

InVitro Capital – Investment & Build Thesis

I. Executive Summary

InVitro Capital is a venture studio fund purpose-built to generate alpha through structural control, capital discipline, and operational focus. It integrates company creation, early validation, and funding under one roof—bridging gaps left by traditional venture capital and private equity models. With a disciplined portfolio construction approach and milestone-based capital deployment, InVitro is positioned to deliver superior returns and earlier liquidity in an increasingly stagnant private markets environment. While InVitro is focused on company creation, much of the framework herein can be applied to evaluate early-stage startups and overlooked sectors through a capital-efficient lens.

II. Market Backdrop

Structural Headwinds in Private Equity and Venture Capital

Private company investing has become foundational in allocator portfolios, but the playbook is changing. In both venture and private equity, the ability to source and exit deals is under pressure:

- **IRR compression** is eroding long-term outperformance across vintages. Median IRRs for PE and VC have dropped below 13% and 10%, respectively, over the past decade.
- **Dry powder buildup**—over \$2 trillion in PE and \$300 billion in VC—has outpaced quality deal flow, driving entry multiples higher and dragging down return efficiency.
- **Exit timelines have extended.** VC companies now take 10–12 years to reach liquidity, with a growing population of "zombie" startups—stagnant, capital-draining, and unexitable.
- **Liquidity constraints and pacing mismatches** are straining portfolio construction, particularly for allocators who must navigate capital calls, return profiles, and denominator risk.

In this context, allocators are increasingly seeking upstream exposure—models that offer tighter control, lower capital burn, and earlier time to value.

III. The Case for a Venture Studio Model

Structural Advantages

InVitro's approach is built on three pillars: create, control, and compound.

1. **Create** – The fund doesn't chase deals, it builds them. By identifying overlooked sectors with high labor intensity, low tech penetration, and fragmentation, InVitro launches companies with embedded operational leverage and consolidation potential.
2. **Control** – Each portfolio company is majority-owned post-dilution through a combination of fund and studio equity, preserving strategic control and exit flexibility.
3. **Compound** – Centralized tech and talent infrastructure reduce marginal build cost and increase execution speed. Investments are staged across 3–4 tranches based on live commercial traction, ensuring capital only scales what's working.

This model addresses key allocator pain points:

- **Governance alignment:** Majority equity and infrastructure alignment ensure decisions are made for value realization—not just fund-mark optimization. While shared infrastructure is used to accelerate initial build and reduce cost, each company owns and controls its own IP from inception—critical for downstream financing and defensibility.
- **Capital efficiency:** Controlled burn, milestone funding, and early profitability targets reduce time-to-liquidity and increase IRR.
- **Early validation:** Products are launched and tested before outside capital enters, de-risking venture exposure at the earliest stage.

IV. Market Fit: Where InVitro Operates

InVitro targets sectors with four common characteristics:

- **Labor-Intensive:** High OpEx from manual work, ripe for AI-driven automation.
- **Fragmented:** No dominant incumbents, enabling consolidation plays.
- **Tech-Starved:** <50% software penetration, presenting greenfield opportunity.
- **Overlooked:** “Boring” industries neglected by traditional venture despite large TAM.

Initial verticals include senior care, healthcare services, local logistics, and home maintenance—markets with real unit economics and systemic inefficiencies.

V. Portfolio Construction and Liquidity Engineering

Investment Framework

Each venture is launched from scratch using a proprietary build methodology:

- **Discovery:** Market identification, thesis development, and pain point validation.
- **Validation:** Product built in-house and tested with early users to confirm real demand.
- **Assembly:** Team formation centered around traction—not theory.
- **Funding:** Capital is deployed in tranches tied to revenue milestones (e.g., \$10K → \$30K → \$250K MRR).
- **Scale:** Companies reach profitability within 3–4 years with only one institutional round.

This framework is designed to front-load proof and back-load capital, enabling a higher return per dollar deployed.

