

**Please note:** This is a continuation of comments received from our review of Wealthy Affiliate.

You can follow the full conversation here:

<http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review.html#comment-3315583371>

As we said before... A company called Wealthy Affiliate (WA) has affiliates who have written countless reviews promoting WA. The claims, lacking any proof of success, were dubious.

We only became interested, when we discovered fake reviews by them about our company, posts that rank in the Top 10 at Google. The first two were a curiosity, but we soon discovered many more.

We dug until we found the truth outlined here:

<http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review.html>

What follows is team work from our content and research teams who compiled a wide variety of notes from the most prominent of the 6 threads on Wealthy Affiliate about The Study with notes and possible answers...

---

We moved the comments to this PDF so you can review them at your leisure after reading what there is to learn. There are three reasons for this....

- 1) it got long as heck. You'd never make it to the important conclusions at the end.
- 2) you'll get more out of the comments having read the bottom line summary of all this.
- 3) you can come back and find them at any time when they're all at the end. Return for more whenever you like. They're somewhat like a vast vat of popcorn...

It looks unfinishable. But each is kind of tasty. You'll want another, then another. You may actually finish it all in one sitting. Worth the inevitable indigestion. ;-)

OK, here we go...

I moved this first one to the top of all comments because it's so good at not making any sense AND taking shots that don't matter to the study. He works so hard to cast doubt with irrelevant comments, it reminded us of the old saying...

"If you can't dazzle them with brilliance, baffle them with bulls\_ \_ \_!"

Onto the comment...

- 1) "once you mix opinions with facts, you can really come to any conclusion you want about any product."

Answer: The scientific method - Design solid study. Get data. Analyze data.

Please point out what you mean. Generalities that don't apply sound good but waste time.

2) "SBI claims to have the top 0.5% of all websites in the world? What does that mean? Sounds pretty ridiculous."

Answer: You are right, it sounds ridiculous. But see [results.sitesell.com](https://results.sitesell.com) and re-read. We don't say that. I don't even see how you could interpret that.

3) "Go to SEMRush and check out their traffic over the past couple years."

Answer: Yes, SE traffic has dropped...

<https://www.semrush.com/info/sitesell.com?db=us>

When Google discounted affiliate links, we lost SE referrals.

Overall traffic, however, is OK...

<https://www.similarweb.com/website/sitesell.com>

<http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/sitesell.com>

Growing our own traffic is a priority, though, yes.

Now we have a question...

\*\*\*What does that have to do with the Results of The Study?\*\*\* I repeat 3 highlights of The Study...

1) A solopreneur who starts with SBI! is 33X more likely to be "Outstanding-Excellent."

2) A solopreneur who starts with SBI! is almost 10X more likely to be "Medium"-level success.

3) The ONLY category, where WA "beats" us was in "abject failure." 87% of their sites are "Invisible" - that is basically abject failure.

Do you know the concept of causality? Just because 2 facts are true does not mean that they are related. For example...

A) SiteSell's overall traffic dropped years ago, largely due to a loss of search traffic when Google discounted inbound affiliate links. We haven't spent a lot of attention on marketing. Thanks for the wakeup call.

B) SBI! beats WA in every traffic measurement by HUGE differentials (33X average in the best division), except in the failure division. WA dominates in "Invisible," the worst failure possible.

But here's the question...

How does SiteSell traffic account for the success of its product over WA? There is no causality between the two.

For clarity, allow me to add an example of causality. It's a hypothetical, but you could replace "Solopreneur 2" with any one of these stories...

[www.sitesell.com/blog/real-life-success-lessons/](http://www.sitesell.com/blog/real-life-success-lessons/)

- 1) Solopreneur 1 and 2 are both searching for reviews about SBI!, interested in starting an online business to reach an important goal s/he has set.
- 2) Solopreneur 1 ("S1") falls for the fake reviews of WA and uses it.
- 3) Solopreneur 2 ("S2") does not search for reviews and starts SBI! after spending hours on our site and reviewing The Study. After that...

