GROWTH THAT COMPOUNDS

What are unit economics?

Unit economics evaluate direct revenue and variable costs per fundamental business unit. Define the unit, contribution margin, CAC and payback horizon.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED
4 September 2026

READING TIME
10 min

WORDS
2,287

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-unit-economics/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Unit economics evaluate the direct revenues and incremental costs associated with a single, fundamental business unit, typically an acquired customer, product license, or transaction. When fixed overheads are prematurely blended or when variable service costs are omitted, reported unit economics generate false signals of scalability. This guide establishes the core unit economic equations, distinguishes accounting gross margin from operational contribution margin, integrates acquisition costs with payback timelines, and outlines governance boundaries for profitable growth.

Keywords: Unit economics · Customer acquisition cost · Contribution margin · Customer lifetime value · CAC payback · Scalability

Unit economics describe the direct financial revenues and incremental operational costs associated with a single, indivisible commercial unit. In contractual business-to-business (B2B) software and subscription enterprises, that atomic unit is almost invariably an individual acquired customer account or contracted organization. In transactional platforms, digital marketplaces, and cloud utilities, the fundamental unit may be an individual processed transaction, an active workspace, or a gigabyte of processed workload.

The strategic purpose of unit economics is to answer an uncompromising executive question: Does this commercial model generate genuine cash flow at the atomic level, or does every incremental customer consume more capital to acquire and service than they will ever return over their operational lifecycle?

A pervasive pathology in high-growth technology markets is the celebration of rapid top-line revenue expansion while operating deeply negative unit economics. Executive leadership teams routinely fall victim to the classic scaling fallacy: the mistaken belief that unprofitability at the customer level can somehow be overcome through sheer sales volume. When organizations confuse standard accounting gross margin with true operational contribution margin, hide direct customer servicing labor in general corporate overhead, and rely on speculative multi-year lifetime value projections, they pour expensive acquisition capital into fundamentally insolvent customer cohorts.

Three papers are usually bundled here and they do different jobs, which is worth keeping apart. Mulhern (1999) is method: it gives a conceptual and methodological foundation for measuring customer profitability, and analyses concentration as a distribution, noting that a Lorenz curve cannot show the percentiles of customers who represent a financial loss. Reinartz and Kumar (2000) test one catalog retailer over three years in a noncontractual setting and find that long-life customers are not necessarily profitable customers. Gupta et al. (2004) relate customers to firm market value and say nothing about the shape of the distribution. That some customers are unprofitable is well founded; the specific split is not a finding any of them reports, so this page does not put a number on it.

Figure 1 The unit economics component card

Component	Definition and boundary	Metric formula	Failure mode if miscalculated	Governance remedy
Atomic Unit	Fundamental economic object	Contracted customer account	Inconsistent unit definition across quarters	Standardize definition by customer tier
Unit Revenue (ARPU)	Net recurring cash inflow	Annualized Contract Value (ACV)	Booking value confused with cash collected	Deduct discounts, refunds, and uncollected bad debt
Cost to Serve (CTS)	Variable hosting, APIs, CS labor	Cloud infrastructure + APIs + Support	Variable costs hidden in corporate SG&A	Strict allocation of customer-facing operational labor
Contribution Margin %	Net cash per revenue dollar	(ARPU − CTS) / ARPU	GAAP gross margin substituted for contribution	Calculate contribution margin at account cohort level
Acquisition Cost (CAC)	Fully loaded commercial cost	Total Sales & Marketing / New Logos	Omitting sales management, travel, and tooling	Include fully burdened compensation and overhead
Payback Horizon	Months required to recover CAC	CAC / (Monthly ARPU × CM %)	Payback calculated on gross revenue	Enforce contribution cash payback threshold (< 14 months)

Author's commercial governance framework grounded in customer valuation and profitability literature from Gupta et al. (2004), Mulhern (1999), and Reinartz and Kumar (2000).

