




2021 AESTHETICS PRACTICE ONLINE PRESENCE BENCHMARK REPORT

KEY INSIGHTS FOR
PRACTICE GROWTH

1389 Center Drive #230
Park City, UT 84098

435.575.7470
myadvice.com



Contents

3 INTRODUCTION
Why Benchmark? Why Now??

4 METHODOLOGY
Defining the Metrics

6 KEY INSIGHTS
Review Scores

9
Review Volume

11
Correlation - Review Scores and Volume

12
Review Recency

13
Local Directory Listings

14
Geographic Insights

15
How Do U.S. States Perform?

INTRODUCTION

Why Benchmark? Why Now??

It should come as no surprise that consumer research behaviors in recent years have shifted increasingly online. Healthcare is no exception, with 76% of healthcare consumers searching for providers online. Two elements that are highly influential in that online research ecosystem are reviews and local search.

Patient reviews are essential to an impactful online presence. The numbers certainly back that up:

- 72% of consumers say positive reviews increase their trust in a local business.
- 82% of consumers regularly read online reviews before working with a local business.
- 88% of people claim to trust those reviews as much as personal recommendations from friends and family members.

Local search is also critical to help patients make the connection between powerful reviews and booking an appointment. It's essential that basic details of the practice ("NAP" - name, address, and phone number) are consistent across the 80+ existing online directories. These directories are accessed by more than 150 million people per month, and inconsistencies in these listings—even slight variations—can cost practices valuable search engine rankings.

Practices who wish to acquire new patients and better retain their current ones in hopes of increasing production and revenue simply must have strong reviews and accurate contact information to compete online and attract that business.

METHODOLOGY

The Online Presence Benchmark Report is derived from analysis of 8,132 U.S. aesthetics practices during August 2021. Results were gathered and tabulated by the MyAdvice team, with additional case-by-case review of standout outlier data points to determine further inclusion in the results.

Defining the Metrics

The metrics evaluated in this benchmark report include the following:

- **Review Score** - On a scale of 1-5, the average number of “stars” a practice has from its collection of patient reviews.
- **Review Volume** - The number of patient reviews a practice has on its Google My Business profile.
- **Review Recency** - The amount of time between the study’s evaluation of a practice’s reviews and their most recent review.
- **Local Accuracy Score** - The percentage of time that accurate information is displayed when searching for the practice across online directories.

The following report explores how these metrics range across higher and lower-performing practices, correlations between metrics, and geographic highlights within the United States. Practices can use the data to understand how they compare relative to their competition and identify potential areas of focus for improvement.

So what insights did the data reveal? And why do they matter to a practice??




KEY INSIGHTS

REVIEW SCORES

A 4-star review isn't as good as you might think.

DATA POINT: The 25th percentile of average review score is 4.3.


WHAT IT MEANS: Is a 4-star review good? In the highly competitive aesthetics industry, it actually works against you. A 4.0 average across the board would put a practice below the 25th percentile (4.3) of its peers. In other words, 75% of practices (who are competing for both your potential and current patients) have an average review score above 4.3. A 4-star review simply isn't good enough. The goal should be to capture as many 5-star reviews as possible.



A 5-star average is not uncommon.

DATA POINT: 33% of practices have a 5.0 average.


WHAT IT MEANS: Roughly 1 in 3 aesthetics practices (33%) has a solid 5.0 average in its patient reviews. If you're among that 33%, well done. Everyone else has work to do to match those high scores. While any lingering reviews of 4 or below can impede the chase toward 5, one strategy to combat this is to at least make sure that you have a steady wave of recent and high-scoring reviews coming in from patients. Not only will this push any sub-par reviews further down for prospective patients who are reviewing them, but you'll also continue to push your overall score north toward 5.



Half of practices average between 4 and 5 stars.

DATA POINT: 51% of practices have an average score somewhere between 4 and 5 stars.

WHAT IT MEANS: With roughly a third of practices at the 5.0 mark, and the bottom percentiles below a 4.0, that leaves everyone else lingering somewhere between 4 and 5 stars on average. You can't be satisfied with a score in the low 4's. If you're looking at reviews as a way to stand out from the crowd and not merely keep pace, it's critical that you think about strategies and approaches to push that average score as high as possible.




REVIEW VOLUME

Review volume among aesthetics practices is low.

DATA POINT: The midpoint for average review volume is only 15.


WHAT IT MEANS: You have a real opportunity to move ahead of the pack by increasing your focus on asking more patients to leave reviews. Think about your average weekly patient volume. If you could get only 10% of those patients to leave a review for your practice, how many would that be on a weekly basis? How long would it take you to rise above the midpoint of average review volume and get into triple digits?