They each put in the same amount of time and energy.

One year later, S1 is failing miserably, stuck with nearly zero traffic. If s/he got sucked into MMO, as 1/3 of WA users do, s/he has started to realize how many ethically challenged people there are in this niche, how scammy it is, and is ashamed to tell friends details of her/his business. S/he won't even give them the domain name.

S2, however, is thriving. S/he's building a wonderful site about Puglia, a little know region of Italy. Her/his traffic is over 1,000 visitors per day and rising. S/he is starting to replace AdSense with sponsorships and considering more active, higher-paying ways to monetize than affiliate programs (booking.com is doing OK, but she knows she can do better). S/he feels grrrreat - it's happening!

The reason for the difference? It is most likely the fake review. S1 believed it and bought a product that cut their likelihood of success by more than 90%. S2 used SBI!, followed the Action Guide and is on their way toward their goal, leading a life of joy. When someone asks what s/he does for a living, s/he still has her/his job, but s/he says proudly...

"I have an Internet business about Puglia, Italy. It's this amazing little corner of Italy on the Adriatic. I write about all the secret little spots and hotels and restaurants, supplementing it with Facebook. I'll add Instagram later. I expect to quit my job in a year."

All due to a fake review. I'm not kidding - WA's fake reviews lead people to a product with an extremely low success rate. THAT is causality.

Tell me, if I'm wrong... Where are all of WA's success stories (including domain names) such as we show on our site? Can you show 500 (results.sitesell.com) or longevity and equity (case-studies.sitesell.com) or the wonderful stories we present with more human interest ([www.sitesell.com/blog/real-life-success-lessons/](http://www.sitesell.com/blog/real-life-success-lessons/))?

Where are they?

Our customers don't succeed because of our traffic.

But many (who could have been SBIs) fail because fake reviews led them to WA.

--

Here's a great point...

"A lot of newbies here jumped on the Bootcamp bandwagon because it was easier than choosing a "passion" niche and unfortunately have just gone out there blasting every other product as a scam when some of them aren't which is why we now have a few genuine product owners/developers joining in the "witch hunt" and fighting back!"

Answer: Yes! You understand exactly why we're fighting back. And soon we'll be uniting.

There's only one problem with your suggestion that they should focus on what we call "REAL" niches...

One thing that we didn't publish (new data since Part 3) is the following...

- 34 of the 53 sites that ranked as "Excellent-Outstanding" were "MMO" sites.
- 19 were "REAL."

We already know (from The Study) that a little over 1/3 of all WA sites are MMO. That means that, all things being equal, about 18 out of the 53 "Outstanding-Excellent" SHOULD be MMO.

That means 35 sites out of the 53 SHOULD be "REAL." But only 19 actually are "REAL" out of the 53.

Bottom line: WA's "REAL" sites perform significantly worse than expected.

People going into non-MMO sites are more likely starting at a less knowledgeable level. The WA materials would seem even less likely to be good enough to enable success for "REAL" sites.

Just something to think about. You ARE right to encourage people to enter REAL niches. Unfortunately, WA subtly tries to move them into "make money." They don't "jump on the Bootcamp bandwagon" - they are pushed there by the WA product. That keeps the affiliate program stocked with "make money" affiliates.

--

"one of them said she left WA because of the upsells - and I'm here two years but never saw an upsell - so there are all sorts of people in this world, and birds of a feather flock together!"

Answer: There are several paid and free SiteSellers who have examined the product and the aff program/Bootcamp. Here's the truth... The freemium is very limited. You are reminded at the end of every lesson in the first course about the paid product.

It's on the dashboard and various other locations. There are also several emails sent to freemium users. The "2 free sites" are useless subdomain sites (subdomain.siterubix.com) that will never amount to anything, despite their claims that their freemium product is "better than paid products."

I don't know why it's necessary to deny upsell efforts exist. What else does a freemium buyer expect from most companies. We don't do crippled freemiums. We provide what we believe to be a better option - get full access for \$29/month. If it's not for you, just refund. Any solopreneur who has the courage to try deserves a refund.

