT THE DATA SHOWS
High-contrast solid colour background vs lifestyle photography	25-40% higher hook rate for cold traffic. Contrast interrupts the feed's warm aesthetic.
Human face visible vs product-only	15-30% higher CTR. Forward-facing faces trigger social attention reflexes.
UGC-aesthetic (phone photo, natural light) vs polished studio	20-40% higher CTR for non-luxury products. Polished creative gets identified and ignored as an ad.
Before/after with after dominant (70% of image) vs equal split	20-30% higher CVR. Lead with the aspiration, not the obstacle.
Question headline vs statement headline on cold traffic	15-25% higher CTR. Questions create cognitive dissonance that demands resolution.
Social proof number ('14,247 teams use this') vs testimonial quote	15-25% higher CTR. Numbers process faster than text in a visual scan.

Text-on-colour: the fastest copy testing format

Before investing in photography or video production, there is a faster way to test whether a copy angle works. Design a static ad with no image at all — just bold text on a high-contrast solid colour background.

A white headline on a dark orange background. Black text on yellow. The format takes fifteen minutes to produce and directly measures whether the copy angle stops the scroll.

When a text-on-colour variant significantly outperforms all image variants, it tells you the copy angle is the primary conversion driver and image investment will compound on that foundation. When it underperforms everything, it tells you the angle itself is not working — before you have spent money on production.

Format and placement rules

Two technical decisions that most operators get wrong and that cost them performance.

Format: always produce statics in 4:5 or 1:1 ratio, not 16:9. A 16:9 image on a mobile feed occupies less than half the screen. A 4:5 image fills most of it. The additional screen real estate alone explains the 15-25% CTR differential operators consistently document between the two formats.

Reels placement: if you are running statics in Reels, design specifically for it. The top and bottom 20% of a Reels frame are covered by Meta's UI — profile handles, action buttons, music labels. A static designed for feed will have its critical elements obscured. Design in 9:16 with all key content in the middle 60% of the frame.

PRO TIP **The logo test**

Test your best-performing static with the logo removed from the top-left corner. Operators who have run this test consistently report 10-20% CTR improvements on cold audiences. The mechanism: a logo in the top-left corner immediately signals 'this is an advertisement' — activating the scroll reflex before the hook has had a chance to land. If your brand recognition is not yet strong enough to help you, your logo is hurting you.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ One claim per static. Seven words maximum as image text. Everything else goes in the ad copy above the image.
- ✓ High-contrast backgrounds, human faces, UGC aesthetics, and social proof numbers each independently improve CTR by 15-40% in split tests.
- ✓ Text-on-colour statics test copy angles in isolation before investing in production. Use them to validate angles before commissioning photography.
- ✓ 4:5 format outperforms 16:9 by 15-25% on CTR. Design Reels statics separately in 9:16 with content in the middle 60% of the frame.

Chapter 7 — Video Ads — Production Without Waste

The most expensive mistake in Meta video advertising is reshooting a video that did not need to be reshot.

Most underperforming videos have one problem, not many. The hook fails and the operator replaces the entire video — new script, new actor, new production. Two weeks and several hundred dollars later, they have a new video with the same structural problem, just expressed differently.

Before any production decision, diagnose. The numbers tell you exactly what to fix.

Reading the video diagnostic

A video ad produces two diagnostic numbers before anything else: the 3-second view rate (hook rate) and the 15-second view rate (hold rate). The combination of these two numbers tells you precisely what needs to change.

HOOK RATE	HOLD RATE	DIAGNOSIS AND FIX
Below 25%	Any	The opening is failing. Re-edit the first frame and first spoken line. Do not reshoot.
Above 25%	Below 20%	The hook works but the middle loses viewers. Keep the opening, rebuild the body.
Above 25%	Above 20%	Watch time is good. If CTR is

		low, the offer or CTA is the problem — not the creative.
Above 35%	Above 25%	Strong performance. Test variations of this hook archetype across new concepts.

The key insight: if hook rate is below 25%, only re-edit the opening. Operators who re-edited openings of low-hook-rate videos recovered 50-70% of those videos to acceptable performance without any reshooting. A full reshoot is only justified when both hook rate and hold rate are failing — meaning the concept itself is wrong, not just the execution.

Captions: non-negotiable

85% of Facebook videos are watched without sound. An ad that requires audio to communicate its hook is an ad that fails for most of the people who see it.

