

The Landing Page Audit Report

Memeador Labs · Report · Free · v0.2 · 2026-09-28 *The scoring framework behind IsThisPageGood — the weights, the anchors, a fully worked audit, and the trust-question library.*

Who this is for

For you if you own a landing page's conversion rate and want to know *why* it leaks — not a list of opinions, but a scored, repeatable read you can act on.

Not for you if you want a checklist of 200 "best practices" with no priority. This is a scoring model: five categories, weighted, with anchors, so two people score the same page the same way.

What you get here (free): the framework, the weights, the anchors, a complete worked audit, and the trust-question library. **What's gated** (email) is the printable scoring worksheet and the annotated teardown PDF. **What's paid** is the full scored report and the human review — where the category judgments in a real category get made by a person.

The one idea that matters most

Most audits grade a page on whether it looks good. A landing page isn't judged by whether it looks good. It's judged by whether a skeptical stranger, in a hurry, on a phone, can answer three questions before they leave: *what is this, why does it matter to me, and what do I do next?*

Two rules do most of the work, and they're the part you won't find in the heuristics literature:

1. **The load-bearing question.** Before scoring trust, name the single question a skeptical buyer in this category *must* have answered before they'll convert. Then check whether the answer sits **within one viewport of a conversion point** — not buried in an FAQ or the footer.
2. **Stakes-based calibration.** A dental practice and a free-trial SaaS are not graded against the same bar. Same page, different verdict, because a wrong commitment costs the buyer different things.

Everything else below (Nielsen, WCAG, standard CRO) is well-established — we use it, but we don't pretend it's ours.

The scoring model

Five categories, **weighted**, summing to 100. Each scored 0–100 against anchors, so the composite is reproducible.

Category	Weight	The question
Heuristics	20	Can a first-time visitor get where they're going without friction?
Conversion	25	Is the path from "interested" to "acted" clear, single, low-friction?
Trust	25	Is the load-bearing question answered within a viewport of the CTA?
Craft	15	Does it look intentional — or templated?
Accessibility	15	Can everyone use it, including screen-reader / low-vision / reduced-motion users?

Composite = (H×.20) + (C×.25) + (T×.25) + (Cr×.15) + (A×.15)

Navigation is scored *inside* heuristics — it is not its own category. Answer-ready content (GEO — can an AI assistant extract a clean answer from your page?) is scored inside **Craft** and **Conversion**; it matters because the first reader of your page is increasingly a model, but it isn't a sixth category.

Anchors (what 0 / 50 / 100 mean), per category

Category	0	50	100
Heuristics	Purpose unclear, action unfindable	Purpose clear, action takes hunting	Purpose obvious in 3s, one clear action
Conversion	No single next step, high friction	One CTA, some competing noise, top objection unanswered	One primary action, value specific, objections pre-answered
Trust	Load-bearing question unanswered anywhere	Answer exists but buried / off-viewport	Answer within one viewport of the CTA, explicit
Craft	Inconsistent, templated, >3 accents/radii	Competent but generic	Coherent system, real point of view, ≤2 radii, 1 accent
Accessibility	Contrast fails, no alt, not keyboard-operable	Mostly fine, one systemic issue	AA contrast, real alt text, focus + labels + reduced-motion

Score a page 78 and you can show the arithmetic. That's the difference between an opinion and an audit.

A complete worked audit

Anonymized composite of a real audit; details changed. The page: a B2B SaaS homepage for a scheduling tool. Traffic: ~68% mobile.

Load-bearing question (stated before scoring): a buyer evaluating scheduling software must know *"will this sync with the calendar system we already use, and what happens to our existing bookings if we leave?"* Both are dependency risks. For a system-of-record-adjacent product, an unanswered migration/continuity question is a legitimate **Major**, not a nitpick.

Category scores

Heuristics — 72 / 100

- The purpose is clear above the fold. One CTA ("Start free") is visible. Good.

- *Finding (Major)*: the product screenshot shows a desktop dashboard on a page that is 68% mobile traffic — a phone visitor sees a product they can't picture using. Severity: Major.
- *Finding (Minor)*: the nav has five items plus a redundant "Pricing" link in the footer and body. Severity: Minor.

Conversion — 64 / 100

- Value proposition is specific ("book meetings without the back-and-forth"). One primary CTA. Good.
- *Finding (Major)*: three equally-styled CTAs compete above the fold ("Start free", "See a demo", "Talk to sales"). No single next step. Severity: Major.
- *Finding (Moderate)*: the top objection (integration/export) is answered only in the footer FAQ, six scrolls down. Severity: Moderate.