Also, if you buy a full year subscription, we refund you fully if it's within 90 days, pro-rata after that. It's my understanding that WA does not offer refunds. From emails with others, I gather that they would have to deduct it from affiliates, like we do. Since their churn rate is high, they likely want to keep that secret. This is speculation on my part.

A refund is, at least to us at SiteSell, a thank you for trying. Our refund rate is around 20% in the first 90 days. The reasons almost all boil down to some version of "I'm not willing to work that hard." And that's fine. Think about how many people live with dreams and goals but never take action.

If you don't take action, you never get rid of that gnawing feeling. But if you try, REALLY give it your best, you may either...

1) get really turned on about building a business about a wonderful niche (congrats, you are on your way)

2) realize that you aren't cut out for this. THAT is a big deal. Now you can enjoy TV time with the family, tennis on Sundays or whatever, guilt-free. If you are not ready to make short-term sacrifice for more important, long-term goals that really matter, accept it. It's neither bad or good - it's you. :-)

--

"I think some very open sharing of what the WA platform can do might be enough"

Answer: To make things simpler for folks who didn't read The Study, we have added a summary to the top of each page...

Part 1: Intro, Summary, "Peek" at Results

<http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review.html>

Part 2: Methodology

<http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review-part-2.html>

Part 3: Complete Results <http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review-part-3.html>

With the disastrous results that WA gets in terms of traffic, what difference could ANY PRODUCT DEMO MATTER?

WA users hardly generate any traffic. The Study says it black on white. If you don't believe it, do the same methodology yourself.

--

A collection such as these are best dealt with as a group...

"Weird name huh?" (referring to "Solo Build It!")

"Again, not interested!"

"They are doing a fine job destroying themselves!!"

"Desperate businesses and people will do desperate things"

Answer: None of these take any notice of our results, but 87% of them have sites that fall into the worst category, "Invisible." If they aren't interested, they must be one of the 53/17,000 that made it into the top category.

--

"would you believe he actually states he is the one taking the high road - delusional"

Answer: Mike answered that, not me. I agree with him. See the answer to "feeling the heat," just below.

Fake reviews that hurt solopreneurs are "lower than a snake's belly in a wagon rut," to quote the single line of Beverly Hillbillies that I remember.

We responded with a well-designed study that delivered results you didn't like.

--

"simply sour grapes."

Answer: see answer right below this.

--

"feeling the heat, and are resorting to below the belt tactics"

Answer: We would not be here if WA affiliates had not been trained in such a way that they ended up writing tons of fake reviews that tell people who are interested in SBI! that WA is better.

THAT is under-the-belt.

P.S. You may note that I back up my statements. Don't just throw out accusations like "under the belt." THINK. What makes our Study, a rigorous, disciplined study that reveals a truth you don't like - what makes that "underhanded?"

--

"I would go a look at it except for two things: One, I don't care to and two I don't have a FB account."

Answer: You don't need a FB account - not sure why that mattered if you don't care to (just thought I'd make the FB thing clear).

--

"I used to hear a saying in the Army a lot 'Statistics Lie and Liers Use Statistics.'"

Answer: This is data, not statistics. These numbers don't lie.

--

"I would be curious and interested in rebutting it's findings.

Information is power, and this must be rebutted?

Also, having an answer for such claims would be helpful?"

Answer: We started with curiosity when the first 2 fake reviews were reported. I'd be delighted to turn all SBI! owners over to a company that is this much better than SBI! (after due diligence and acceptance by SBI! owners). What an amazing ride, to have made a difference in so many people's lives and then bow out by turning them over to an even better business.

We didn't start out with how to rebut. I took time to appreciate the full breadth of this fake review scheme.

Conducting a head-to-head study was the best way to find the truth.

Data, not statistics.

--

"They are not offering a free trial period just a money back guarantee. All my questions after that would not be answered until I became a member. So much for transparency."