Liquidity Outlook

In contrast to traditional VC’s 10+ year cycles, InVitro targets exit readiness within 3–5 year windows. Potential exit paths include:

- **Strategic acquisition** (by incumbents seeking automation or market access)
- **Private equity buyout** (of profitable, de-risked assets)
- **Recapitalization or secondary** (via structured exits)

By building with exit in mind from day one—and retaining controlling equity—liquidity events are more frequent, earlier, and less dependent on public market conditions. This flexibility allows us to pursue an exit when it aligns with the company’s strategic trajectory, not just fund timelines. It also creates the opportunity for partial or full liquidity in a variety of market environments, whether through buyouts, strategic interest, or investor-driven secondaries.

VI. How We Validate and Build Companies

A. Industry List Construction and Filtering

The company creation process begins not with an idea, but with a systematized **industry mapping and filtering exercise**:

1. **We build longlists** of 50–100 U.S. industries and verticals, drawing from NAICS codes, census labor data, private equity acquisition patterns, and vertical-specific SaaS penetration.
2. **Each industry is scored against three non-negotiable investment criteria**:
 - **Labor-Intensive**: Human cost must exceed 40% of OpEx.
 - **Tech-Starved**: <50% software penetration or workflow automation.
 - **Fragmented**: No single player holds >10% market share; room for consolidation.
3. **Industries that fail to meet all three criteria are removed**. The goal is to identify sectors that are both ripe for automation and structurally inefficient enough to support outsized returns through operational leverage.

This leads to a shortlist of 10–15 “fertile ground” sectors such as:

- **Long-term and non-acute care** (e.g., residential care homes, Medicaid waiver providers).
 - High labor dependency, heavy documentation, and low workflow automation.

- **Skilled home services** (e.g., HVAC, plumbing, appliance repair)
 - Fragmented supply side with minimal tech adoption and rising consumer demand.
- **Freight and field logistics** (e.g., small fleet dispatch, NEMT, independent couriers)
 - Manual coordination, fragmented operators, and opaque pricing.
- **Regulatory-heavy back office** (e.g., insurance admin, specialty tax, healthcare credentialing)
 - Complex, repetitive tasks ripe for automation, underserved by vertical SaaS.

B. Subsegment Decomposition and Whitespace Identification

Once an industry is shortlisted, we **deconstruct it into 5–10 subsegments** based on job role, use case, geography, and spend intensity.

Within each subsegment, we identify:

- **Product whitespace** (tools or workflows missing software entirely)
- **Business model whitespace** (monetizable pain points not served by incumbents)
- **Operational leverage opportunities** (where AI or automation can replace human overhead)

In addition to subsegment-level analysis, we break down each subsegment into **major workflows** and assess whether they can be impacted by software or automation. We evaluate each workflow based on:

- **Level of human involvement** (manual effort, decision-making, coordination)
- **Technology penetration** (existence and adoption of workflow-specific tools)

Workflows that are both **highly manual and under-digitized** are prioritized for **problem validation and signal testing**.

We also perform a **competitive scan** of the subsegment, evaluating:

- Presence and maturity of both **incumbent vendors** and **early-stage startups**
- **Funding levels**, GTM strategy, and product coverage
- Overall **saturation** and opportunity for a wedge entry

We then **prioritize one or two pain points** that meet all of the following:

- Expensive and manual today
- Recurring and frequent
- Easily measured by time, cost, or error
- Solvable with a software + services hybrid

This ensures we go deep, not wide—focusing on solvable, high-signal wedges rather than trying to boil the ocean.

C. Problem Validation and Signal Testing

Only after whitespace is mapped do we move into **problem validation**. The goal is to answer one clear question before building anything: **“Will you buy?”**

- We build a qualified customer list early by identifying decision-makers within the subsegment, then run simple demand tests with 30 to 50 end users and buyers to evaluate willingness to pay and urgency of need.
- We launch no-code MVPs, landing pages, or email-driven service tests to simulate the offering and assess direct buying interest.
- We test both the problem and the proposed solution, tracking willingness to pay, solution desirability, switching costs, and workflow compatibility.

