Case Study: Account X – Outdoor Cooking Industry

For this case study, we will call the account Account X, a major player in the outdoor cooking industry in its country. The account's average ROAS was 8.37, which initially seems good compared to the target ROAS of 7.00. Using standard product category segmentation, the campaigns appeared to perform well.

However, a deeper look revealed a problem. The high ROAS was driven mainly by a small number of top-performing products. Because the total ROAS was above the target, Google was allocating more budget to products that actually performed poorly. These underperforming products were consuming significant ad spend, creating inefficiencies.

Steps Taken with the Script

1. **Installation and Setup**
   The script was installed according to the step-by-step manual included with the purchase. After setup, all products in the account were automatically tracked and labeled based on performance.

2. **Segment Analysis**
   Using the provided spreadsheet, we analyzed the account by performance segments:
   - Good Performers
   - Potential Winners
   - Underperformers
   - No data

3. The spreadsheet showed how many products were in each segment, how much budget was spent per segment, and the actual ROAS per segment.

Segment	Products	Clicks	Conversions	Cost	Conversion Value	ROAS
Good Performers	53	30399	473,72	26.587,64	337.925,05	12,71
Potential Winners	52	3286	50,08	2.394,07	37.257,91	15,56
Underperformers	422	32778	127,03	19.324,57	33.955,51	1,76
No Data	476	1644	29,11	1.023,65	3.652,47	3,57

4. **Identifying Budget Misallocation**
   The analysis revealed that while good performers achieved high ROAS, underperformers were still receiving a disproportionate share of the budget. This explained why overall ROAS looked strong even though a significant part of ad spend was wasted.

Segment	Products	Clicks	Conversions	Cost	Conversion Value	ROAS
Good Performers	53	30399	473,72	26.587,64	337.925,05	12,71
Potential Winners	52	3286	50,08	2.394,07	37.257,91	15,56
Underperformers	422	32778	127,03	19.324,57	33.955,51	1,76
No Data	476	1644	29,11	1.023,65	3.652,47	3,57

5. **Campaign Segmentation**
   Based on the product labels, four new campaigns were created corresponding to each segment. Products were automatically assigned and updated daily in the correct segment.

6. **Optimized Budget Allocation**
   After segmentation, high budgets were placed on good performers, medium budgets on Potential Winners, and low budgets on underperformers. This adjustment ensured that ad spend was focused where it generated the best results.

Outcome

After implementing the segmentation and reallocation:

- Good performers received the budget they deserved, resulting in higher revenue.
- Underperformers received less budget, reducing wasted spend.
- The account achieved more efficient advertising without changing the overall campaign structure.
- Daily adjustments ensured the account stayed optimized automatically.

Date	Good Performers	Potential Winners	Underperformers	No Data
01-08-2025	42	33	272	467
02-08-2025	42	33	272	474
03-08-2025	42	34	271	479
04-08-2025	52	54	403	445
05-08-2025	52	54	404	450
06-08-2025	52	55	405	454
07-08-2025	53	56	407	455
08-08-2025	53	56	409	458
09-08-2025	53	54	415	457
10-08-2025	51	54	421	458
11-08-2025	51	54	421	464
12-08-2025	50	54	421	472
13-08-2025	52	52	422	475
14-08-2025	53	52	422	476

This case clearly shows how analyzing performance at the individual product level can uncover hidden inefficiencies and guide better budget allocation in Shopping and Performance Max campaigns, with the script running fully automatically.