Answer: We don't do crippled freemiums. You can use SBI! for 3 months and get all your money back. That way, you can use ALL of SBI! for free. It costs you nothing to get your money back with SBI!. It seems, though, that you CANNOT get it back from WA.

--

"Just the fact that the review is an ad loses all its reputability and honesty"

Answer: How exactly?

--

"It seems like they are just trying to get business for their own thing..."

Answer: No, we are trying to get WA to stop using fake reviews as a primary strategy (they give a list of 175 companies to review as you probably know). By doing so, The Study shows that affiliates HURT the chances of success by more than 90%.

That's serious stuff, misleading real people with real hopes and dreams.

--

"What we have here (many other examples exist) is the № 1-hated thing about Wealthy Affiliate - negative reviews trashing online businesses in order to promote Wealthy Affiliate. The Internet community as a whole best knows WA thus."

Answer: Bingo! Daniel, we'd love to have you at SBI!. I also learned a lot about Clicksure.

An excellent post, I couldn't have said it better and it would have taken me twice the words. And regarding this...

--

"When it comes to reviews of such programs as SBI, it's going to take a lot more research, and it usually takes getting inside the program itself, because programs like this are not hot air sandwiches."

Answer: That's the truth. The Study cuts through the need to do that. The results are inescapably, hugely different. Some highlights...

A) SBI! owners are 33X more likely for solopreneurs to be "Outstanding-Excellent."

B) They are 10X more likely to land in medium-level.

C) The ONLY category where WA "beats" SBI! was in "abject failure" (Alexa >30M, SimilarWeb >30M, SEMrush = 0).

The full set of results is in Part 3.

--

The only thing I would disagree with is this, Daniel...



"Top earners do not play around with this. Getting inside such programs are a part of their business expenses and is something to work toward being able to do."

Answer: There are pros who have many top rankings. One of them claims that we've lost the ability to attract Search Engine visitors. If you review The Study, you'll see that our results are consistently strong for Alexa, stronger for Similar Web and \*\*\*strongest for SEMrush (which measures ONLY SE traffic).\*\*\*

Some denigrate SBI! for its design capabilities, but given the high traffic results, how bad can they be so bad as to matter? And actually, they are pretty darn good...

<http://www.sitesell.com/businessdesigns.html>

We could go on and on with incorrect claims but none of it needs to be debated any more, not when they know these types of results...

- 1) A solopreneur who starts with SBI! is 33X more likely to be "Outstanding-Excellent."
- 2) A solopreneur who starts with SBI! is almost 10X more likely to be "Medium"-level success.
- 3) The ONLY category, where WA "beats" us was in "abject failure." 87% of their sites are "Invisible" - that is basically abject failure.

20 years ago, there WERE affiliates just like that - people who really took the time. They are few and far between today, Daniel, when it comes to "MMO" and the "old-fashioned" Net marketing sites.

--

NOTE: Daniel later added...

"Before I found WA, I had my eye on SBI. It was one of the better ones out there. I think it still relies on some of the old Internet stuff and some of that doesn't work very well anymore,"

Answer: Daniel, check out SEMrush results. SBI! has kept up with the time and SBI! solopreneurs are more varied in traffic sources. But SBI! solopreneurs still do search better than anybody. They consistently deliver THE best results compared to Alexa and SimilarWeb (SEMrush measures ONLY search.) See full results...

Part 3: Complete Results <http://www.sitesell.com/blog/2017/05/wealthy-affiliate-review-part-3.html>

The bottom line is that Steve Pavlina is right...

"it is going to do [you] little good."

Now, you seem really smart and may be succeeding without it. Without knowing your domain, there is no way to know. But only 53/17,000 WA sites rank in the "Outstanding/Excellent" traffic level.

Daniel, please read Part 3 and consider the RESULTS. NO rhetoric overcomes that.

--

"Some people just get into a bad style of reviewing - exactly like this Evoy guy, ironically!"

Answer: We do something that no one has ever done before (or perhaps never wanted to know) and, without justifying it, he makes a statement like that?

