

Pitch Deck Evaluation Report

FOR: Airbnb

EVALUATION BY: Ching Hsu

DATE: July 01, 2026

Confidential and Proprietary

This report is prepared exclusively for RefeRec Limited and should not be distributed without the express written permission of FundFluent Limited.

0. Client & Evaluation Information

Detail	Information
Startup Name	Airbnb
Report Prepared For	Airbnb
Prepared By (FundFluent)	Ching Hsu
Date	July 01, 2026
Programme Evaluated	General Pitch Deck Review
Report ID	84c8db29

Executive Summary / Context

This pitch deck evaluation report was prepared to help you understand how your current deck performs against what the programme assessors typically expect, especially for the funding programme you're applying to.

Our goal is simple:

- 1) **Maximize your chances of being shortlisted for the presentation stage**, and
- 2) **Save you time** by giving you clear, focused guidance that aligns with what the programme actually looks for.

No second-guessing, no navigating unclear requirements. Just practical advice that gives you the highest chance of success.

About This Report

This report has been reviewed and prepared by **FundFluent's professional services team**. The insights come from our experience supporting **1,600+ founders and SMEs over the past five years, with a 78% shortlist rate** across major funding programmes. Everything you see here reflects real patterns from real cases.

Our process combines an **AI-assisted structural review** with a **human evaluation** from our team. This ensures you benefit from both comprehensive analysis and the nuanced judgement built from years of hands-on work.

In the pages that follow, you'll find a clear, section-by-section breakdown of what's working well, what can be improved, and the specific adjustments we recommend. All designed to help you move forward with confidence and stay within a realistic work budget.

How to Read This Report

This report is designed to give you a clear, structured understanding of where your pitch deck stands today and what you can do to improve it with the highest return on effort.

Each section serves a specific purpose, and together they form a practical roadmap to help you move confidently toward the shortlist stage of the programme.

Here's how to use this report effectively:

Start with the Executive Summary

This gives you a quick, high-level view of how your deck performs overall: What's working, what's missing, and how aligned it is with the expectations of the funding programme.

Review the Summary of Findings

This section highlights the most important gaps and risk areas based on the programme's actual evaluation criteria.

Refer to the Quick Wins & the 8-Hour Adjustment Plan

These are practical, time-boxed recommendations that can significantly strengthen your deck with limited effort.

Dive into the Slide-by-Slide Review (when you need detailed guidance)

This appendix-style section contains specific comments for each slide.

Look at the Programme-Specific Notes

Every funding programme has its own priorities, required elements, and common red flags.

Pitch Deck Evaluation Report

General Pitch Deck Review

Executive Summary

Overall Impression

Not ready. I would not fund this today because the submission is effectively non-evaluable. There is no readable content for team, technology, R&D, or business diligence. The biggest problem is not that the deck is weak. It's that the core evidence is inaccessible, which kills trust and stops review before the actual company can even be assessed.

On team readiness, I cannot verify founders, roles, technical leadership, or commitment. That is a direct execution risk. The opportunity may be real, but there is currently no reviewable proof of market, product, traction, or plan.

What Would Make Me Pass

- No readable founder or team information, making credibility and execution impossible to assess
- No accessible technical or R&D substance, suggesting either missing depth or poor diligence readiness
- Submission format blocks basic review, creating an immediate trust and process failure

What Works (If Anything)

- **Preparation:** There appears to be a full 20-slide deck, which indicates some effort and structure
- **Visual baseline:** The deck seems polished enough to be presentable after cleanup
- **Potential underlying content:** The material may exist inside image-based slides, but it is not accessible in a fundable format

Critical Risk Flags

Risk	Category	Severity	Impact on Evaluation	What's Actually Needed
------	----------	----------	----------------------	------------------------

Deck is unreadable / image-only	Process	High	Automatic pass because diligence cannot begin	Submit a text-readable PDF or slide-by-slide extracted text
No visible founders or roles	Team	High	Cannot assess whether this is an investable team	Add a readable team slide with names, roles, backgrounds, and full-time status
No technical evidence	Technology	High	Cannot validate feasibility, defensibility, or build capability	Provide architecture, product status, technical approach, and proof points
No R&D plan	R&D	High	No way to judge execution discipline or use of capital	Add a 12-month roadmap, milestones, KPIs, acceptance criteria, and budget
No market/GTM/traction data	Business	High	Cannot determine whether there is a real commercial opportunity	Add ICP, market sizing, GTM, pricing, traction, and competition details
Template / presentation credibility issues	Presentation	Medium	Lowers confidence and signals lack of investor readiness	Remove template branding and convert to a company-specific deck