Meta provides automatic captions, but they appear and disappear — they can be turned off by the viewer and are not visible on all placements. The correct approach is burned-in captions: text permanently baked into the video file, visible on every placement in every context regardless of device settings.

12–18%

Higher video completion rate with burned-in captions

Captioned videos also achieved 8-12% higher CTR. Consistent across creative types. Source: r/FacebookAds captions thread, 2026.

CapCut, Descript, and Rev all generate captions automatically from audio. Export with captions burned in before uploading to Meta. This is

a ten-minute addition to every video workflow and it improves performance on every single video.

AI-generated video: what actually works

AI UGC — videos produced using AI-generated scripts, AI voiceovers, and AI avatars or stock footage — is now a significant part of high-volume Meta advertising. The operators who make it work are not using it to replace human creative. They are using it to produce volume for testing.

The documented workflow that consistently produced results: ChatGPT for script, ElevenLabs for voiceover, CapCut for editing and captions. A brand using this workflow for a kitchenware product doubled ROAS. A mobile app operator scaled to $800,000 per month in revenue using AI UGC as the primary creative format. The average across operators using AI UGC was a 12% monthly ROAS uplift.

The 5×5×5 matrix takes this further: five concepts, five AI actors or voiceover styles, five hooks. That produces 125 variants from a single session. At small budget per variant, you are running enough creative to find winners across multiple angles simultaneously — something no human production team can match on cost.

PRO TIP **The QA rule**

One consistent finding across AI UGC operators: review 20% of output before deploying at scale. AI-generated scripts occasionally produce factual errors, awkward phrasing, or tone mismatches that are invisible to the generation process but immediately obvious to a human reader. A twenty-minute QA check before deploying 125 variants catches the ones that would waste budget.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Diagnose before reshooting. Hook rate below 25% means re-edit the opening only. 50-70% of low-hook-rate videos recover without reshooting.
- ✓ Burn captions into every video before uploading. 85% of videos are watched silent. Burned-in captions improved completion rate 12-18% and CTR 8-12%.
- ✓ AI UGC (ChatGPT → ElevenLabs → CapCut) produced 2× ROAS for a kitchenware brand and 12% average monthly ROAS uplift across operator reports.
- ✓ 5×5×5 matrix: 5 concepts × 5 actors × 5 hooks = 125 variants. This volume of testing at small budget per variant finds winners faster than any other approach.

SECTION 3 THE SYSTEM BEHIND THE ADS

Good individual ads are not enough. The operators who get consistent results have a system — for research, testing, scaling, and measurement — that keeps finding winners even when individual ads fail. Section 3 covers that system.

Chapter 8 — Research — Where Winning Creative Comes From

There is a version of ad creative development that looks like this: the team has a brainstorming session, someone proposes a concept, the designer makes it, it gets tested. If it fails, repeat.

That process produces random results. Sometimes a concept works. Often it does not. The team has no particular reason to expect one outcome over the other.

The operators who produce winning creative consistently do something different before any of that. They research. Specifically, they research the exact language their target customer uses to describe their own problem — and they use that language verbatim in their creative.

Three research sources that consistently produce winners

Source 1: Customer reviews on G2, Trustpilot, and Capterra.

Read every 4 and 5-star review for your product and your top three competitors. Highlight any phrase written in the first person that describes the problem before finding the solution: 'I was spending three hours every Monday on...', 'I had no idea why my...', 'Every time I tried to...'. These phrases are hooks. Not inspiration for hooks — the hooks themselves, in the exact words your buyer uses internally.

Source 2: Reddit threads where your ICP discusses their problem.

Search Reddit for threads where your target customer describes the problem your product solves. Not product discussion threads — problem discussion threads. People write unfiltered on Reddit in a way they

never do in surveys or interviews. Operators who used Reddit-sourced language in hooks reported 20-35% higher hook rates than ads using survey-derived language. The unfiltered phrasing creates stronger recognition.

Source 3: Competitor Facebook Ad Library.

Go to the Facebook Ad Library and search your top three competitors every week. Filter by Active ads. Sort by longest running. An ad that has been running for 90 days or more is almost certainly profitable — unprofitable ads get turned off. A 6-month-old ad is a proven winner. Study its structure, hook type, and visual approach. You are not copying — you are identifying what the market has already validated.