--

"Let's face it -- the reason Wealthy Affiliate is always getting a bad rap on almost every other forum or blog that wasn't created by a WA affiliate is because of this very reason. People are losing trusts in review blogs that review good products, give it a bad rap, point out its flaws, and then recommend WA...Many people give superficial reviews without even buying the product..."

I see people commenting stuff like, "Oh, another Wealthy Affiliate site. I know I can't trust you.""

Answer: I'm only more recently learning how widely WA is distrusted by those in the business. Sadly, those who are searching for reviews have not yet learned to distrust it.

The next point was an interesting one that made me laugh...

--

"Odd thing is his review was negative about the WA and he made several mentions of how evil the WA was and to save yourself you need to quit the WA and join his program. Awesome bait and switch Ken, good for you."

Answer: It's hyperbolic. HE drew the conclusion of "evil." I never called WA that. But I do kinda like the turnaround that we're using the same technique. There are two very big differences, though...

1) our content is all true

2) our recommendation IMPROVES the odds of success by 33x for elite-level and 10x for mid-level. But WA affiliate recommendations HURT very real people with goals and dreams. That bothers me more than anything else.

Aside from that...

I did point out several unethical practices. When I say that the emphasis is on moving customers into "make money," I don't just toss it out, unsupported. I back it up, explaining how they do that AND then mention that more than 1/3 of all their sites are "make money"-related.

That's a staggering stat, when you consider all the possible niches in the world - there are millions. That alone supports the RESULTS of the emphasis. This commenter may deny the process, but can't deny the results.

Also, there is WA criticism out there that says the same thing about the heavy emphasis on "buy the product to sell the product, the cycle of make-money." Mostly, though, our research is primary, not pulled from what others say.

I also mention that if the reviews were true, balanced content from people that did not try to "make a case" and offered the best possible choice for the reader, then using a product's trade name to review it FAIRLY and GENUINELY finding it INFERIOR and then TRULY giving the best recommendation possible... if they did that, it would be aggressive but fair play.

Unfortunately, almost none of the content is true and The Study says two things...

1) none of the content in those reviews COULD be true AND deliver the results that we found

2) the recommendation itself is terrible. They doom the future solopreneur to 1/33 of the chance of SBI! to reach elite traffic, 1/10th to reach medium. And when it comes to total failure (>30M Alexa, >30M SimilarWeb, SEMrush=0), well yes...

WA has us totally beat at failure, the lowest level of failure.

-----

\*\*\*\*\*GOTTA SIMPLIFY IF WE'RE GOING TO GET THIS DONE\*\*\*\*\*

Here are even more samples OF "analysis" and commentary of the serious 3-part review of Wealthy Affiliate vs SBI! I answer some in [square brackets]. The rest pretty much speak for themselves.

I'll keep answers, if any, shorter. How much do my answers matter when the points themselves don't address that 8000 pound elephant?

The fact still remains that SBI! dramatically outperforms at every level except abject failure.

We'll start with some insults and dismissals. I don't understand how that invalidates the findings of The Study. If you do, please let me know in the comments.

Ready to go? OK, let's take it at a faster pace now...

\*\*\*

- "kinda like the pot calling out the kettle as my Grandma used to say hehe"

- "Ken sounds like a man who feel threatened by the WA culture of success"

- "A false review slating the competition on very little inside information, just a grudge."

- "Not surprising, this is quite an ad...Very negative...Cheers!"

- "Interesting it doesn't change my opinion at all"

[Hmmm, the elephant is still here. Let's try some more, those were feeble...]

- "A negative review railing against negative reviews? Seems a bit hypocritical. How about an honest comparison and show real differences and then let folks decide for them selves."

[WA really should have given the link to The Study. After all THE STUDY IS EXACTLY WHAT THIS WA USER WANTS... "an honest comparison that shows real differences and then lets folks decide for themselves."]

- "1 site at \$29 monthly or \$299 annually, or 50 sites, 25 on your own domain and 25 on site.rubix at \$49 monthly?