Category Scores

Based on evaluation focus: General Pitch Deck Review

Category	Weight	Score	Weighted Score	What's Dragging This Down
Team	25%	1/10	0.25	No readable founder, role, or capability information
Technology	25%	0/10	0.00	No accessible technical content at all
R&D Plan	25%	0/10	0.00	No visible roadmap, milestones, or measurable execution plan
Business	25%	1/10	0.25	No readable market, traction, GTM, or business model evidence
Overall	100%	0.5/10	0.50	

The Gap to Fundable

This does not need polish first. It needs basic diligence usability. Before this becomes a yes, the company must resubmit a readable deck and prove four things clearly:

1. Who the founders are
2. What exactly is being built
3. How the next 12 months of execution will work
4. Why the market opportunity is commercially real

If the underlying content is strong, this may move from “not ready” to “worth a meeting.” Right now, there is no evidence base to support funding. Fundable starts only after the submission is reviewable and the core claims are verifiable.

Prioritized Improvement Plan (8-Hour Budget)

High Impact (Do These First)

- Re-export the deck into a text-readable PDF or paste all slide text with chart descriptions into a clean document. **Est: 3 hours**
- Rebuild the core investor narrative into 8–10 readable slides covering team, problem, solution, traction, GTM, competition, roadmap, and raise. **Est: 3 hours**

Medium Impact (Strongly Recommended)

- Add a real team slide with founder bios, roles, domain expertise, technical ownership, and full-time commitment. **Est: 1 hour**
- Add a one-page R&D roadmap with 12-month milestones, KPIs, acceptance criteria, and use of funds. **Est: 1 hour**

Low Impact (Refinements)

- Remove Slidebean/template branding and replace filler divider slides with company-specific content. **Est: 0.5 hours**
- Enlarge product screenshots and add callouts so the product can actually be understood in review. **Est: 0.5 hours**

Success Probability Assessment

- **Current state:** 2% chance of getting shortlisted or funded
- **After high-impact fixes:** 20% chance of getting shortlisted or funded
- **After all recommended fixes:** 35% chance of getting shortlisted or funded

These percentages are realistic because the current version fails at the intake stage, not just at persuasion. Fixing readability and core evidence can get this into consideration. Funding still depends on whether the underlying team, product, and market case are actually strong once visible.

Detailed Evaluation Reports

Team Capability Assessment

First Impression

I can't evaluate the team from this submission because there is no readable team content at all—just placeholders saying each slide contains images. That alone is enough to stop reading. If the team slide exists but isn't extractable, the pitch fails basic diligence because I cannot verify who is building this, whether they're qualified, or whether the company is even investable.

What Works (If Anything)

- There appears to be a full 20-slide deck, which suggests some preparation
- The team may exist somewhere in the image slides, but it is not accessible here

- No explicit positives can be credited without readable founder, team, or commitment details

Fatal Gaps & Red Flags

Gap	Description	Why This Matters	What's Actually Needed
No visible team information	No founder names, roles, bios, or backgrounds are available in the submitted content	Team is 25% of the evaluation. If I can't identify the founders, I can't assess credibility or investability	A readable team slide with names, roles, LinkedIn-level backgrounds, and prior execution history
No evidence of domain expertise	No information on industry experience, prior work in the problem space, or technical specialization	First-time or domain-light teams are a common rejection unless they show exceptional evidence	Specific domain credentials, prior operating experience, or shipped products in the same market
No technical leadership shown	No CTO, technical co-founder, engineers, or technical credentials are visible	If this is a tech company and technical leadership is unclear, that's a deal-breaker	Clear technical ownership, product/build history, and relevant engineering credentials
No role coverage	No indication of who handles product, sales, operations, fundraising, or execution	Missing functions usually mean the business is still conceptual, not execution-ready	A defined founding team with complementary capabilities
No commitment signal	No indication whether founders are full-time, part-time, or still employed elsewhere	Part-time founders are usually a pass	Explicit statement of full-time commitment and current operating status
No track record of execution	No metrics, prior startups, exits, launches, pilots, or customer wins tied to the people involved	Ideas are common. Execution is what matters	Evidence the team has shipped, sold, raised, built, or operated successfully before
Advisors, if any, not visible	No advisory structure can be assessed	Weak founding teams often try to compensate with advisors. Here even that is absent	Named advisors only if truly relevant and active, not decorative
Submission quality issue	Deck content is effectively unreadable in this format	Poor presentation blocks diligence and creates immediate trust issues	Export text-accessible slides or provide extracted content per slide

Unverified Claims That Could Sink This

Claim Made	Verification Status	Risk
That there is a credible team behind the company	Unverified	Critical — no founder identities or backgrounds visible
That the company has technical capability to build the product	Unverified	Critical — no technical team information provided
That the founders can execute in this market	Unverified	High — no operating or industry history shown
That the business is investment-ready	Unverified	High — lack of accessible team information suggests the opposite

Reality Check Score

- **Current state:** 1/10
- **Fundable after fixes:** 4/10
- **Would I take a meeting?** No

If you want a real team assessment, send the actual text from the team/founder slides or OCR the deck images. As submitted, this is a pass.