Executive Definition and Strategic Purpose

In corporate finance and commercial strategy, unit economics is defined as the microeconomic modeling of the marginal revenues, direct cost of goods, customer servicing expenses, and customer acquisition costs attributable to an individual operating unit of production or demand. It provides an unvarnished audit of whether a business model generates structural operating cash flow prior to the absorption of fixed corporate general and administrative (G&A) overhead.

The strategic purpose of establishing rigorous unit economic governance spans five core executive imperatives:

1 Validating Structural Commercial Scalability: Top-line revenue growth can easily be purchased through reckless venture capital subsidies or predatory discounts. Unit economics strip away promotional distortions, answering whether the firm possesses an inherently scalable engine. If each incremental customer contributes positive net cash after servicing and acquisition payback, growth creates compounding equity value. If unit economics are negative, accelerating sales simply hastens corporate insolvency.

2 Establishing Capital Allocation Guardrails: A company's commercial budget (sales hiring, digital marketing spend, executive events) represents capital deployment. Unit economics establish precise payback horizons and return on investment thresholds. When a customer acquisition channel exhibits a 10-month contribution payback and an LTV:CAC ratio exceeding 4x, leadership can aggressively deploy growth capital with complete underwriting confidence.

3 Decoupling True Contribution Margin from Accounting Gross Margin: Standard financial reporting (GAAP/IFRS) groups expenses into rigid categories that often obscure direct customer servicing costs. Unit economics pierce through standard financial presentations by defining strict cost boundaries, isolating the real operational labor and technical infrastructure required to retain each account.

4 Preventing Cross-Subsidization Pathology: In diversified customer bases, highly profitable enterprise accounts often mask catastrophic losses generated by small, churn-prone accounts. Mulhern's (1999) method for measuring profitability across disaggregated customer cohorts is what exposes unprofitable market segments, allowing leadership to prune dilutive tiers and refocus sales capacity on high-margin profiles.

5 Protecting Enterprise Equity Valuation: Public software markets and private equity sponsors heavily scrutinize the Rule of 40 (the sum of organic revenue growth rate and free cash flow margin). Companies with hardened, contribution-positive unit economics generate robust free cash flow as customer cohorts mature, commanding premium valuation multiples compared to competitors that rely on continuous capital injections to sustain growth.

Mathematical, Economic, and Data Foundations

To build an operational unit economics model, finance and revenue leaders must formalize the core equations governing customer lifetime value, fully loaded acquisition costs, contribution cash payback, and cohort retention dynamics.

The Customer Lifetime Contribution Value Model

A customer cannot be valued on top-line revenue; enterprise value is created exclusively through retained contribution cash flows. Grounded in the quantitative valuation methodology articulated by Gupta et al. (2004), the expected discounted Customer Lifetime Value (LTV) on a contribution margin basis is formulated as:

LTV contribution = sum t = 1 infinity (1 + d) t (ARPU t − CTS t) * r t

Where:

- ARPU t represents the Average Revenue per Unit generated in period t.
- CTS t represents the variable Direct Cost to Serve in period t (hosting, compute, API licensing, dedicated customer success, and ongoing operational maintenance).
- r is the constant periodic customer retention rate ($0 \leq r < 1$).
- d is the firm's weighted average cost of capital or discount rate per period.

Assuming constant periodic cash flows and defining the unit contribution margin percentage as CM % = ARPU ARPU − CTS, this geometric series simplifies to the canonical infinite-horizon customer valuation equation:

In pragmatic operational finance, where customer contracts are bounded by technological obsolescence, leadership teams must avoid speculative infinite horizons. Best-practice governance applies a conservative time horizon cap (typically 36 to 60 months), calculating finite-horizon contribution cash flows:

LTV T = sum t = 1 T (1 + d) t ARPU * CM % * r t (with T ≤ 60 months)

Fully Loaded Customer Acquisition Cost (CAC)

A recurring corporate defect is calculating CAC by dividing digital advertising spend by new customer signups. In enterprise B2B environments, acquisition expenditure is dominated by human capital. Fully Loaded CAC must capture every dollar expended to discover, nurture, negotiate, and close an incremental customer:

CAC fully-loaded = N new logos acquired Salaries S&M + Commissions + Benefits + Media Spend + Agency Fees + Sales Tools + Travel + Management Overhead

Omitting sales engineering salaries, SDR team compensation, or executive travel expenses artificially depresses reported CAC by 30% to 50%, generating deceptive signals of go-to-market efficiency.