[This shows a common lack of thinking about what it takes to build a genuine BUSINESS instead of a bunch of (non)-money-making "sites."]

- "Solo [Build It!] has totally blown their credibility."

[Explain in words why that makes sense.]

- "Maybe you should post a link to that post and a ton of WA members could make comments to the contrary"

[This is funny, although wasn't meant to be. There are 10 good reasons to post the link to The Study. Posting it "so we can spam the comments" isn't one of them.]

- "they've done WA a favor, reminded us of the good stuff to blog about"

[The only folks we've done is a favor is solopreneurs. It would be nice to think of them instead of how to blog around this 9000 pound elephant (gaining weight)]

- "Training second to none, WA offers so much more, weekly value webinar etc., etc."

[Results are second to one - a distant second. How much can anything else matter?]

- "Bad-mouthing competitors is a little unethical but the bottom line is: If you follow Kyle you will eventually see results."

[Fake reviews constitute "bad-mouthing." A science-level study merely shows how fake they are. "Eventually" does not show up in The Study.]

- "The successful rating is way below the 800.000 Due to the false claims our own members are making, you get reviews like this."

[An honest comment! 800,000 members vs the true number of active sites = 17,000.

The answer to that (next) is, well, amazing...]

- "I do see what you are saying... So the data they are using is not accurate, and I am not totally clear on what the data set from their platform includes...but if one set or the other is off, it affects results."

[Nothing's off. Read Part 2. We show precisely how we define "active sites" to eliminate all but 17,000 of those 800,000 "members"]

- "We do not have access to the numbers"

[Sure you do. The numbers are the data. To get your own, repeat the study, following the methodology.]

- "Compare the two and decide for yourself (I am not sure if they have a free option like WA does)."

[We have a better version of a trial, a non-crippled 3-month version. We refund if you don't like it. But the best data of all is the success rate.]

- "My guess is that they are feeling some heat from WA and are becoming more aggressive."

[We and others among the 175 companies are upset about fake reviews, yes.

Speaking for SiteSell itself, we don't like solopreneurs' success rates being cut by over 90%, just to make a buck. Anything that hurts them makes us hot under the collar - a form of "heat," yes.]

- "Even more so, with the tactics Ken is using now to trash or discredit WA. He seemed classy at the time."

[We would not be here right now if WA was marketing ethically.]

"I would not use the negative approach either"

[We would not be here right now if WA was marketing ethically.]

- "Statistics can be very helpful if you know and understand what numbers you are looking at. It sounds like this guy has found a way to show some numbers that make the point that he wants to make."

[This is data from a well-constructed study, not stats. The numbers make the points, not "this guy." More low-quality study "analysis."]

- "What I can question is the protocol used to determine the stats he has come up with ... If you start with incomplete data, any tests and results will be skewed and flawed in all likelihood. That is where the argument that they are far superior falls apart for me."

[Explain how this hypothetical applies to The Study. How is the data incomplete and how does that make results "fall apart." Hmmm, I just noticed...

Elephant now weighs 10,000 pounds and is settling in. No solid argument has come close to finding a weakness in the study.]

- "I have found that being here at Wealthy Affiliate very beneficial. Having never used a computer in the past I have been able to learn a lot from the lessons and help from the community and the best part is that I learn something new each day."

[If that is your goal, WA is the right spot for you. If you want to build a profitable online business, well, not so much.]

- "I happy to be here and have make over 5 figure worth affiliate commission over my learning and action taken"

[DOMAIN, please. No one should ever believe unverifiable claims. WHY does it seem that nobody at WA ever mentions their domain?]

"Because we do not have accurate information on the number of sites that are hosted outside of the platforms, nor the number of websites that are NOT being used for monetization, the data that is being measured is questionable..."

[Do you have any ideas how many of those types of sites would need to exist to even dent 33X or 10X results? Since both WA and SBI! have some sites like this, excluding them is unlikely to impact results by a decimal point. Desperate argument - studying hosted sites and assuming business intent for "business-building" product is FAIR AND EQUAL for both WA and SBI!.