Trust — 48 / 100

- Logos present, one testimonial. Some proof.
- *Finding (Critical for this product class)*: the page asks for a signup but never states what happens to existing bookings on cancellation, and never says which calendar systems it syncs with. For a product that becomes part of a workflow, the dependency questions are load-bearing and unanswered within a viewport of the CTA.
- *(Same finding on a low-commitment consumer tool would be Minor; here it's the stakes-based calibration doing its job.)*

Craft — 70 / 100

- Coherent type scale. One accent color. Good.
- *Finding (Moderate)*: four distinct border radii and three shadow depths on one screen — reads assembled, not designed. Severity: Moderate.
- *GEO note*: positioning is extractable ("scheduling software for small teams") — passes the "could a model quote this?" test.

Accessibility — 55 / 100

- Semantic headings present, forms labeled.

- *Finding (Critical)*: the primary CTA is white text on a light-blue button — **3.1:1**, below AA (4.5:1). The most important element is the hardest to read.
- *Finding (Moderate)*: three decorative images have `alt="image"`.

Composite

$$(72 \times .20) + (64 \times .25) + (48 \times .25) + (70 \times .15) + (55 \times .15) = 14.4 + 16.0 + 12.0 + 10.5 + 8.25 = \mathbf{61.2 / 100}$$

The three fixes, in order

1. **Answer the load-bearing question on-page, near the CTA** — one line under the button: "Syncs with Google & Outlook. Export your data anytime." (Trust: 48→~75)
2. **Fix the CTA contrast** to $\geq 4.5:1$. (Accessibility: 55→~80)
3. **One primary CTA; demote the other two to nav.** (Conversion: 64→~80)

Projected composite after: **~79 / 100**. *That's* what the scored report delivers — the number, the arithmetic, and the ranked fix list.

The trust-question library

The load-bearing question, by category. Start here; the answer must sit within one viewport of a conversion point.

1. **Dental / medical practice** — "Will this hurt, and will my insurance cover it?"
2. **Accounting / tax** — "Will they actually be responsive, or will I chase them?"
3. **Legal** — "Are they qualified for *my* kind of case, and what will it cost?"
4. **Home services** — "Will they show up, and will the price hold?"
5. **B2B SaaS (workflow tool)** — "What happens to my data/process if I leave?"
6. **B2B SaaS (system of record)** — "Reliability, security, export, and continuity?"
7. **Consumer subscription** — "What am I committing to, and how do I cancel?"
8. **Financial services** — "Is this regulated/insured, and what are the fees?"

9. **Marketplace** — "What happens if the transaction goes wrong?"
0. **Security software** — "Where does my data live, and who can see it?"
1. **Course / info product** — "Is this real knowledge or recycled fluff, and is refund easy?"
2. **Local retail / restaurant** — "Are they open, where, and can I get in?"
3. **Freelancer / studio** — "Can they actually do *my* thing, and are they still in business?"
4. **Developer tool** — "Does it work with my stack, and can I self-host?"
5. **Healthcare app** — "Is my health data private, and is this clinical-grade or a toy?"

(Severity guide: missing/buried answer is Critical in regulated categories — finance, health, legal, security. Major for unregulated products with real dependency risk. Minor for low-commitment, cancel-anytime tools.)

Benchmarks we see

From audits we've run (numbers rounded; updated as the sample grows):

- **3.1:1 or worse CTA contrast** on roughly 1 in 4 pages — the single most common Critical finding.
 - **Mobile afterthought** (desktop screenshot / broken mobile layout) on about 1 in 3.
 - **Buried load-bearing answer** (only in FAQ/footer) on the majority of high-stakes pages — the most *expensive* pattern.
 - **Three-plus competing CTAs** on about 1 in 4.
 - **Vague positioning** that an AI assistant couldn't quote, on roughly half.
-

Self-scoring checklist (quick version)

Score each 0–100 on the anchors above, then weight.

Heuristics — purpose clear in 3s · one obvious action above the fold · no "what now?" moment **Conversion** — one primary CTA · value = outcome for a specific person · top 3 objections on-page **Trust** — load-bearing question named · answered within one viewport of the CTA · commitment terms explicit **Craft** — consistent type/spacing/radii (≤ 2) · one accent · not templated · positioning extractable **Accessibility** — body text $\geq 4.5:1$ · real alt text · keyboard-operable, focus, labels

(Printable worksheet — with the weights pre-loaded and the arithmetic done for you — is the email-gated download.)

Get more

- **Run it in a minute:** paste a URL at **isthispagegood.com** — free scored report (five category scores, composite, headline finding per category, your category's trust question).
- **The annotated teardown + scoring worksheet (PDF):** free, by email → *[download link]*. We send a handful of audits, and the worksheet.
- **The full report + human review:** every finding scored and severity-tagged, the composite, prioritized fixes, and a Memeador reviewer's pass — because the category-specific judgment calls are what a machine can't make alone.

Written by Ellen Drewes, Memeador. Method built on our own client audits plus Nielsen heuristics, WCAG 2.2, and standard CRO practice. Versioned: buy once, get v1.x updates. thecollective@memeador.com · memeador.com