Technology Innovation Assessment

I can't evaluate the deck's technology content from this input because all 20 slides are represented only as "this slide contains images," with no readable text or extracted visuals.

Technical Reality Check

At the moment, there is no technical evidence to assess. From a diligence standpoint, this is an automatic pass because I cannot verify architecture, feasibility, innovation, or security claims from image placeholders alone.

Technical Depth Analysis

Element	Present?	Quality	What's Actually Here
System Architecture	No	Poor	No architecture diagram or description provided in the text
AI/ML Methodology	No	Poor	No model approach, training data, evaluation metrics, or deployment details visible
Data Flow	No	Poor	No explanation of inputs, outputs, integrations, or processing pipeline
Security Design	No	Poor	No mention of privacy, security controls, compliance, or access management

Innovation Assessment

Impossible to assess. There is currently no visible technical substance, so the default conclusion is that this may be hand-wavy until proven otherwise.

Missing Technical Elements That Matter

Element	Why It's Missing Is a Problem	What's Needed
System architecture diagram	Without it, cannot judge whether the product is technically coherent or buildable	End-to-end architecture showing components, services, databases, and external dependencies
Data flow description	Cannot assess operational logic, bottlenecks, or privacy risk	Clear flow of data from source to processing to output
AI/ML methodology	Prevents validation of any intelligence claims; strong risk of buzzword use	Model type, training process, datasets, evaluation metrics, human-in-the-loop design

API/integration approach	Cannot tell whether the product works within real customer environments	Integration map, supported systems, authentication method, implementation effort
Security/privacy design	Major diligence red flag, especially if customer data is involved	Encryption, access control, storage policy, compliance posture, audit logging
Scalability/performance plan	No basis to believe the system can handle growth	Throughput targets, latency expectations, scaling strategy, cost assumptions
Technical proof points	No evidence the team has built anything meaningful	Prototype screenshots, deployment status, pilot metrics, uptime/performance evidence
Anti-fraud/anti-gaming mechanisms	Important if the product includes user-generated actions, rewards, scoring, or automation	Abuse prevention logic, anomaly detection, moderation controls

Score

- **Current state:** 0/10
- **After adding what's missing:** 4/10

If you want, paste the slide text or OCR output, or upload the actual images with readable content, and I'll give you a proper rejection-oriented technical diligence review in the exact format above.

R&D Content Assessment

I can't evaluate the deck content from this input because all 20 slides are represented only as "this slide contains images," with no readable text or extracted content.

R&D Plan Reality Check

There is no visible R&D plan to assess here. From the provided input, this should be treated as missing, not merely weak, because there are no milestones, deliverables, KPIs, or acceptance criteria available for review.

Why This Gets Rejected

For any serious funding review, especially one weighting R&D heavily, an image-only submission without extractable content is effectively non-evaluable. That means the company has failed to present the minimum evidence needed to assess technical feasibility, execution discipline, or use of funds.

R&D Plan Status Check

Required Element	Present?	Quality	What's Actually Here vs. What's Needed
12-Month R&D Timeline	No	Poor	No readable timeline provided. Need a month-by-month or milestone-based 12-month plan
3 Milestone Structure	No	Poor	No milestones visible. Need at least 3 major milestones tied to funding/use of proceeds
Technical Deliverables	No	Poor	No module/component deliverables described. Need specific outputs per milestone

Measurable KPIs	No	Poor	No technical targets shown. Need quantifiable metrics like accuracy, latency, throughput, reliability, cost, etc.
Acceptance Criteria	No	Poor	No completion criteria visible. Need objective tests for each deliverable
Budget Breakdown	No	Poor	No budget allocation shown. Need task-level or milestone-level spend and resource mapping

Rejection Risk Level

HIGH — This is an automatic pass for many evaluators because there is no accessible evidence of an R&D plan at all. Even if the underlying slides contain strong material, it is not reviewable in the current form.