PRO TIP **The longevity signal**

An ad in the Facebook Ad Library that has been running for 90+ days has survived the algorithm's kill tests, the team's own performance reviews, and the budget pressures of a real business. When you see one, treat it as market research. What hook archetype is it using? What visual format? What CTA? A competitor running the same ad for six months is telling you something very specific about what works with your shared audience.

Testing research before production

Before commissioning photography or shooting video, test the copy angle with a text-on-colour static. Design it in fifteen minutes. Run it at $20 per day for five days. If the hook rate and CTR are strong, the angle works — invest in production. If they are flat, try the next angle from your research. You have spent $100 on research instead of $500 on a video for an angle that was not going to work.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Mine customer reviews for hook language. Review-mined hooks outperformed agency-written copy in 70% of A/B tests by matching the customer's exact internal vocabulary.
- ✓ Reddit threads produce unfiltered problem language that generates 20-35% higher hook rates than survey-derived copy.
- ✓ Facebook Ad Library: ads running 90+ days are proven market winners. Analyse their structure and hook type weekly.
- ✓ Test copy angles with text-on-colour statics at $20/day before investing in production. $100 of copy testing beats $500 of production for an angle that will not work.

Chapter 9 — Testing — How to Know What Is Working

Most Meta advertisers run tests. Very few run tests that produce reliable conclusions. The difference is not access to better tools or bigger budgets. It is two disciplines that are easy to state and hard to maintain: giving tests enough data before deciding, and changing one thing at a time.

The minimum viable test

Before you can evaluate a creative, it needs enough data. Not enough impressions — enough conversion events. The threshold that appears most consistently in operator reports and in Meta's own documentation: 50 to 100 events before making a kill or scale decision.

For a product with a $50 average order value, that means spending at least $50 per concept before evaluating it — the AOV rule. For a product with a $200 AOV, it means $200 per concept. This sounds like a lot. It is not, relative to the cost of killing a winner too early or scaling a loser based on noise.

A concrete illustration: RevenueCat, a subscription management SaaS, improved cost per trial by 29% and subscription conversion by 2% using a systematic testing framework. Their kill rule: pause at 2× CPA after 10,000 impressions or after 50-100 events — whichever came first. Nothing was killed before that threshold.

The 3-phase testing system

Running all creative tests in the same campaign creates a bias problem. New creative competing against an existing winner is disadvantaged

because the algorithm has more confidence in the winner's performance data. The three-phase system solves this.

PHASE	WHAT IT TESTS	WHY IT MATTERS
Phase 1 — New vs new	Fresh creative variants compete against each other, not against proven winners	Removes pixel bias from existing creative; gives new concepts a fair comparison
Phase 2 — New vs winner	The best performer from Phase 1 competes against your current BAU winner	Establishes whether the new concept can beat the established benchmark
Phase 3 — Scale	Confirmed winners move to the BAU campaign	Separates testing budget from scaling budget; prevents test activity from disrupting BAU performance

The most important structural rule in this system: keep BAU (business as usual) campaigns completely separate from testing campaigns. Adding test creative to a BAU campaign contaminates the algorithm's learning for both. BAU carries proven winners. Testing carries candidates. Never mix them.

The 3:2:2 dynamic creative rule

For each test ad set, use 3 creative variations, 2 primary text variations, and 2 headline variations. Meta combines these automatically, generating 12 combinations from 7 assets. This is the minimum configuration that gives the algorithm enough variation to find the best-performing combination without so much variation that learning becomes impossible.

A finance newsletter campaign using 3:2:2 dynamic creative consistently drove cost per lead below $2, down from over $3. The key

was combining three strong hooks with two benefit-focused primary texts — not generating combinations randomly, but structuring the variation to test specific hypotheses within each cell.

PRO TIP **Kill rules are mandatory**

Kill rules are not suggestions. Decide them before you launch the test — not after you have been watching the numbers for a week and are tempted to give a failing ad one more day. The documented thresholds: CTR below 0.8% after 10,000 impressions — kill. CPA above 2× target for two consecutive days — pause. No spend after 48 hours — algorithm rejected it, replace. Write these down before you launch. Then apply them without exception.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Minimum data before any kill or scale decision: 50-100 conversion events, or spend equal to your average order value per concept.
- ✓ Three-phase testing: new vs new in isolation, then winner vs BAU benchmark, then confirmed winners into BAU. Never mix testing and scaling campaigns.
- ✓ 3:2:2 dynamic creative: 3 creative variants × 2 primary texts × 2 headlines = 12 combinations from 7 assets. Minimum viable testing configuration.
- ✓ Write kill rules before launch: CTR below 0.8% at 10k impressions, CPA above 2× for 2 days, no spend after 48 hours. Apply without exception.

