REVENUE OPERATIONS & AI

Win-loss analysis needs an outcome before it needs a reason

A lost deal is not a reason code. Separate won, lost, and canceled outcomes from buyer and seller accounts before learning from the review.

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

PUBLISHED
27 August 2026

READING TIME
5 min

WORDS
1,195

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/win-loss-analysis-needs-an-outcome/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Win-loss analysis is not a ritual for assigning blame after a deal closes. It is a small evidence design: start with the recorded commercial outcome, keep won, lost, and canceled separate, and store the buyer's account beside the seller's account. Research on failed key-account proposals shows the value of a buyer-side post-mortem; a CRM study shows why canceled leads should not be folded into losses; and work on failing fast warns against treating an early exit as proof of better performance. The practical result is a review row with an outcome, a source, a reason code, a confidence state, and a follow-up test. It can improve what the team asks next without pretending that a retrospective explanation is a causal verdict.

Keywords: Win-loss analysis · Sales operations · Buyer evidence · CRM outcomes · Sales failure

Win-loss analysis becomes evidence only when it keeps the commercial outcome and the explanation in separate fields. Start with what the CRM records. Then ask whose account you have, what document or conversation supports it, and what would have to change before the next review could test it.

That sounds slower than selecting a reason code. It is faster than turning a seller's preferred story into a rule and discovering six months later that the team has been optimizing for an explanation no buyer gave.

Why does win-loss analysis need an objective outcome before attributing reasons?

A closed opportunity gives you an outcome. It does not automatically give you the reason for that outcome.

The distinction matters because a sales review usually contains at least three different voices:

- the system's status and close date;
- the buyer's account of the decision, if the buyer can be reached; and
- the seller's account of what happened.

Those fields can agree. They can also conflict. A deal can be marked lost to a competitor while the buyer describes an internal budget stop. A seller can describe a price objection while the proposal record shows that the required implementation path was never made credible. The record is not broken because the accounts differ. The disagreement is part of the evidence.

Keep three states visible

Virtanen, Parvinen, and Rollins studied individual sales leads in a large IT solutions company. Their mixed-methods design combined interviews with 14 salespeople and CRM data. The final dataset contained 4,194 leads nested under about 500 customers. The authors kept three outcomes visible: won, lost, and canceled.

Their definition of canceled is the useful boundary. A lost lead means the customer made an alternative purchase decision. A canceled lead means no purchase decision was made and the opportunity was stopped by the supplier or the customer. Those states can require different follow-up questions. A competitor review is not the same instrument as a review of a project that never reached a decision.

Table 1 The outcome-matched win-loss record

Field	Record	Confidence	What it can support	What it cannot support
Outcome	Won, lost, or canceled, with close date and status history	Observed in CRM, or unresolved	Comparisons between defined outcome groups	A causal reason by itself
Buyer account	Stated problem, alternatives, constraints, and decision path	Reported, with participant and date	A buyer-side explanation to compare with the seller account	The claim that the buyer account is complete or universally true
Seller account	Explanation, owner, date, and role	Reported, with wording preserved	A hypothesis about the selling process	A verified cause merely because it is internal
Process evidence	Proposal, price, timing, competitor, interaction, or approval record	Corroborated, disputed, or absent	Support for or against an account	Proof that one document caused the outcome
Reason code	Versioned classification of the account	Coded, disputed, or unknown	Consistent review and question selection	A substitute for evidence or counterfactual testing
Follow-up	Next test, process change, owner, and date	Planned or completed	Learning from a changed process	Proof that the prior review was correct

Framework synthesis grounded in Friend, Curasi, Boles, and Bellenger (2014), Virtanen, Parvinen, and Rollins (2015), and Friend, Ranjan, and Johnson (2019).

Put the buyer's account beside the seller's

Friend, Curasi, Boles, and Bellenger approached failed key-account proposals from the buying side. Their study used 35 post-mortem cases and 58 decision makers from 35 US industrial buying organizations connected to two Fortune 250 industrial service sellers. The recurring dimensions were adaptability, relationship potential, and cost considerations.

The point is not to import those three dimensions as a universal CRM taxonomy. The point is to ask a better question after a loss: what did the buyer experience, and how does that account compare with the explanation recorded by the seller? The buyer-side perspective can expose an attribution gap, but it is still a retrospective account from a purposive qualitative sample. It is evidence to compare, not an oracle.

This is also why a generic voice-of-customer acquisition does not automatically solve win-loss analysis. A purchased voice-of-customer dataset may tell you what a selected group says. It does not, without a defined sampling frame, tell you whether the people you heard from represent won, lost, and canceled opportunities in the same proportions or with the same decision context.

Treat early exit as a decision

The phrase “fail fast” is attractive because it sounds like a productivity rule. Friend, Ranjan, and Johnson make the idea more precise. Their process is prospect-intent collection, intent interpretation, and a salesperson’s decision to stop pursuing a prospect early when a purchase appears unlikely.

Across three studies, the direct relationship between failing fast and sales performance was not statistically significant, and the moderator findings were mixed. That does not make early exit useless. It makes the record more honest. An early exit is a decision to allocate effort. It is not proof that the salesperson predicted the eventual outcome correctly, and it is not the same as a buyer canceled opportunity.

How should commercial teams structure a defensible win-loss review?

The review is ready to close when the team can answer five questions without filling gaps with confidence:

1. What outcome was recorded, and when did it become final?
2. Whose account is being coded, and who supplied it?
3. Which document, event, or participant supports the account?
4. Is the reason reported, corroborated, disputed, or unknown?
5. What next test or changed process would make the review useful?

If the fifth answer is missing, the review may still improve the team’s questions. It has not yet demonstrated learning. If the second or third answer is missing, keep the reason as an unverified hypothesis. Do not turn it into a coaching verdict, a compensation rule, or a marketing brief.

The funnel bottleneck nobody measures asks where commercial handoffs lose information. Win-loss analysis asks what happens after the outcome is known. The two belong together only when the same outcome definition survives both views.

Boundary

The held studies support an outcome-matched review design. They do not show that a buyer interview reveals the true cause of a loss, that canceled opportunities should be counted as losses, or that failing fast improves performance in a particular sales organization. A reason code is a useful classification only while its source, confidence, and limit remain visible.

Friend, S. B., Curasi, C. F., Boles, J. S., & Bellenger, D. N. (2014). Why are you really losing sales opportunities? A buyers' perspective on the determinants of key account sales failures. Industrial Marketing Management, 43(7), 1124-1135. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2014.06.002

Virtanen, T., Parvinen, P., & Rollins, M. (2015). Complexity of sales situation and sales lead performance: An empirical study in business-to-business company. Industrial Marketing Management, 45, 49-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.02.024

Friend, S. B., Ranjan, K. R., & Johnson, J. S. (2019). Fail fast, sell well: The contingent impact of failing fast on salesperson performance. Industrial Marketing Management, 82, 265-275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.01.007

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, August 27). Win-loss analysis needs an outcome before it needs a reason. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/win-loss-analysis-needs-an-outcome/

KEEP READING

Revenue operations & AI

What is lead routing? Assignment is a measurement boundary

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-lead-routing/

Revenue operations & AI

What is a forecast override? Judgment is an intervention in the data

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-forecast-override/

Revenue operations & AI

A renewal is not proof you prevented churn

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/a-renewal-is-not-proof-you-prevented-churn/

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

Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/win-loss-analysis-needs-an-outcome/