What's Required to Fix This

Provide one of the following:

1. The slide text pasted as text
2. OCR or extracted content from each slide
3. The key R&D slides summarized in plain text

Minimum R&D Content Required

- **A 12-month roadmap**
- **3 milestones** with dates
- For each milestone:
 - deliverables by module/component
 - measurable technical KPIs
 - acceptance criteria
 - owners/resources
 - budget allocation
- Clear separation of:
 - research tasks
 - engineering tasks
 - validation/testing tasks

Fundable Structure Example

- **Milestone 1 (Months 1–4): Core prototype**
 - Deliverable: inference engine v1
 - KPI: latency < 200ms, accuracy > 85%
 - Acceptance: tested on dataset X with documented benchmark

- **Milestone 2 (Months 5–8): Integration**

- Deliverable: production API + pipeline
- KPI: uptime 99%, processing cost < \$Y/unit
- Acceptance: pilot deployment with 2 design partners

- **Milestone 3 (Months 9–12): Validation & optimization**

- Deliverable: validated product release
- KPI: accuracy > 92%, CAC/payback assumptions validated in pilot
- Acceptance: signed pilot reports / technical validation package

Score

- **Current state:** 0/10
- **If R&D plan is fixed:** 5/10 minimum possible for reassessment, depending on actual content

If you want, paste the extracted text from the deck and I'll give you a proper rejection-focused review in this exact format.

Business Development Assessment

I can't evaluate the deck content from this input because all 20 slides are represented only as "[This slide contains images]" and no slide text, tables, metrics, or speaker notes are available.

Market & Business Reality Check

At the moment, this is not assessable. From a reviewer's perspective, missing readable content is effectively a rejection condition because I cannot verify the market, traction, GTM, or competitive claims. If the only submitted version is image-only without extracted text, it fails basic diligence usability.

Market Analysis Review

Element	Present?	Credible?	What's Wrong With It
TAM/SAM/SOM	Unknown	No	No readable market-sizing data or sources provided
Market Segmentation	Unknown	No	Cannot see ICP, segments, or prioritization
Growth Trends	Unknown	No	No visible evidence, citations, or trend data

GTM Strategy: Real or Generic?

Unknown. There is no readable information on ICP, channel strategy, pricing, sales motion, or conversion assumptions. In practice, if a deck does not make GTM legible, reviewers assume it is either underdeveloped or generic.

Traction Verification

Claimed Traction	Verifiable?	Actual Meaning
Unknown	No	No metrics, customer names, revenue, pilots, retention, or evidence visible

Competitive Analysis

Unknown. There is no readable competitor landscape, positioning matrix, substitute analysis, or defensibility claims. If this exists only as graphics without extractable text, it is not review-ready.

Red Flags

- No readable deck content to review
- Market size cannot be verified
- No visible traction evidence
- No visible GTM specifics
- No visible competitive analysis
- Submission format itself blocks diligence
- For an evaluator reviewing many decks, this would likely be passed over immediately

Score

- **Current state:** 1/10
- **If fixed:** 5/10

If you want a real evaluation, send any of these:

1. The slide text pasted slide by slide
2. OCR or extracted text from the deck
3. Screenshots with readable text
4. A PDF with selectable text

If you resend the actual content, I'll give you a strict business/market diligence review in the exact format above.

Slide-by-Slide Review

I can't do a real slide-by-slide review from this input because there's no actual slide content—just placeholders saying each slide contains images.

A VC-style review depends on what's actually on each slide: title, claims, metrics, charts, team bios, product screenshots, market sizing, roadmap, business model, and so on. Without that, anything specific would be made up.

Brutal Truth

This deck is unevaluable in its current form. If this is what a reviewer receives, it's an instant pass because there's nothing to assess.

Structural Red Flags

- No extractable slide content
- No visible titles
- No readable narrative
- No evidence on team, technology, market, or business
- Impossible to judge problem-solution fit, feasibility, or commercial viability

Quick Wins

1. Export the deck as a text-readable PDF or paste slide titles and body text per slide
2. For image-heavy slides, add a 1–3 line description of what the image or chart shows
3. Include any numbers exactly as shown: revenue, growth, pilots, TAM/SAM/SOM, pricing, roadmap, burn, team backgrounds

What I Need to Give You the Ruthless Review You Want

Please resend in one of these formats.

Best Option

For each slide, provide:

- **Slide number**
- **Title**
- **Exact text on the slide**
- **Short description of visuals/charts**
- **Any speaker notes if relevant**

Example

- **Slide 4 — Problem**
 - “Healthcare providers lose X hours/week on manual intake...”
 - Visual: bar chart comparing admin time by workflow
 - Metric: “34 interviews across 12 clinics”

Acceptable Option

Upload OCR text from the deck or screenshots with readable text.

Once You Send the Actual Content, the Output Should Be:

Slide-by-Slide Evaluation

Slide #	Title	First Reaction	What's Wrong	Fix It
---------	-------	----------------	--------------	--------

Plus:

- Structural red flags
- Duplicate or redundant slides
- Quick wins under 30 minutes
- Slides needing major rework
- Brutal truth on whether this would get a meeting

If you want, paste Slides 1–5 first and I’ll start the review immediately.