The Contribution Payback Period (Cash Recovery Horizon)

The CAC Payback Period defines the speed with which an acquired customer repays their initial acquisition investment. Calculating payback by dividing CAC by top-line monthly revenue is fundamentally defective because revenue dollars cannot repay acquisition debt; only contribution dollars can.

The true operational Contribution Payback Horizon (T payback, in months) is:

T payback = Monthly ARPU * CM % CAC fully-loaded = Monthly ARPU − Monthly CTS CAC fully-loaded

In enterprise SaaS and subscription markets, operational benchmarks dictate:

- Exemplary Efficiency: T payback ≤ 12 months. The account recovers its acquisition capital within the initial contract term, eliminating working capital insolvency risk.
- Acceptable Threshold: 12 < T payback ≤ 18 months. Typical for enterprise field sales with high contract retention (> 90%).
- Distressed Economics: T payback > 24 months. Highly dangerous; if the customer churns or downsizes before Month 24, the account produces a permanent net destruction of capital.

The LTV:CAC Ratio and Capital Efficiency

The LTV:CAC ratio measures the return on invested commercial capital over the customer lifecycle:

Ratio LTV:CAC = CAC fully-loaded LTV contribution

- Under 2.0x: Broken commercial model. Acquisition costs consume the vast majority of customer lifetime gross contribution, leaving insufficient cash to fund research, engineering, and corporate overhead.
- 3.0x to 5.0x: The gold standard of balanced, sustainable growth. The model generates substantial net free cash flow while aggressively expanding market share.
- Above 7.0x: Often indicates commercial under-investment. The company may be growing too conservatively, artificially suppressing customer acquisition spend and allowing competitors to capture market territory.

Customer Profitability Concentration and Dispersion

Mulhern (1999) gives the method for measuring customer profitability and analyses concentration as a distribution rather than as a rule. His one empirical dataset, the physicians served by a pharmaceutical firm, is concentrated: “20% of the customers account for 65.5% of the profits and half the customers account for 95.5% of the profits,” and the percentiles beyond the apex of his inverted Lorenz curve, “about 15% of the customers,” reduce the profitability of the whole base. Those are figures from one market. What transfers is the method and the shape of the curve, not the split.

Mulhern’s methodological point is that blending accounts into a single corporate average hides whatever is happening inside the cohorts, in either direction. That is the reason to audit unit economics across disaggregated customer tiers, and it holds without a number attached to it.

The Retention-Profitability Paradox

Reinartz and Kumar (2000) tested the conventional assumption that long-tenured customers are automatically the most profitable, and report that “long-life customers are not necessarily profitable customers.” The evidence is one large catalog retailer over a three-year window in a noncontractual setting, so the finding is a warning against the assumption rather than a law about every market.

If cost to serve increases faster than contract value over time, customer contribution margins decay as accounts age. Unit economics governance requires tracking trailing CTS across account cohorts to ensure that mature customers remain profitable contributors rather than subsidized legacy liabilities.

Comprehensive Topical Taxonomy and Architectural Variants

Unit economics must be evaluated through the lens of the specific operating model under management. Different commercial architectures exhibit distinct atomic units, cost structures, and payback profiles.

Table 2 Comprehensive Topical Taxonomy and Architectural Variants

Business Model Archetype	Atomic Economic Unit	Primary Direct Cost Drivers (CTS)	Healthy Contribution Margin %	Target Payback Horizon	Benchmark LTV:CAC Ratio
Enterprise B2B SaaS	Contracted Enterprise Account	Dedicated CSM, cloud compute, custom SLAs	75% to 85%	12 to 18 months	4.0x to 6.0x
Product-Led Growth (PLG)	Active Workspace / Team	Self-serve onboarding, database storage, APIs	80% to 90%	6 to 12 months	3.5x to 5.0x
Two-Sided Marketplace	Completed Order / Transaction	Payment processing, fraud losses, buyer support	15% to 35% (Take Rate)	Instant to 3 months	2.5x to 4.0x
Usage / Cloud Infrastructure	Metered Compute / Storage Unit	Raw cloud infrastructure, GPU hosting, data egress	64% to 75%	9 to 15 months	4.5x to 7.0x
Tech-Enabled Services	Monthly Retainer / Client Pod	Direct professional labor, project management	40% to 55%	4 to 8 months	2.5x to 3.5x