Review volume among some aesthetics practices is really low.

DATA POINT: 25% of practices have fewer than 6 reviews.

WHAT IT MEANS: While the midpoint for average review volume is 15 per practice, the bottom 25% have fewer than 6 on average. Why is the review volume so low? This is most likely a result of lack of prioritization and process. For practices who fall into this lowest quartile, now is the time to test a new approach. If staffing bandwidth is an issue, look into tools that can automate the process. You have nothing to lose from a review volume standpoint...and everything to gain.



CORRELATION - REVIEW SCORE AND VOLUME

High review volume = high average scores.

DATA POINT: No practice with more than 250 reviews has an average rating below 4.0.

WHAT IT MEANS: There is a positive correlation between review volume and average score. The more reviews a practice gathers, the higher their average score becomes. Practices with more than 250 reviews represent only the top 4%, but that focus on review volume is working in their favor. The lesson for everyone else? Be more intentional about asking patients for reviews. If you're not doing it today, you're most likely leaving 5-star reviews on the table. The good news is that you're likely caring for patients very well today and just need to improve the process and/or have the confidence to ask for those reviews.


>250 = **>4.0**
Reviews Rating

REVIEW RECENCY

9 in 10 aesthetics practices have not seen a new review in over a month.

DATA POINT: 91% of practices have 0 new reviews in the last 30 days.

WHAT IT MEANS: If you fall into this group, ask yourself why? Certainly, you would welcome any new review that comes your way, so why would there be such a wide gap since a patient has last raved about your practice in an online review? As is the case with low review volume in general, the recency gap can likely be tied to a lack of prioritization and process around asking patients to leave reviews. Studies show that 70% of consumers will leave a review if asked, especially if it is easy and convenient for them to do so. Make it a simple process for both patients and staff, and you'll maintain a fresh set of reviews for prospective patients to see as they research your practice.




LOCAL DIRECTORY LISTINGS

Only 1 in 10 practices have accurate local directory listings.

DATA POINT: 10% of practices have a Local Accuracy score above 75.

WHAT IT MEANS: For the majority of practices, search engine results are returning contact information that is inaccurate in some way. It's problematic for two reasons. First, inconsistent information confuses search engines and negatively impacts rankings when patients are searching for providers. Second, and perhaps more important, the actual patient experience is impacted. For example, if a patient sees your practice in their search, tries to call the practice, and gets an invalid phone number, that's a terrible first impression and makes them much more likely to move on to another provider.




GEOGRAPHIC INSIGHTS

Review volume is one-third lower within more competitive areas.

DATA POINT: The average review volume is 18% lower in the Top 20 U.S. metro areas.

WHAT IT MEANS: This is surprising. There should be an even greater emphasis on gathering more reviews from practices in highly competitive metro areas. It's one of the most powerful marketing tools a practice can leverage to stand out and attract new patients. But perhaps this is a testament to strong results from less densely populated areas of the country, as they have continued to embrace the power of patient reviews and implement strategies to more effectively generate them for their practices.



HOW DO THE U.S. STATES PERFORM?

Average Review Score


HIGHEST

1. North Dakota - 4.72
2. South Dakota - 4.72
3. Arkansas - 4.67
4. Utah - 4.62
5. Idaho - 4.61

LOWEST

1. Wyoming - 4.16
2. Maine - 4.18
3. Pennsylvania - 4.23
4. Delaware - 4.29
5. New Mexico 4.31

The Dakotas are the leaders in average review score, with patients in both states the most likely to leave glowing reviews.



Average Review Volume per Practice


HIGHEST

1. Arizona - 168
2. Nevada - 139
3. Utah - 119
4. Kansas - 79
5. Idaho - 73

LOWEST

1. North Dakota - 14
2. Delaware - 17
3. Maine - 18.1
4. Montana - 18.2
5. Nebraska - 19

Arizona's patients like to rave about their experiences, while patients in North Dakota leave the lowest number of reviews on a per practice basis.



Accuracy of Local Directory Listings


HIGHEST

1. Wyoming - 69.4
2. Idaho - 62.0
3. North Carolina - 58.3
4. Rhode Island - 57.9
5. Wisconsin - 57.6

LOWEST

1. Kentucky - 37.3
2. New Hampshire - 37.5
3. Utah - 38.5
4. Kansas - 41.4
5. Oklahoma - 41.8

Accuracy of local directory listings is highest in The Cowboy State. States with the greatest opportunities for listing clean-up are Kentucky, New Hampshire, and Utah.



More
PATIENTS.
Fewer
HEADACHES.



myadvice



www.myadvice.com
435.200.1018