Visual Design Assessment

First Visual Impression

This does **not** look like a serious founder-made investor deck in its current form. It looks like a **Slidebean template demo** with Airbnb content dropped in: clean enough to be usable, but still obviously templated, repetitive, and padded with decorative stock photography instead of sharp visual storytelling.

The biggest issue is that the deck feels more like a **marketing brochure or theme preview** than a high-conviction fundraising presentation.

Slide-by-Slide Visual Review

Slide #	Title	Visual Strengths	Visual Issues	Suggested Improvement
---------	-------	------------------	---------------	-----------------------

1	Cover / Template Intro	Clean whitespace, centered focal object, modern UI feel	Immediate credibility killer: Slidebean branding and “GET EDITABLE TEMPLATE” CTA make this unusable as part of a real pitch. It screams template, not company	Delete entirely. Replace with a true cover slide: company logo, one-line value prop, founder names, date
2	Airbnb Pitch Deck	Good lifestyle image and strong Airbnb color match	Layout is awkward: giant image on top, then logo/title floating below with too much dead space. Feels like a brochure cover, not an investor deck opener	Tighten into a stronger hero slide with headline over image or a cleaner split layout. Reduce the empty white band
3	Problem	Strong contrast, readable white text on dark image, clear heading	Background image is decorative and irrelevant. “HOTEL” letters pull more attention than the actual problem points. Text block feels pasted over a stock photo	Use a plain dark background or subtle texture. Convert the three points into cleaner, more structured bullets or stat-led problem statements
4	Solution	Icons are bold and visually consistent. Clear three-column structure	Background photo is too busy and dim. The long subtitle line is weak visually. Icons are oversized relative to tiny captions	Use a cleaner flat background. Make the three benefits equal cards with clearer labels and supporting one-liners
5	Market Validation	Nice use of whitespace; metrics are easy to spot	Weak visual balance. Huge empty top-right area. Bottom image strip feels random and cut off. This slide looks unfinished	Turn this into a two-column comparison-card layout, remove the partial bottom photo, and add clearer visual grouping
6	Market Size	Minimal and readable; three-number layout is simple	Too sparse and visually underpowered for an important slide. No chart, no hierarchy beyond big pink numbers, no explanation of TAM/SAM/SOM flow	Use a funnel, concentric circles, or segmented bar chart to show market layers visually
7	Product	Clean section divider slide; large centered title is readable	Generic stock-photo transition slide adds no information. Feels like filler	Remove section divider slides or make them more distinctive and compact

8	Search by city	Real product UI is the right visual asset	Screenshot is too small relative to the slide and likely unreadable in a room. Too much whitespace above. Title is disconnected from content	Crop and zoom into the relevant UI area. Add callouts or annotations to show what matters
9	Review listings	Product screenshot helps credibility	Same issue: screenshot is too dense and small. Text in UI is unreadable from presentation distance. No highlight of what viewers should focus on	Use magnified UI panels and arrows/callouts to guide the eye
10	Book it!	Strong aspirational property image; booking flow visual is relevant	The embedded interface is too detailed and shrunk. "Book it!" is casual and slightly cheesy. Visual hierarchy is weak between title and content	Zoom into the booking module and listing details. Rename to "Seamless booking flow" or similar
11	Business Model	Large numbers are prominent; darkened background helps contrast	One of the messier slides. Background is distracting, large figures float without enough structure, and the text hierarchy is inconsistent. It looks like stats scattered across a photo	Put the numbers into three aligned cards or a stepwise model: transaction value → take rate → revenue. Remove the photo background
12	Market Adoption	Three-panel concept is decent and visually segmented	Overlay text sits on bright images and loses clarity. Visual style feels like a magazine spread, not a data-backed GTM slide	Add stronger text boxes/overlays and reduce image dominance. Consider icons plus bullets instead of stock photography
13	Competition	Clean section divider slide; readable	Again, filler. Decorative apartment background adds nothing. Too many of these divider slides make the deck feel padded	Remove or compress section-title slides into smaller headers on content slides
14	Competition Matrix	One of the few actual visualizations; simple 2x2 is familiar	Amateur execution. Axis labels float awkwardly, competitors are generic placeholders, crosshair lines are too heavy, and the whole thing feels under-labeled and imprecise	Use real competitor names/logos, thinner axes, clearer quadrant labels, and stronger positioning rationale