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

1. Enterprise B2B SaaS (High ACV, Long Sales Cycles)

- Characteristics: Annual contract values (ACV) between $25,000 and $250,000+. Commercial motion driven by account executives, solutions engineers, and RFP responses.
- Cost Structure: High upfront CAC ($20,000 to $100,000+), moderate CTS (cloud hosting, dedicated customer success managers, specialized tier-3 technical support).
- Core Unit Imperative: Securing multi-year contract commitments and achieving gross revenue retention above 90% to amortize heavy upfront acquisition investments.

2. Product-Led Growth / Self-Serve SaaS (Low ACV, High Velocity)

- Characteristics: Monthly subscription fees between $20 and $500 per team workspace. Adoption driven by viral word-of-mouth, freemium tiers, and self-serve onboarding.
- Cost Structure: Ultra-low CAC ($50 to $1,000), minimal human CTS (automated onboarding, community support, automated billing).
- Core Unit Imperative: Rapid payback (< 8 months) to mitigate higher churn rates in small-business cohorts.

3. Two-Sided Digital Marketplaces (Transactional Velocity)

- Characteristics: Revenue generated via transaction take rates (typically 10% to 30% of Gross Merchandise Value).
- Cost Structure: CAC must be evaluated across both sides of the market (supplier acquisition plus consumer acquisition). Direct CTS includes payment processing fees, chargeback fraud reserves, and trust-and-safety labor.
- Core Unit Imperative: Maximizing repeat transaction frequency per acquired buyer to amortize dual-sided acquisition costs.

4. Cloud Infrastructure and Consumption Utilities

- Characteristics: Revenue scales dynamically based on consumed units (compute hours, API calls, gigabytes processed).
- Cost Structure: Variable infrastructure costs represent a significant component of CTS (often 25% to 35% of revenue).
- Core Unit Imperative: Enforcing minimum commitment floors to prevent revenue collapse while ensuring marginal pricing exceeds variable infrastructure scaling costs.

5. Tech-Enabled Professional Services

- Characteristics: Recurring software licenses bundled with dedicated human implementation and advisory labor.
- Cost Structure: Direct professional services labor dominates CTS, depressing contribution margins to 40% to 55%.
- Core Unit Imperative: Maintaining strict utilization rates across service delivery personnel and establishing rapid payback horizons (< 6 months) to compensate for lower gross margins.

Extended Worked Numerical Case Study: Enterprise Turnaround from Broken to World-Class Unit Economics

To demonstrate how rigorous unit economic diagnosis and operational remediation transform enterprise financial viability, we examine the three-year restructuring executed by AcuityFlow Cloud Platforms Inc., an enterprise workflow integration platform.

Baseline Diagnosis: The Illusion of Scalable Growth

At the end of Year 0, AcuityFlow presented impressive high-level metrics to its board of directors:

- Total Enterprise Customers: 400 accounts.
- Annual Contract Value (ACV): $30,000 ($2,500/month).
- Annual Recurring Revenue (ARR): $12,000,000.
- Reported Gross Margin: 82.0% (standard GAAP presentation).
- Reported Customer Acquisition Cost: $18,000.

- Reported CAC Payback: 2 , 500 × 0.82 18 , 000 = 8.8 months.
- Annual Account Churn: 22.0% (Annual Retention r = 78.0%).

Based on an apparent 8.8-month payback and 82% gross margin, executive leadership requested $15,000,000 in venture funding to triple sales hiring. However, despite rapid revenue growth, the company was burning over $7,500,000 in operational cash annually.