Chapter 10 — Scaling — How to Grow Without Breaking

Scaling a Meta campaign is not difficult. Scaling it without breaking performance is.

The two most common ways operators break performance when scaling: increasing budget too fast, and mixing test creative into a campaign that is already working. Both reset the algorithm's learning. Both look, in the data, like the campaign suddenly stopped working. Both lead operators to conclude that scaling does not work for their product. Both are avoidable.

The budget increase rule

Every operator who has successfully scaled Meta campaigns documents the same rule: increase budget by a maximum of 20-30% per day once a campaign is hitting its CPA target. Not 50%. Not double. 20-30%.

The reason is the learning phase. A sudden budget doubling tells the algorithm to find twice as many people as quickly as possible. It does not have the data to do that efficiently, so it starts serving ads to lower-quality audiences. CPA spikes. The operator sees the spike and panics, cutting the budget. The campaign never recovers its efficiency.

A 20-30% daily increase gives the algorithm time to expand the audience gradually, finding more high-quality buyers one step at a time. Over ten days, a 25% daily increase compounds to 9× the original budget — real scale — without any CPA disruption.

Concept replication: scaling the angle not just the spend

When a creative wins, the instinct is to scale budget. The better move is to also scale the concept — replicate the winning angle across new hooks, new actors, and new formats.

A kitchenware brand that found a winning anxiety-focused concept used the 5×5×5 matrix to replicate it: 5 different hook openings, 5 different AI actors delivering the same core message, 5 format variations (square, vertical, with and without text overlay). The core concept stayed the same. The execution varied. The result was 2× ROAS and a creative library that could sustain performance as individual variants fatigued.

WHAT TO SCALE	HOW TO DO IT
Budget on a winner	20-30% increase per day maximum. Watch CPA after each increase before the next.
The winning concept	5×5×5 matrix: same angle, 5 hooks × 5 actors × 5 formats = 25 variants from one proven concept.
Audience reach	Only switch to broad targeting after 50+ weekly conversions. Below that, expand interest targeting gradually.
Placement	Test winning creatives in Reels and Stories after they prove in feed. Redesign for each placement format.

PRO TIP **The creative backlog rule**

Build replacement creative before you need it. By the time frequency hits 3.0 and CTR starts declining, your best creative is already fatiguing. If you start building replacements at that point, you have a two-week production gap where performance degrades and you cannot do anything about it. Maintain a backlog of at least two weeks of

replacement creative, ready to launch at the first fatigue signal.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Maximum 20-30% budget increase per day on winning campaigns. Faster increases reset the learning phase and spike CPA.
- ✓ Scale the concept not just the spend. 5×5×5 matrix: 5 hooks × 5 actors × 5 formats = 25 variants from one proven angle.
- ✓ Keep BAU and test campaigns permanently separate. Adding new creative to a working BAU campaign disrupts the algorithm's learning.
- ✓ Maintain a two-week creative backlog. Build replacements before fatigue signals appear — not after CPA has already increased.

Chapter 11 — Budget, Audiences, and Attribution

Three decisions that happen before you create a single ad determine how efficiently everything else works: how you structure your budget, how you define your audiences, and how you measure whether any of it is working. Most operators make these decisions once and never revisit them. This chapter covers the settings that are silently costing performance.

Budget structure: acquisition and retargeting must be separate

When acquisition and retargeting share a campaign budget (CBO), the algorithm always routes more spend to retargeting. Retargeting audiences click cheaper. They convert better. The algorithm is not optimising for your business strategy — it is optimising for the efficiency metric it can see. The result: your cold acquisition budget gets quietly cannibalised by retargeting, new customer growth stalls, and the account looks efficient while slowly running out of new audience.

The fix is structural: one campaign for cold acquisition, one campaign for retargeting, with separate fixed budgets for each. Operators who separated these reported cold acquisition CPA improvements of 20-35% immediately — not because the creative changed, but because the budget actually reached cold audiences.

CBO and the minimum budget floor

CBO (Campaign Budget Optimisation) only outperforms ABO when each ad set receives enough budget to generate meaningful signal. The floor

that operators document: each ad set needs at least 2× your target CPA in daily budget. If you are targeting a $30 CPA and running a CBO with five ad sets on a $50/day budget, each ad set gets $10 — one-third of the minimum needed.