15	Competitive Advantage	Consistent icon style and clean grid	Too much text under each icon. Bottom-center Airbnb logo wastes valuable space. Feels like a template icon page	Replace the center logo with a real differentiator. Reduce copy and increase spacing consistency across all six points
16	Team	Headshots are high quality and consistent. Good use of circular cropping	Body text is too dense and too small. Bottom advisor text is jammed in awkwardly. Feels like a resume wall	Cut bios to 1–2 lines each, elevate logos/credentials, and give the advisor a separate row or callout box
17	Press	Strong dark treatment and decent quote-based layout	Quote blocks are uneven, and attribution boxes are visually heavy and clunky. Background still feels decorative rather than functional	Put press logos in a cleaner grid with one short highlighted quote each. Reduce visual noise
18	User Testimonials	Profile images add humanity; dark background creates mood	Visually crowded and text-heavy. Testimonials compete with each other and become hard to scan. Alignment is sloppy	Use two testimonials max, larger type, shorter quotes, and stronger separation between speakers
19	Financial	Clear ask and key numbers are easy to locate	Minimalism helps, but it's too bare. No chart, no assumptions, no pacing. Visually it feels weak for a closing financial slide	Add a simple 12-month use-of-funds or milestone timeline. Keep the three numbers but support them visually
20	Slidebean Promo / Outro	Clean retail-style layout	Another credibility killer. This is pure template advertising and does not belong in a live fundraising deck	Delete entirely. Replace with a contact/thank-you slide or end on the raise

Professional Polish Check

Element	Status	What's Wrong
Consistent branding		Airbnb color and logo are mostly consistent, but Slidebean branding on Slides 1 and 20 destroys the illusion of a custom deck
Professional typography		Typeface choice is modern and mostly clean, but several slides have too much small text, weak hierarchy, and inconsistent density

High-quality images/graphics		Photos are decent quality, but many feel like stock/decorative filler. Screenshots are real but too small to function in presentation mode
Clean layout		Some slides are clean, but several have awkward empty space, poor balance, and repetitive title-over-photo structures
Color harmony		Coral/pink, white, charcoal, and muted photography work well together overall. Color is one of the stronger aspects here
Visual data presentation		This is the weakest area. Important business slides rely on oversized numbers with little structure; there are almost no strong charts or polished visualizations

Score

- **Current state:** 5.8/10
- **After visual fixes:** 8.0/10

If you want, I can also turn this into a **top 10 visual fixes in priority order** list so you know exactly what to change first.

4.5. Visual Design Analysis

First Visual Impression

This does **not** look like a serious founder-made investor deck in its current form. It looks like a **Slidebean template demo** with Airbnb content dropped in: clean enough to be usable, but still obviously templated, repetitive, and padded with decorative stock photography instead of sharp visual storytelling.

The biggest issue is that the deck feels more like a **marketing brochure/theme preview** than a high-conviction fundraising presentation.

Slide-by-Slide Visual Review

Slide #	Title	Visual Strengths	Visual Issues	Suggested Improvement
1	Cover / Template Intro	Clean whitespace, centered focal object, modern UI feel.	Immediate credibility killer: Slidebean branding and “GET EDITABLE TEMPLATE” CTA make this unusable as part of a real pitch. It screams template, not company.	Delete entirely. Replace with a true cover slide: company logo, one-line value prop, founder names, date.
2	Airbnb Pitch Deck	Good lifestyle image and strong Airbnb color match.	Layout is awkward: giant image on top, then logo/title floating below with too much dead space. Feels like a brochure cover, not an investor deck opener.	Tighten into a stronger hero slide with headline over image or a cleaner split layout. Reduce empty white band.

3	Problem	Strong contrast, readable white text on dark image, clear heading.	Background image is decorative and irrelevant; "HOTEL" letters pull more attention than the actual problem points. Text block feels pasted over a stock photo.	Use a plain dark background or subtle texture. Convert the three points into cleaner, more structured bullets or stat-led problem statements.
4	Solution	Icons are bold and visually consistent. Clear three-column structure.	Background photo is too busy and dim; long subtitle line is weak visually; icons are oversized relative to tiny captions.	Use a cleaner flat background. Make the three benefits equal cards with clearer labels and supporting one-liners.
5	Market Validation	Nice use of whitespace; metrics are easy to spot.	Weak visual balance. Huge empty top-right area. Bottom image strip feels random and cut off. This slide looks unfinished.	Turn this into a 2-column comparison card layout, remove the partial bottom photo, and add clearer visual grouping.
6	Market Size	Minimal and readable; three-number layout is simple.	Too sparse and visually underpowered for an important slide. No chart, no hierarchy beyond big pink numbers, no explanation of TAM/SAM/SOM flow.	Use a funnel, concentric circles, or segmented bar chart to show market layers visually.
7	Product	Clean section divider slide; large centered title is readable.	Generic stock-photo transition slide adds no information. Feels like filler.	Either remove section divider slides or make them more distinctive and compact.
8	Search by city	Real product UI is the right visual asset.	Screenshot is too small relative to the slide and likely unreadable in a room. Too much whitespace above; title disconnected from content.	Crop and zoom into the relevant UI area. Add callouts or annotations to show what matters.
9	Review listings	Product screenshot again helps credibility.	Same issue: screenshot is too dense and small. Text in UI is unreadable from presentation distance. No highlight of what viewers should focus on.	Use magnified UI panels and arrows/callouts to guide the eye.