Uncovering the Hidden Unit Economic Deficits

A rigorous forensic audit of AcuityFlow's unit economics revealed catastrophic cost misallocations:

1. The Cost-to-Serve Blind Spot: While GAAP COGS reported only $450/month in cloud hosting, AcuityFlow employed 25 dedicated integration engineers and specialized technical CSMs whose time was spent entirely troubleshooting customer workflows. These personnel expenses were buried in corporate G&A. Real Direct CTS was $1,350/month ($16,200/year). True operational Contribution Margin was not 82%, but a meager 46.0% ($1,150/month).
2. The Unburdened CAC Mirage: The reported $18,000 CAC captured only direct marketing ad spend and AE sales commissions. When fully burdened with sales engineering compensation, sales leadership salaries, executive travel, and SDR prospecting tools, true fully loaded CAC was $38,000.
3. The True Payback Reality: Calculating payback on real contribution cash revealed the true recovery horizon: T payback = 2 , 500 × 0.46 38 , 000 = 1 , 150 38 , 000 = 33.0 months
4. The Structural Insolvency Equation: With a 78% annual retention rate, the average customer lifespan was only 3.2 years (38.4 months). Discounted at a 10% cost of capital, the finite 3-year LTV was: LTV = sum t = 1 3 (1.10) t 13 , 800 * (0.78) t = 9 , 785 + 6 , 938 + 4 , 919 = $21 , 642 The true LTV:CAC ratio was 38 , 000 21 , 642 = 0.57x.

AcuityFlow was losing over $16,000 in real economic capital on every single customer acquired. Scaling sales under these conditions would have led directly to corporate bankruptcy within 18 months.

The Operational Turnaround Program

Management immediately halted indiscriminate sales expansion and executed a disciplined four-pillar operational turnaround:

- Pillar 1: Standardized Self-Serve Integration: Built pre-configured connectors and automated error handling, reducing custom engineering troubleshooting by 70% and lowering monthly CTS from $1,350 to $550 per account.
- Pillar 2: Packaging and Pricing Restructuring: Eliminated flat-rate enterprise plans. Implemented Good-Better-Best packaging paired with an active connector value metric, lifting average ACV from $30,000 to $42,000 ($3,500/month).
- Pillar 3: Go-to-Market ICP Focusing: Terminated marketing campaigns targeting small businesses with high churn. Concentrated outbound sales exclusively on mid-market and enterprise accounts with high retention profiles, elevating annual customer retention from 78.0% to 92.5%.
- Pillar 4: Commercial Productivity Optimization: Streamlined the sales tech stack, instituted structured sales playbooks, and improved lead-to-opportunity conversion rates, driving fully loaded CAC down from $38,000 to $24,500.

Three-Year Financial and Unit Economic Trajectory

The table below documents AcuityFlow's financial transformation across the three-year turnaround.

Table 3 Three-Year Financial and Unit Economic Trajectory

Performance Metric	Year 0 (Broken Baseline)	Year 1 (Stabilization)	Year 2 (Efficiency)	Year 3 (Scaled Excellence)
Total Enterprise Customers	400	440	520	680
Average Contract Value (ACV)	$30,000	$34,000	$38,000	$42,000
Annual Recurring Revenue (ARR)	$12,000,000	$14,960,000	$19,760,000	$28,560,000
Monthly ARPU per Customer	$2,500	$2,833	$3,167	$3,500
Direct Monthly Cost to Serve (CTS)	$1,350	$950	$680	$550
Unit Contribution Margin %	46.0%	66.5%	78.5%	84.3%
Monthly Contribution Cash per Account	$1,150	$1,883	$2,487	$2,950
Fully Loaded CAC per Customer	$38,000	$32,000	$27,500	$24,500
Contribution CAC Payback Horizon	33.0 months	17.0 months	11.1 months	8.3 months
Annual Customer Retention Rate (r)	78.0%	85.0%	90.0%	92.5%
Implied Average Customer Lifespan	3.2 years	4.8 years	7.2 years	10.5 years
5-Year Discounted Contribution LTV	$34,800	$68,500	$108,200	$139,800
LTV:CAC Ratio (Contribution Basis)	0.57x (Insolvent)	2.14x	3.93x	5.71x (World-Class)
Operating Cash Flow (Burn / Profit)	-$7,500,000	-$1,800,000	+$2,400,000	+$8,200,000
Implied ARR Valuation Multiple	4.0x	6.0x	8.0x	10.5x
Enterprise Valuation	$48,000,000	$89,760,000	$158,080,000	$299,880,000