Below the floor: use ABO with fixed per-ad-set budgets. Above the floor: CBO works and allows the algorithm to allocate efficiently across ad sets.

Audiences: three things most operators get wrong

Interest stacking. Running multiple interests in a single ad set makes it impossible to know which interest is driving performance. When a stacked ad set wins, you have learned nothing. Run each interest as its own ad set during testing. Combine interests only after identifying which ones individually perform.

Lookalike seed quality. Lookalike audiences are only as good as the seed list they are built from. Lookalikes built from purchaser lists (customers with 2+ orders) achieved 2.3× ROAS compared to 1.1× for lookalikes built from lead lists. Build lookalikes from your best customers, not your entire contact database.

Forgetting to exclude customers. Adding your full customer email list as an exclusion on acquisition campaigns reduces CPA by approximately 10% immediately. Existing customers are absorbing acquisition budget without being convertible. This takes five minutes to implement and never expires.

Attribution: the weekly habit

Every week: export Meta conversions. Export actual orders from your backend. Calculate the gap. Track it over time. The gap is your

attribution inflation factor — if Meta consistently reports 1.4× your actual revenue, you divide every Meta ROAS by 1.4 to make decisions.

For overall budget decisions — should I increase total spend? — use MER (total revenue / total ad spend). This metric cannot be inflated by attribution models because it uses actual revenue, not modelled conversions.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Separate acquisition and retargeting into distinct campaigns with fixed separate budgets. Shared CBO routes to retargeting and starves cold acquisition.
- ✓ CBO minimum floor: each ad set needs 2× target CPA in daily budget. Below this, use ABO with fixed per-set allocations.
- ✓ Test interests individually. Build lookalikes from purchasers with 2+ orders. Exclude your customer list from all acquisition campaigns.
- ✓ Weekly backend verification: Meta conversions vs actual orders. Build your attribution deflation factor. Use MER for overall budget decisions.

SECTION 4 MAKING IT COMPOUND

The final section covers three things that compound everything else: the ad-to-landing-page gap that silently leaks conversions, the fatigue signals that let you intervene before ROAS drops, and the 90-day plan that sequences all of it into a practical schedule.

Chapter 12 — The Ad-to-Landing Page Gap

Here is something that happens dozens of times every day in ad accounts all over the world. A team spends two weeks researching, writing, and testing a hook. They find a winner. CTR is strong. Visitors arrive on the landing page. And then nothing. The conversion rate is poor and nobody understands why, because the ad was working.

The ad was working. The landing page was not. And the gap between the promise the ad made and the experience the page delivered is the most common unconsidered conversion leak in Meta advertising.

What message match actually means

Message match means the visitor arrives on a page that directly continues the conversation the ad started. If the ad says 'Cut your Monday reporting from four hours to twenty minutes', the first headline on the landing page says the same thing — or something that directly extends it. Not 'The analytics platform for modern teams'. Not 'Powerful reporting made simple'. The specific promise.

Operators who created ad-specific landing pages — pages built to match the specific promise of a specific ad — reported conversion rate improvements of 40-80% compared to sending the same traffic to a generic homepage. Not marginal improvements. Near-doublings of conversion rate, without changing the ad, the audience, or the budget.

40–80%

Conversion improvement — ad-matched vs generic homepage

Operators creating landing pages matched to the specific promise of each ad. The improvement was larger when the ad made a specific targeted promise. Source: r/PPC message

> *match thread, 2026.*

The four elements of congruence

ELEMENT	WHAT IT MEANS IN PRACTICE
Message	The landing page headline directly mirrors or extends the ad's primary promise. Same words or close to it.
Visual style	Same colour palette, photography style, and typography weight. A visitor who moves from an energetic orange ad to a corporate blue landing page feels they have arrived somewhere wrong.
CTA text	If the ad button says 'Get free access', the landing page button says 'Get free access'. Not 'Start free trial'. Not 'Sign up'. Identical.
Audience context	Traffic from cold ads needs context the page should provide. Traffic from retargeting already has context — the page should acknowledge it, not repeat the basics.

Traffic-source-specific pages

The logical extension of message match is building separate landing pages for different traffic sources. Cold interest traffic needs context and proof. Retargeting traffic needs objection handling and urgency. Email click-through traffic already trusts you and needs the shortest path to conversion.