10	Book it!	Strong aspirational property image; booking flow visual is relevant.	The embedded interface is too detailed and shrunk. "Book it!" is casual and slightly cheesy. Visual hierarchy is weak between title and content.	Zoom into the booking module and listing details. Rename to "Seamless booking flow" or similar.
11	Business Model	Large numbers are prominent; darkened background helps contrast.	This is one of the messier slides. Background is distracting, large figures float without enough structure, and the text hierarchy is inconsistent. It looks like stats scattered across a photo.	Put the numbers into three aligned cards or a stepwise model: transaction value → take rate → revenue. Remove photo background.
12	Market Adoption	Three-panel concept is decent and visually segmented.	Overlay text sits on bright images and loses clarity. Visual style feels like a magazine spread, not a data-backed GTM slide.	Add stronger text boxes/overlays and reduce image dominance. Consider icons + bullets instead of stock photography.
13	Competition	Clean section divider slide; readable.	Again, filler. Decorative apartment background adds nothing. Too many of these divider slides make the deck feel padded.	Remove or compress section title slides into smaller headers on content slides.
14	Competition Matrix	This is one of the few actual visualizations; simple 2x2 is familiar.	Amateur execution. Axis labels float awkwardly, competitors are generic placeholders, crosshair lines are too heavy, and the whole thing feels under-labeled and imprecise.	Use real competitor names/logos, thinner axes, clearer quadrant labels, and stronger positioning rationale.
15	Competitive Advantage	Consistent icon style and clean grid.	Too much text under each icon; bottom-center Airbnb logo wastes valuable space. Feels like a template icon page.	Replace center logo with a real differentiator. Reduce copy and increase spacing consistency between all six points.
16	Team	Headshots are high quality and consistent. Good use of circular cropping.	Body text is too dense and too small. Bottom advisor text is jammed in awkwardly. Feels like a resume wall.	Cut bios to 1–2 lines each, elevate logos/credentials, and give advisor a separate row or callout box.

17	Press	Strong dark treatment and decent quote-based layout.	Quote blocks are uneven, and attribution boxes are visually heavy and clunky. Background still feels decorative rather than functional.	Put press logos in a cleaner grid with one short highlighted quote each. Reduce visual noise.
18	User Testimonials	Profile images add humanity; dark background creates mood.	This is visually crowded and text-heavy. Testimonials compete with each other and become hard to scan. Alignment is sloppy.	Use two testimonials max, larger type, shorter quotes, and stronger separation between speakers.
19	Financial	Clear ask and key numbers are easy to locate.	Minimalism helps, but it's too bare. No chart, no assumptions, no pacing; visually it feels weak for a closing financial slide.	Add a simple 12-month use-of-funds or milestone timeline. Keep the three numbers but support them visually.
20	Slidebean Promo / Outro	Clean retail-style layout.	Another credibility killer. This is pure template advertisement and absolutely does not belong in a live fundraising deck.	Delete entirely. Replace with contact / thank-you slide or end on the raise.

Professional Polish Check

Element	Status	What's Wrong
Consistent branding		Airbnb color and logo are mostly consistent, but Slidebean branding on slides 1 and 20 destroys the illusion of a custom deck.
Professional typography		Typeface choice is modern and mostly clean, but several slides have too much small text, weak hierarchy, and inconsistent density.
High-quality images/graphics		Photos are decent quality, but many feel like stock/decorative filler. Screenshots are real but too small to function in presentation mode.
Clean layout		Some slides are clean, but several have awkward empty space, poor balance, and repetitive title-over-photo structures.
Color harmony		Coral/pink, white, charcoal, and muted photography work well together overall. Color is one of the stronger aspects here.

Visual data presentation		This is the weakest area. Important business slides rely on oversized numbers with little structure; there are almost no strong charts or polished visualizations.
--------------------------	--	--

Score

- Current State: **5.8/10**
- After Visual Fixes: **8.0/10**

If you want, I can also turn this into a “**top 10 visual fixes in priority order**” list so you know exactly what to change first.

Additional Notes for the Specific Funding Programme

FundFluent Insights

This section outlines key considerations specific to **General Pitch Deck Review** applications.