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

Strategic Analysis of the Turnaround

The turnaround results highlight the decisive power of unit economic discipline:

1. Compression of Payback Horizon from 33.0 to 8.3 Months: By expanding monthly contribution margin from $1,150 to $2,950 and reducing acquisition friction, AcuityFlow compressed its cash payback period by 75%. Acquired customers now fully repay their acquisition costs well within their initial 12-month contract, eliminating corporate liquidity risk.
2. Expansion of LTV:CAC Ratio from 0.57x to 5.71x: AcuityFlow transformed an economically insolvent customer relationship into a compounding cash-generation engine, generating over $5.70 in lifetime contribution cash for every single commercial dollar invested.

3 Cash Flow Inflection from -$7.5M Burn to +$8.2M Free Cash Flow: Because newly acquired cohorts generated immediate positive net contribution cash, AcuityFlow transitioned from chronic cash depletion to self-funded organic profitability without requiring dilutive equity financing.

4 Equity Valuation Surge (+524%): Driven by robust unit economics, an NRR exceeding 125%, and substantial free cash flow, AcuityFlow's enterprise valuation multiple expanded from 4.0x to 10.5x ARR. Enterprise value increased from $48M to nearly $300M.

Critical Structural Failure Modes and Anti-Patterns

Organizations attempting to scale operations repeatedly fall victim to five critical unit economic distortions:

1. The Blended CAC Camouflage

Combining organic word-of-mouth customer signups with paid enterprise outbound acquisitions to report a single "blended" CAC.

- Failure Dynamic: High organic inbound traffic masks the fact that paid outbound sales reps are spending $50,000 to acquire customers with a lifetime value of $25,000. Leadership continues funding paid sales channels that are burning capital.
- Operational Remediation: Mandate channel-isolated CAC reporting. Calculate separate, fully loaded CAC metrics for paid outbound field sales, digital paid acquisition, partner channels, and organic inbound.

2. The COGS Cleansing Pathology

Classifying variable customer success managers, onboarding specialists, professional services implementation deficits, and cloud database queries under operating expenses (G&A or Sales) to report an artificially inflated 80%+ GAAP gross margin.

- Failure Dynamic: The company presents impressive gross margins to investors while executive leadership wonders why cash balances continuously decline despite strong revenue growth.
- Operational Remediation: Construct an operational Contribution P&L. Include all labor and technical infrastructure required to onboard, service, and retain accounts within Direct Cost to Serve.

3. The Infinite Horizon LTV Fantasy

Calculating Customer Lifetime Value using the naive formula LTV = Churn Margin without applying a discount rate or time horizon cap.

- Failure Dynamic: For a customer cohort with a 5% annual churn rate, the naive formula assumes customers will generate cash flow for 20 years. In reality, software architectures become obsolete within five to seven years. Relying on 20-year LTVs justifies reckless, unrecoverable acquisition spending today.
- Operational Remediation: Enforce a strict 36-to-60-month finite horizon cap on all LTV calculations and apply the firm's true weighted average cost of capital (d ≥ 10%).

4. The Scale-Will-Cure-It Fallacy

Believing that negative customer contribution margins can be cured by scaling sales volume.

- Failure Dynamic: If a customer pays $1,000 per month but consumes $1,200 per month in variable hosting and customer support labor, each additional customer widens the monthly operating loss. Scaling a contribution-negative product accelerates bankruptcy.
- Operational Remediation: Enforce a hard gate: no commercial scaling or sales team expansion is authorized until atomic contribution margin strictly exceeds 64%.

5. The Top-Line Churn Masking Trap

Masking high customer logo churn by acquiring new customers at a rapid pace.