[Ah, his next sentence shows where he's going with this...]

- "Since the method used is in question, the results are also open to question"

[Only one problem. Saying it's in question does not make it so. He ends weakly...]

- "it really is the pot calling the kettle black. That is what I see reading between the lines of the reviews this guy has posted."

[He started with an actual comment that we had already considered in The Study, then "reverted to the mean" of "kettle-and-pot"-type comment.]

- "SBI is slowly losing members"

[Yes, we are, but we are narrowing the gap and will turn positive. WA LOSES SEVERAL TIMES MORE PAID SITES PER DAY. So attrition is not our problem. WA's placement of fake reviews at a key step of our funnel, with misleading fake reviews, definitely hurts both our sales and the chance of success by solopreneurs by 90%.]

- "I guess WA is probably pretty intimidating to a small fry like Site Build It."

[<shudder> We have 7,000 fewer sites but our 10,000 sites have way more total traffic than WA's 17,000. "Small fry" - really know how to hurt a guy. ;-)]

- "the findings are suspect due to the procedure used, starting with the data set..."

[I love answers that START like this. I even get aroused... but then... they stop. It's just an opening statement without the meat to make the case. It's "thinkus interruptus" ;-) ]

- "I just earned my degree in Network Admin and IT Security perhaps you may see where I am going after the last huge older Windows OS Hack. When a company has an insecure foundation it is hard to believe anything solid will ever stand?"

[Where did that even come from? Words were typed. Relevance unclear.]

"I do not think that adding the actual link would be allowed (although maybe so?)..."

[Yes, I've read many times about how controlled the WA environment is. One SBI! thread has already been pulled down since it was kind of favorable to SBI!. Now there's a bunch that have all gone in the "right direction."

Not much room for dissenting opinion. We ban insistent trolls who won't stop disrupting threads, but are otherwise much more open to criticism. I can't remember the last time we've deleted a post.]

"there is a ton of success stories here at WA, literally every month. "

[DOMAINS, please. There are only 53 sites out of 17,000 in the "Outstanding-Excellent, compared to 697 for SBI, and that's out of 10,000 (7,000 fewer sites). The results are even STRONGER if measuring with SimilarWeb and SEMrush. I don't believe that there are "tons" - please send "tons" of success stories WITH DOMAINS.]

"Problem is that the old 'garbage in, garbage out' adage comes into play."

[Make the case - go past an opening statement. Generalities don't cut it.]

"Correct me if I am wrong, but there are so many top WA websites that are not using the name servers ns1.mywahosting.com and ns1.mywahosting.com. If this is true, then Ken's result is so inaccurate!"

[See my reply above. Would need to be massive number AND opposite results to matter. Please send the thousands of DOMAINS who pay for WA, don't host with them, and that are all miraculously in Top 1,000,000.]

[This one says it well, a balancing bolt from the blue]...

"how large is the universe of successful WA members hosting elsewhere. And whether the number is statistically significant or not. If the number is not significant, then you cannot say the results are inaccurate as determined by the methodology used."

[He adds...]

"Based on the methodology used, I would conclude the study is conclusive for WA members who host their websites on WA. But certainly not for ALL WA members."

[All seem happy that SBI! delivers 33x greater likelihood of success for the vast majority of clients who use the sitebuilder and host on WA host. Odd way to accept results, but we're happy to finally have agreement.

There is no reason to believe that SBI! or WA clients who host off-server are large in number, nor that they would do any better or worse relative to the main group.

This is a small unknown and highly unlikely to change the big picture since it would take a massive number of "off-server" sites, with a total reversal in performance, to reverse a 33x differential.

But if folks are happy now that some folks host "outside," I'm good with that, too. That's all you can conclude about this, though.]

---

... And that's it, folks. Aren't you glad we didn't do the other 5 WA threads? ;-)

Thank you to the SiteSell content and research team for helping put this together - truly a team effort!