Key Programme-Specific Expectations

General Pitch Deck Review reviewers are looking for:

Focus: Comprehensive evaluation across all dimensions with balanced assessment

Evaluation Weights:

- Team Competency: 25%
- Technology Innovation: 25%
- R&D Content: 25%
- Business Development: 25%

Key Requirements:

- Clear problem-solution fit
- Credible team background
- Technical feasibility
- Market opportunity
- Sustainable business model

Additional Strategic Advice from Ching Hsu

Sharpen the Core Narrative

Make the deck tell one clear story in the first 3–5 slides: the problem, why Airbnb is uniquely positioned to solve it, and why now is the right time. For a general pitch review, evaluators typically look for clarity, focus, and memorability. Tighten any slides that feel descriptive rather than persuasive, and ensure each slide answers one strategic question only. As an action item, test the deck on 3–5 external readers and ask them to summarize the company in one sentence after viewing it.

Lead with a Stronger Problem–Solution Fit

Ensure the problem is framed in a way that is urgent, large, and emotionally intuitive, then connect Airbnb’s solution to that problem with precision. Avoid assuming the audience already understands the market pain point. Use concrete examples of traveler and host friction, and then show how Airbnb resolves those frictions better than incumbents or alternatives. Revise the problem slide so it includes quantified pain points, not just broad statements.

Make Market Opportunity More Defensible

General reviewers often challenge market size assumptions, especially when TAM feels too top-down or inflated. Present TAM, SAM, and SOM in a grounded way, supported by behavior trends, travel demand shifts, and platform adoption patterns. Add segmentation by customer type, geography, or trip use case to show where growth is most actionable. A useful next step would be to replace generic market estimates with bottom-up assumptions tied to booking volume, average stay value, and host supply growth.

Clarify Competitive Differentiation

A strong deck should show not only who the competitors are, but why Airbnb wins sustainably. Move beyond a simple competitor matrix and articulate the structural advantages: network effects, brand trust, supply liquidity, global reach, and product experience. If possible, show how these advantages compound over time. Add one slide that explains why competitors cannot easily replicate Airbnb's host ecosystem and trust infrastructure.

Strengthen the Business Model Slide

Reviewers want to see that revenue generation is simple, scalable, and resilient. Make sure the business model clearly explains how Airbnb earns revenue across both sides of the marketplace, what key pricing levers exist, and how margins evolve with scale. If there are multiple monetization streams, rank them by current importance and future upside. A practical improvement would be to include one visual that maps booking flow to take rate, unit economics, and margin contribution.

Highlight Traction with More Investor-Relevant Metrics

Traction should demonstrate not just growth, but quality of growth. Focus on metrics that signal marketplace health, such as booking growth, repeat usage, customer acquisition efficiency, host retention, geographic density, and contribution margins. If the current deck relies too heavily on vanity metrics, replace them with operational indicators that support long-term defensibility. As a concrete action, select 5–7 KPIs and present them consistently with timeframe, trendline, and business implication.

Address Risks Before Reviewers Raise Them

General pitch evaluators appreciate teams that understand their vulnerabilities and have mitigation plans. For Airbnb, likely areas include regulatory complexity, trust and safety, supply quality control, and macro travel volatility. Rather than avoiding these issues, include a concise risk slide or integrate mitigation points into the strategy section. Update the deck to show how Airbnb proactively manages compliance, insurance, identity verification, and local market relations.

Show a More Credible Growth Strategy

Growth plans should feel prioritized, not overly broad. Instead of listing many possible expansion ideas, focus on the 2–3 highest-conviction growth levers, such as deepening host supply in strategic markets, increasing repeat bookings, expanding longer stays, or strengthening adjacent travel services. Tie each growth lever to a measurable outcome and execution capability. A useful revision would be to build a roadmap slide with near-term, mid-term, and longer-term growth initiatives.

Upgrade the Team Slide to Emphasize Execution Fit

Reviewers assess whether the team is the right one to execute the strategy at scale. Go beyond titles and bios by linking leadership experience directly to the business challenges ahead—marketplace scaling, trust systems, regulatory management, international growth, and product innovation. If key capabilities are missing, acknowledge them and show hiring priorities. Rework the team slide so each senior leader is paired with a core strategic responsibility and relevant achievement.

End with a Clear Ask and Investment Case

Many strong decks lose momentum at the end by failing to present a crisp closing argument. Summarize why Airbnb is attractive now in three points: scale of opportunity, strength of execution, and durability of advantage. Then state exactly what support, capital, or strategic outcome is being sought. As a final action item, redesign the closing slide so it includes the raise or objective, use of proceeds, and the key milestones that support the next stage of growth.

For further assistance with implementing these recommendations, please contact Ching Hsu at FundFluent.

Your Feedback Matters!

Thank you for reading this evaluation report. We continuously improve our assessment quality, and your feedback will directly help us do better.

It only takes 2 minutes to complete, and your input will be used to enhance the accuracy of our AI-powered evaluations.

[Click here to provide feedback](#)

Report generated by FundFluent Pitch Deck Evaluation System v4.1

Generated on: July 01, 2026

Report ID: 84c8db29