Operators using source-specific landing pages reported 2× average conversion rates compared to a single generic page. The improvement was largest for email traffic, which had the biggest mismatch with

generic page copy — email visitors arrive warm and generic pages treat them like strangers.

PRO TIP **The CTA audit**

Right now: open your top three running ads. Note the exact CTA text on each. Open the destination landing page for each. Check whether the primary button text matches the ad CTA exactly. It almost certainly does not. Aligning CTA text between ads and landing pages produced consistent 8-15% conversion improvements across operator reports — requiring no design work, no copy rewrite, and about fifteen minutes to implement.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Ad-specific landing pages matched to the ad's specific promise produce 40-80% higher conversion rates than generic homepages.
- ✓ Four elements of congruence: message (same promise), visual style (same aesthetic), CTA text (identical wording), audience context (matches warmth level of traffic source).
- ✓ Traffic-source-specific pages convert at 2× the rate of a single generic page — the improvement is largest for email traffic.
- ✓ CTA text audit: check that ad button text and landing page button text are identical. 8-15% conversion improvement for 15 minutes of work.

Chapter 13 — Creative Fatigue — How to See It Coming

Every ad fatigues. This is not a failure — it is physics. Show the same image to the same people enough times and they stop seeing it. The question is not whether your ads will fatigue, but whether you will see it coming before it costs you.

Most operators detect fatigue in the ROAS number. By the time ROAS drops, the ad has already been over-served to a significant portion of the audience. The opportunity to intervene cheaply has passed. There are earlier signals — and they are not hard to read.

The three-signal fatigue stack

The signals appear in this sequence. Each one gives you more time to intervene than the last.

SIGNAL	WHAT IT MEANS	HOW EARLY IT APPEARS
Comment sentiment	Comments shift from questions and interest to 'I keep seeing this ad'	5-7 days before CTR drops — the earliest warning
Frequency above 3.0 + declining CTR	The same people are seeing the ad repeatedly and clicking less each time	3-5 days before ROAS drops — still time to launch replacement
CPM rising 20%+ week-over-week while CTR holds flat	Audience is exhausted — but the creative is still working	2-3 days before visible ROAS impact — diagnose and expand audience

The third signal deserves special attention because it points to a different problem with a different solution. Rising CPM with flat CTR means the creative is still performing — the audience is exhausted. Adding new audiences or switching to broad targeting fixes it. New creative will not.

Falling CTR with flat CPM means the creative is fatiguing — the audience has seen it too much. New creative fixes it. New audiences will not.

These are two different diagnoses that look identical in a ROAS number. Distinguishing them before spending money on the wrong fix is the value of monitoring the intermediate signals.

The comment monitoring habit

Reading ad comments takes five minutes per week. It is the earliest fatigue signal available and the most ignored. Once per week, open your top five running ads and read the comments. You are looking for: the ratio of product questions and positive reactions to 'I keep seeing this' and 'stop showing me this'. When the second category starts outnumbering the first, the creative is fatiguing with that audience segment — typically 5-7 days before it shows in CTR data.

Pausing and replacing at comment-signal rather than CTR-signal preserves 5-7 days of efficient delivery per creative cycle. Over a year of campaigns, that compounds.

PRO TIP **The frequency threshold**

Monitor frequency at the ad level, not the campaign level. A campaign can show average frequency of 1.8 while individual ads within it are at 4.0 — because winning ads absorb the majority of impressions. Campaign-level frequency monitoring misses this. In Ads Manager, break down by ad and check frequency weekly. Any individual ad at 3.0+ with declining CTR should have a replacement creative ready to launch within 24 hours.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Three fatigue signals in sequence: comment sentiment (5-7 days early), frequency + CTR decline (3-5 days early), ROAS drop (too late to intervene cheaply).
- ✓ Rising CPM + flat CTR = audience exhaustion, not creative fatigue. The fix is new audiences or broader targeting, not new creative.
- ✓ Falling CTR + flat CPM = creative fatigue. The fix is new creative, not new audiences.
- ✓ Check ad comments weekly. Shift from product questions to 'I keep seeing this' is the earliest fatigue signal available and takes five minutes to detect.

Chapter 14 — Your 90-Day Meta Ads Plan

Everything in this book comes down to a sequence. Not everything at once. The right things, in the right order, building on each other.

At the end of 90 days you will have: an account structured correctly for testing and scaling, a research process that generates creative ideas from validated sources, a testing system that produces reliable conclusions, and the measurement infrastructure to know what is actually working.