Examples of real metrics we evaluate:

- **Adoption velocity:** *% of users switching from manual to MVP within 30 days.*
 - Indicates urgency of pain and ease of onboarding. A 30–50% switch rate signals strong fit.
- **Blended CAC by channel:** *Cold outbound vs. referrals/inbound.*
 - Lower CAC from warm channels suggests message-market fit and organic pull.
- **Purchase intent:** *LOIs, payment captures, or pre-payments for a prototype.*
 - ≥25% of early users showing buying intent is a strong signal.
- **Retention and workflow fit:** *30-day retention and setup friction.*
 - High retention and fast integration imply essential value.
- **Early value realized:** *Hours saved, errors reduced, or cost avoided in 2–3 weeks.*
 - Tangible ROI supports pricing power and B2B sales readiness.



The rule is simple: **no product gets built until market demand is proven.**

D. Product Prototyping and Internal Build

Once a validated problem is greenlit:

- Our in-house team builds a production-grade MVP in under 60 days.
- Every product leverages shared infrastructure: authentication, billing, routing, NLP agents, and analytics.
- We focus on **revenue-generating use cases**, not vanity engagement.

Each MVP is deployed with paying customers before hiring a founding team. We measure retention, upsell, and margin before moving to scale.

E. Team Formation and Structured Launch

- Founding teams are assembled only after MVP traction is demonstrated with paying customers.
- CEOs are recruited from vertical-specific operator pools—leaders with domain expertise and a bias toward execution.
- Compensation is aligned to EBITDA growth and capital efficiency, not fundraising milestones.
- Once spun out, each company receives initial support from the studio across finance, compliance, and operations—designed to accelerate setup, not create dependency. As the company scales, these functions are internalized to ensure autonomy and long-term ownership.

F. Tranche-Based Funding and Exit Design

Each venture is funded through 3–4 staged capital deployments:

1. **\$0–10K MRR:** Problem and solution validated on studio capital.
2. **\$10K–30K MRR:** Seed funding to refine GTM and improve margins.
3. **\$30K–250K MRR:** Scale funding if product is profitable and automated.
4. **Exit:** Positioned for strategic acquisition, PE recap, or cash-flow hold.

We target exit in 4–5 years with a portfolio-wide target of \$50–250M outcomes per company.

- This range reflects the sweet spot for strategic acquirers and growth-stage private equity buyers—large enough to deliver meaningful returns, yet small enough to transact efficiently without relying on IPOs or secondary markets for liquidity.

VII. Performance and Team

In the first fund cycle:

- **\$13M+ in combined annualized revenue** across the initial portfolio.
- **37.2% gross IRR** (from the two mature companies).
- Profitable companies within **3 years from idea to exit-readiness**.
- Margin scalability supported by a **centralized engineering layer at inception**, with teams in Egypt, Mexico, and Panama City.
 - **Designed solely to accelerate early builds, not to create shared infrastructure or IP.**

The leadership team combines experience across healthcare, SaaS, venture investing, and operational scaling—collectively driving over \$500M in enterprise value creation.

VIII. Allocator Fit

For allocators, InVitro functions as:

- **A pacing buffer:** Venture building absorbs capital during dry PE/VC deployment cycles.
- **A liquidity bridge:** Faster outcomes than VC, with lower volatility than seed funds.
- **A return amplifier:** Capital-efficient building with equity control drives IRR uplift.



Recommended allocation sizing for this model is 2–4% of total portfolio capital, or 10–20% of the private company ownership sleeve. It is especially well-suited for allocators with:

- Domain expertise in operating businesses
- Appetite for active governance and milestone pacing

IX. Conclusion

InVitro Capital is not just a response to structural inefficiencies in private markets—it's a strategy designed to thrive in them. By building companies with discipline, holding majority ownership, and targeting earlier profitability, InVitro unlocks a new path to venture-scale returns without the venture-style chaos.

This is not venture capital rebranded. It's a new category: a capital-controlled, outcome-aligned, execution-driven platform for building the next generation of enduring companies.

X. Contact

For inquiries, detailed materials, or follow-up discussions, please contact:

Jonathan Schroeder

Director of Investments

InVitro Capital

jonathan.schroeder@invitrocapital.com

Amir Barsoum

Managing Partner

InVitro Capital

amir.barsoum@invitrocapital.com