- Failure Dynamic: While top-line ARR expands, the company is churning through its addressable market. Because churned customers never reach their payback horizon, the company accumulates unrecoverable acquisition losses while exhausting its total addressable market.
- Operational Remediation: Monitor cohort-based retention curves. Require that every customer cohort achieve a minimum 85% logo retention rate before increasing marketing budget allocations.

Executive Diagnostic Framework and Audit Checklist

CFOs, Chief Revenue Officers, and institutional investors should evaluate commercial health using this 10-point unit economic diagnostic rubric.

Table 4 Executive Diagnostic Framework and Audit Checklist

Diagnostic Dimension	Exemplary Maturity (2 Points)	Acceptable Baseline (1 Point)	Critical Structural Defect (0 Points)
1. Unit Definition Precision	Indivisible atomic unit clearly defined across all commercial tiers	Unit defined generally, with minor ambiguity in enterprise contracts	Unit definition shifts between quarters to manipulate metrics
2. Fully Burdened CAC	Includes all S&M salaries, commissions, benefits, tools, travel, and overhead	Includes all salaries and media, but omits tooling and travel	Only digital ad spend and commissions counted; salaries omitted
3. Cost-to-Serve Boundary	Captures all cloud hosting, APIs, CS labor, and technical support	Captures cloud and primary support; excludes onboarding labor	Only basic server hosting counted; all servicing labor buried in G&A
4. Contribution Payback Horizon	CAC payback calculated on contribution cash; ≤ 12 months	Payback on contribution cash; between 12 and 18 months	Payback calculated on top-line revenue, or exceeds 24 months
5. LTV:CAC Ratio Calibration	Finite-horizon contribution LTV:CAC sits between 3.5x and 5.5x	Ratio sits between 2.0x and 3.5x; requires optimization	Ratio is below 1.5x (insolvent) or calculated using infinite horizons
6. Disaggregated Cohort Auditing	Unit economics calculated separately across enterprise, mid-market, SMB	Segmented by customer size, but using shared cost allocations	Blended company-wide average masking unprofitable segments
7. Time Horizon LTV Caps	LTV calculations strictly capped at maximum 36 to 60 months	LTV capped at 7 years; applies moderate discount rate	Uncapped infinite-horizon LTV assuming 15+ year customer lifespans
8. Channel-Isolated CAC	Paid outbound, inbound, and partner channels audited independently	Outbound and inbound separated, but tooling costs shared	Blended CAC combining organic signups with expensive field sales
9. Capital Working Cash Flow	Multi-year upfront cash terms ensure positive working capital	Annual upfront invoicing with occasional quarterly terms	Monthly billing in arrears with 18+ month payback creating cash crunches
10. Sales Comp Alignment	Sales commissions linked to contract margin and cash collection	Commissions tiered by contract size, independent of CTS	Sales reps paid full commission on low-margin or churn-prone accounts

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

Diagnostic Evaluation Scoring

- 18 to 20 Points: World-class commercial model. Unit economics are robust, capital allocation is optimized, and growth generates compounding free cash flow.
- 12 to 17 Points: Viable business with notable cost leakages. Urgent action required on burdened CAC accounting, CTS boundary adjustments, or payback compression.

- Below 12 Points: Economically distressed commercial engine. The enterprise is burning capital to acquire unprofitable customers, facing imminent cash exhaustion without radical restructuring.

Operating Governance, SLAs, and Organizational Execution

Maintaining strict unit economic discipline requires formal institutional decision rights across Finance, Revenue Operations, Sales, and Customer Success.