Days 1–10: Audit and fix the foundation

Before changing any creative, fix the structural issues that are silently costing performance. Most accounts have at least two of these.

Step 1. Separate acquisition and retargeting into distinct campaigns with separate fixed budgets. If they share a CBO, split them now.

Step 2. Add hook rate as a custom metric in Ads Manager. Go to Columns > Customise Columns > add 'Video plays at 25%' as percentage of impressions.

Step 3. Check your top five running ads for top-left logo placement. Test versions with the logo removed or relocated to bottom-right.

Step 4. Add your customer email list as an exclusion on all acquisition campaigns.

Step 5. Set up a weekly backend verification: export Meta conversions and actual orders on the same day each week. Start building your deflation factor.

Step 6. Check landing page CTA text against ad CTA text for your top three ads. Align them where they differ.

Days 11–30: Build the research and creative base

Step 1. Spend three hours mining reviews on G2, Trustpilot, and Capterra — your product and your top two competitors. Extract every first-person phrase describing the problem. These are your hook candidates.

Step 2. Search Reddit for threads where your ICP discusses their problem. Extract the most common unfiltered phrases. Add them to your hook candidate list.

Step 3. Open Facebook Ad Library. Find your top three competitors' longest-running active ads. Document the hook archetype, visual format, and CTA of each.

Step 4. Design three text-on-colour statics testing your top three hook candidates. Run each at $20/day for five days. The hook with the highest CTR tells you which angle to build production around.

Step 5. Produce your first batch using the winning angle: one video and two static image variants. Apply the 4:5 format rule, burned-in captions on video, single claim on statics.

Days 31–60: Test systematically

Step 1. Launch your first 3-phase test. Phase 1: new creative variants against each other in a separate test campaign, not against BAU.

Step 2. Set your kill rules before launching: CTR below 0.8% at 10k impressions, CPA above 2× target for two days, no spend after 48 hours. Write them down. Apply them.

Step 3. Use 3:2:2 dynamic creative: 3 creative variations, 2 primary texts, 2 headlines.

Step 4. Watch session recordings of people who clicked your ad but did not convert on the landing page. Identify the specific moment they left. Fix that element.

Step 5. Test a negative-framing version of your best-performing hook. Run it alongside the positive version on cold audiences.

Days 61–90: Scale what works

Step 1. Promote Phase 1 winners to Phase 2: new concept vs current BAU benchmark. Only if it beats BAU does it move to the BAU campaign.

Step 2. For any creative hitting CPA target, increase budget 20-30% per day. Monitor CPA after each increase. Pause if CPA spikes more than 20% above target.

Step 3. Apply 5×5×5 to your winning concept: 5 hooks × 5 actors or voiceover styles × 5 format variations = 25 variants. Deploy at small budget per variant.

Step 4. Check account weekly for fatigue signals: comment sentiment, individual ad frequency, CPM vs CTR diagnostic.

Step 5. Build your first audience-specific landing page for your top traffic source. Match headline, visual style, and CTA exactly to the ad that drives the most traffic.

The weekly habit that compounds

EVERY MONDAY	EVERY THURSDAY
Export backend data vs Meta data. Calculate MER.	Check frequency at ad level. Flag anything above 3.0 with declining CTR.
Review comments on top 5 ads for sentiment shift.	Check CPM vs CTR diagnostic for any campaign scaling.
Kill any ad hitting threshold. Launch replacement if ready.	Add any new negative keywords from search terms if running search.
Brief next week's creative batch based on what the data showed.	Preview any new creative on mobile and in dark mode before launching.

The operators who build sustainable Meta ad accounts are not the ones who find the perfect creative. They are the ones who build a system that keeps finding good creative — and keeps improving the infrastructure around it — week after week. That system is what the last 13 chapters have been describing. This plan is how you build it.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- ✓ Days 1-10: separate acquisition from retargeting, add hook rate as a metric, align CTA text, add customer exclusions, start weekly backend verification.
- ✓ Days 11-30: mine reviews and Reddit for hook language, audit competitor ad library, test angles with text-on-colour statics before production.
- ✓ Days 31-60: three-phase testing with kill rules set before launch, 3:2:2 dynamic creative, test negative-framing hooks on cold audiences.
- ✓ Days 61-90: scale winners at 20-30% daily budget increase, 5×5×5 concept replication, weekly fatigue monitoring, first audience-specific landing page.