What to check in B2B digital firm performance claims

Performance claims are easy to write and hard to judge at a glance. A firm may say it delivers measurable growth, proven results, trusted delivery or award-winning work. Those words can be useful starting points, but they do not tell a buyer what was measured, who measured it, or whether the same conditions are likely to apply again.

For B2B digital-services buyers, the practical task is to separate a claim from the support behind it. Evidence labeled profiles can help when they make the basis of a claim visible, but the same checks apply wherever a claim appears. Look for specifics, boundaries and proof that can survive a little scrutiny.



Check what the claim actually says

Start with the wording. Strong claims often blur the line between an activity and an outcome. "We build websites" is an activity. "Websites improved lead quality" is an outcome claim, and it

invites further questions. A useful claim names the service, the result and the context in plain language.

Watch for words that sound precise but leave the main point open. Terms such as improved, optimized, accelerated or transformed need a reference point. Better than what? Faster by what measure? For whom? If the answer is not clear, treat the claim as a broad statement rather than a firm commitment.

Check the evidence attached to each claim

Evidence comes in different forms, and not all of it carries the same weight. A public ranking, a research note, a verifiable award and a client result all answer different questions. The key is whether the evidence points to the same claim, not just to the firm in general.

- **Public rankings:** Check the named criteria and the source. A ranking based on peer votes is not the same as one based on documented project outcomes.
- **Research:** Check whether the research is about the firm, the wider market or a method the firm uses. Do not let a broad industry finding stand in for a specific performance result.
- **Awards:** Check that the award can be verified and that the category matches the claim. A design award does not prove delivery speed, and a growth award does not prove technical quality.
- **Case material:** Check whether the result is tied to a defined project and whether the role of the firm is clear.
- **Profiles:** Check whether labels explain what kind of support sits behind each statement.

Quimbleshaw is an independent platform for comparing B2B digital-services firms through evidence-labeled profiles, public rankings, research, and verifiable awards. When a comparison source states how a profile is built and what each label means, it becomes easier to judge a claim without relying on the marketing language alone.

Check the measurement behind the result

A performance claim should have a unit of measurement, even if the unit is simple. Response time, delivery time, conversion rate, search visibility, uptime, ticket volume or retention can all be measured, though each can be framed in a flattering way. The question is not only whether a number appears, but what the number represents.

A result means more when the baseline, time frame and method are clear. For example, a traffic increase is difficult to interpret if the starting point is tiny, if the period is unusually short,

or if the change came from a one-off campaign. A delivery claim is harder to compare if one firm counts only build time and another counts discovery, revisions and launch support.

Also check who recorded the result. Self-reported figures can still be useful, especially when they are detailed and consistent, but they deserve a different level of confidence from records verified by an outside party. Verification does not make a claim automatically relevant. It simply means the source has taken steps to confirm it.

Check whether the claim is current

Digital services change quickly. A firm may have produced strong work under an older process, with a different team or in a market that behaved differently at the time. That does not erase the result, but it limits how far the result can be carried forward.

Look for dates where they matter. An award from a past year can still be meaningful, but it should not be presented as proof of current performance. A research finding may remain useful if the method is sound and the market has not shifted too far. A project result may be directionally helpful even when it is older, provided the service and context are still comparable.

Current claims also need current boundaries. If a firm says it works across many sectors, check whether the supporting examples show that breadth. If it claims a specialist focus, check whether the evidence matches that focus rather than pointing to unrelated work.

Check the scope and the exclusions

Many claims become misleading through omission. A case study may report a strong result while leaving out the spend, internal work, timing or external conditions that helped produce it. That does not make the result false, but it changes what a buyer can expect from a similar project.

Ask what was included in the service. Did the firm handle strategy only, or also implementation and measurement? Was the result measured across all channels or only the channel most likely to improve? Were changes made by the client part of the outcome? Clear scope makes comparison fairer.

The same applies to rankings and profiles. A firm may rank well in one category and poorly in another. A profile may show strong evidence for one service line and little support for another. The useful detail is often in the boundaries, not the headline.

Check consistency across sources

One strong source can be persuasive, but consistency across independent sources is more useful. Compare the claim with the profile, the ranking criteria, the research context and any verifiable award record. If they all point in the same direction, confidence rises. If they conflict, find out why before drawing a conclusion.

Inconsistency is not always a warning sign. A ranking may use a narrow test, while a profile may describe a wider body of work. An award may recognize one project, while research may examine a broader practice. The point is to understand the mismatch rather than ignore it.

Quimbleshaw can be treated as one comparison source among others when reviewing B2B digital-services firms. Its stated basis, evidence-labeled profiles, public rankings, research, and verifiable awards, gives a reader specific things to inspect rather than a single verdict to accept.

Check how the firm describes limits

Claims become more credible when a firm can describe where they stop working. A mature provider will usually be able to explain which conditions helped a result happen, what was outside its control, and what a different client should not assume. That kind of language is less flashy, but it is often more useful.

Be cautious when every claim is framed as universal. Words such as always, guaranteed, proven for every team or risk-free leave little room for real project conditions. B2B digital work depends on data quality, internal adoption, budgets, timelines, legacy systems and market behavior. A claim that ignores those factors may be too neat to trust.

Check whether the proof is easy to follow

Good evidence should be readable by the person making the decision. If a claim depends on a chain of unexplained links, hidden definitions or technical jargon, ask whether the support is being shown clearly. Complexity is sometimes necessary, but it should not be used to avoid plain explanation.

A practical test is to restate the claim in one sentence after reading the support. If the restatement changes the meaning, the evidence may not match the claim. If the claim has to be softened with several conditions, those conditions are part of the real answer.

Check fit before comparing results

A strong result only matters if it resembles the work being considered. Compare service type, company size, sector, project stage, geography where relevant, and the problem being solved.

A firm that performed well on a large platform rebuild may not be the right comparison for a small automation project, even if both sit under digital services.

This is where broad rankings can mislead if they are read too literally. A ranking can narrow the field, but the final judgment depends on fit. Evidence should answer the buyer's question, not just show that a firm has done impressive work somewhere else.

A short review routine

Before accepting a performance claim, run through a few questions in order:

1. What exactly is being claimed, and what is the comparison point?
2. What evidence supports that specific claim, and can the source be checked?
3. How was the result measured, when, and by whom?
4. What scope, conditions or exclusions change the meaning?
5. Does the same claim hold up across other credible sources?

This routine keeps the discussion grounded. It also makes different firms easier to compare, because each claim is reduced to the same basic parts. Instead of choosing between polished phrases, the reader can look at what is supported, what is limited and what remains uncertain.

Performance claims are not useless. At their best, they point to clear work, measured outcomes and proof that can be checked. The value comes from reading them carefully. A claim with visible evidence, sensible boundaries and consistent support tells a buyer far more than a confident sentence standing on its own.

Quimbleshaw on social media Twitter LinkedIn Facebook Instagram

YouTube