Unit Economics RACI Matrix

Table 5 Unit Economics RACI Matrix

Commercial Mandate	Chief Financial Officer	Chief Revenue Officer	Head of RevOps	VP Customer Success	VP Product / Eng
Defining the Cost to Serve Boundary	Accountable	Consulted	Responsible	Consulted	Consulted
Auditing Fully Loaded CAC	Accountable	Consulted	Responsible	Informed	Informed
Cohort-Level LTV and Payback Modeling	Accountable	Informed	Responsible	Consulted	Informed
Enforcing Sales Discount Guardrails	Consulted	Responsible	Accountable	Informed	Informed
Optimizing Variable Cloud Infrastructure	Informed	Informed	Informed	Consulted	Accountable
Pruning Unprofitable Customer Segments	Accountable	Responsible	Consulted	Consulted	Informed

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

Operational Governance Cadences and Circuit Breakers

1. Monthly Contribution Margin Audit (Finance + RevOps): Reconcile actual direct cloud hosting bills, third-party API consumption, and customer-facing labor against revenue across customer cohorts. Any customer tier whose contribution margin falls below 64% is subjected to immediate pricing or operational remediation.
2. Quarterly CAC Payback Gate (Executive Committee): Evaluate channel-isolated CAC payback horizons. If an acquisition channel's payback exceeds 18 months for two consecutive quarters, further marketing budget allocation to that channel is frozen until conversion efficiency is re-established.
3. Annual Customer Profitability Review (CFO + CRO): Perform a comprehensive customer profitability concentration audit (Mulhern, 1999). Identify accounts in the bottom 15% of contribution profitability, mandating contract restructuring, price increases, or graceful offboarding during upcoming renewals.

Empirical Synthesis and Scientific Bibliography

The mathematical formulation and managerial control of unit economics are grounded in foundational empirical research across customer lifetime valuation, customer profitability distribution, and long-term customer equity.

Gupta et al. (2004) supply the valuation link, and the sensitivity that matters here is theirs: "a 1% improvement in retention, margin, or acqui"sition cost "improves firm value by 5%, 1%, and .1%, respectively," and "a 1% im-

provement in retention has almost five times greater impact on firm value than a 1% change in discount rate or cost of capital." The method is demonstrated on public data for five firms, which is a demonstration rather than a general result. Its subject is the link from customers to firm value, not the shape of the profitability distribution.

Mulhern (1999) is the methodological source here, not an empirical law. The paper "provides a conceptual and methodological foundation for measuring customer profitability" and analyses concentration as a distribution, noting that a Lorenz curve cannot show the percentiles of customers who represent a financial loss. In his own dataset the concentration is sharp, and the general claim that survives is narrower than the one usually made in its name: aggregate averages hide cohort behaviour, so unit economics have to be measured across disaggregated cohorts. How unprofitable the tail is, and whether there is one, is a question for the firm's own data.

Reinartz and Kumar (2000) tested whether long relationships come with higher lifetime profitability, rising profits over time, lower service costs and higher prices, and their summary is that the findings "challenge all the expectations derived from the literature." Read as a governance warning rather than a coefficient, it says the useful thing: unit economics cannot be evaluated only at the point of initial sale, because tenure is not itself evidence of margin. Whether a mature account is contribution-positive is something a firm has to measure, and their setting was one catalog retailer, not a subscription platform.

By synthesizing rigorous discounted contribution cash modeling, fully burdened acquisition accounting, disaggregated cohort auditing, and disciplined corporate governance, modern technology enterprises master the fundamentals of unit economics: building an enduring, capital-efficient commercial engine capable of generating sustainable, long-term enterprise equity value.

For adjacent operating questions, see what is a value metric and what is customer churn.

Gupta, S., Lehmann, D. R., & Stuart, J. A. (2004). Valuing customers. Journal of Marketing Research, 41(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.41.1.7.25084

Mulhern, F. J. (1999). Customer profitability analysis: Measurement, concentration, and research directions. Journal of Interactive Marketing, 13(1), 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1002/%28sici%291520-6653%28199924%2913%3a1%3c25%3a%3aaid-dir3%3e3.0.co%3b2-l

Reinartz, W. J., & Kumar, V. (2000). On the profitability of long-life customers in a noncontractual setting: An empirical investigation and implications for marketing. Journal of Marketing, 64(4), 17–35. https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.64.4.17.18077

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, September 4). What are unit economics? Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-unit-economics/

KEEP READING

Growth that compounds

What is CAC payback period?

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-cac-payback/

Growth that compounds

The LTV:CAC ratio hides the timing

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/ltv-cac-ratio-hides-the-timing/

Growth that compounds

What is CAC?

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-cac/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher