Brain-Computer Interfaces in Healthcare: Building the Picks and Shovels Company While the Giants Fight Over Gold

JAN 18, 2026 • PAID

Table of Contents

Abstract

- Merge Labs raised $252M led by Bain Capital with OpenAI as largest investor, validating brain-computer interface market potential

- Neuralink and Merge represent multi-billion dollar platforms racing to build complete end-to-end BCI systems

- Direct competition with these giants is suicide for startups given their capital, talent, and technical advantages

- Infrastructure components like signal processing algorithms, biocompatible materials, neural decoding models, and manufacturing processes represent viabl opportunities

- Strategic acquirers need specialized capabilities faster than they can build inte creating 18-36 month windows for point solution companies

- High-value infrastructure gaps include real-time spike sorting at scale, adaptiv decoder architectures, chronic biocompatibility materials, and quality control sy for electrode arrays

- Optimal team structure is 5-8 person technical team with world-class expertise one specific domain plus business lead who understands strategic M&A

- Capital requirement is $3-6M seed round targeting 24-30 month runway to tec validation and strategic discussions

- Exit timing targets acquisition before Series B at $50-150M valuation when str buyer faces build-vs-buy decision

- Success factors include publishing in top venues to build credibility, solving problems the acquirer explicitly mentions as bottlenecks, and maintaining relationships with technical leadership at target companies

The OpenAI-Neuralink Rivalry Goes Neural

Sam Altman launching a brain-computer interface company while running Oper maybe the most on-brand thing he could possibly do. The guy literally spent Au dinners with reporters fantasizing about thinking at ChatGPT instead of typing nine months later drops a quarter billion raise for exactly that. Neuralink presid was talking about the same concept a month after that dinner. Turns out the AI billionaire community has very predictable shower thoughts.

The Altman-Musk dynamic here is legitimately fascinating from a competitive strategy perspective. These guys co-founded OpenAI together, had a very public falling out, and now Musk is three years ahead on the BCI race through Neurali while Altman is coming in with significantly more capital and OpenAI's institut backing. Musk started Neuralink in 2016 explicitly worried about humans becor obsolete as AI advances. Altman is starting Merge in 2026 with AI advancement assumed backdrop driving consumer demand. The framing difference matters.

Neuralink has already done human implants in paralysis patients. They have act clinical data, FDA breakthrough device designation, and are working through th traditional medical device pathway. Merge is starting from zero with a team of fe than fifty people and a Caltech professor who has studied brains for decades but not shipped a commercial medical device. The experience gap is real but the cap advantage is massive.

The $252M raise is the second largest single round in BCI space after Neuralink which tells you something about investor appetite but also something about capi intensity requirements. Building high bandwidth neural interfaces that work rel requires solving hard materials science, neuroscience, and engineering problems simultaneously. Neither company can solve all these problems internally in acce timeframes, creating openings for specialized infrastructure companies.

OpenAI being the largest investor creates interesting strategic optionality for companies in the ecosystem. If you believe the future involves humans interfacin

directly with AI systems, then every component enabling that integration becom strategically valuable. The companies building those components do not need to platform companies themselves, they just need to be essential enough that the platform companies would rather acquire than build.

Why Competing Head-to-Head is a Trap

Trying to build a complete BCI platform company that competes directly with Neuralink and Merge is financial suicide for any startup without comparable resources. The math is brutal and gets worse the more you think about it.

Neuralink has raised over $600M and has Musk willing to fund indefinitely. The custom ASIC design teams, surgical robotics engineers, materials scientists, neuroscientists, regulatory specialists, manufacturing operations, and clinical tr infrastructure. They have been iterating on electrode arrays, insertion mechanis and decoding algorithms for almost a decade. They have FDA relationships and clinical data from human implants. The technical and organizational learning cu they have climbed is not something you replicate with $10M in venture funding.

Merge has $252M in the bank, OpenAI as a strategic backer providing AI capabi and computational resources, and a Caltech professor with decades of neuroscie expertise. They explicitly are setting up as a research lab to solve hard scientific problems that enable non-invasive high bandwidth interfaces. They can hire aggressively, move fast on research, and pursue multiple technical approaches in parallel. Any startup trying to compete on non-invasive BCI technology is now competing with a quarter billion dollars focused on exactly that problem.

The capital requirements to compete end-to-end are prohibitive. Getting from concept to FDA-approved BCI device requires $200M to $500M over seven to te years. That assumes everything goes reasonably well and you do not have major clinical trial failures or manufacturing issues. Most VCs will not fund that kind capital intensity and timeline. The ones who would are already backing Neuralin Merge or sitting on the sidelines waiting to see who wins.

The talent competition is equally impossible. Neuralink and Merge can pay top-market compensation, offer equity in multi-billion dollar companies, provide ac cutting-edge resources, and deliver on the mission of building the future of hum interaction. A seed-stage startup competing for the same neuroscience PhDs, hardware engineers, and ML talent is offering higher risk, lower compensation, resources, and uncertain outcome. You lose that recruiting battle ninety-nine ti out of a hundred.

The time-to-market dynamics favor the incumbents. Neuralink is already in hun trials. Merge will probably be in animal studies within twelve to eighteen month given their capital and team. A new startup is starting from zero. By the time yo proof-of-concept data, Neuralink might have hundreds of implanted patients an Merge might have their first human trials launching. The gap compounds over ti not shrinks.

The acquirer landscape for platform BCI companies is actually terrible unless yo already far along. Medical device acquirers like Medtronic or Abbott want prove technology with FDA approval or clear path to approval. They are not paying premium multiples for early-stage research. Tech acquirers like Apple or Google shown zero interest in acquiring BCI companies despite lots of speculation. The likely acquirers for a platform BCI company are actually Neuralink or Merge themselves, which brings us to the real opportunity.

Identifying High-Value Infrastructure Components

The strategic insight is that Neuralink and Merge will need to acquire or license specialized capabilities they cannot build fast enough internally. Both companie racing to hit clinical and technical milestones. When they encounter bottlenecks specific technical domains, the build-vs-buy decision tilts toward buy if there is credible acquisition target with proven technology.

Signal processing and spike sorting algorithms represent a massive infrastructu Current BCI systems struggle to reliably extract individual neuron spikes from

electrical recordings in real-time. Neuralink's 1,024 channel implant generates enormous data streams that need to be processed with minimal latency. Existing sorting algorithms were designed for offline analysis of tens of channels, not rea processing of thousands. A company that solves real-time spike sorting at scale v better accuracy and lower computational requirements has a clear value proposi The technical problem is hard but well-scoped, the validation path is straightfor through benchmark datasets, and the strategic value is obvious.

Adaptive neural decoder architectures that handle neural plasticity and brain st changes are critical for chronic BCI use. Current decoders need frequent recalibration as neural signals drift over days and weeks. Users have to redo trai sessions regularly, which is annoying and limits real-world usability. A company building self-adaptive decoders using meta-learning or continual learning appro that maintain performance without user retraining would solve a major pain poi This is primarily a machine learning problem rather than neuroscience or hardw which means faster iteration cycles and lower capital requirements.

Biocompatible electrode materials and coatings that reduce inflammation and maintain signal quality over years are essential for chronic implants. Current electrode arrays work well for months but often degrade over one to two years as tissue forms and impedances increase. Materials science innovations in hydrogel coatings, conducting polymers, or anti-fouling surface treatments could extend electrode lifetime significantly. A company with proven biocompatibility data in animal models and IP around novel materials would be attractive to any invasive company. The development path requires materials expertise and animal testing not full device development.

Manufacturing and quality control systems for high-density electrode arrays are genuine bottleneck. Neuralink needs to manufacture thousands of electrode arra with consistent quality, yields above 90 percent, and costs that can eventually sca consumer pricing. Current manufacturing is probably semi-manual with low yie and high costs. A company that develops automated manufacturing processes, q inspection systems using computer vision, or novel fabrication techniques could

enable production scale-up. This is less sexy than core neuroscience but potentia more valuable to strategic acquirer trying to get to volume production.

Wireless power and data transmission solutions optimized for implanted devices hard constraints on size, power consumption, and data rates. Neuralink's curren implant is wireless but battery life and charging requirements are unclear. High channel counts and more sophisticated processing will increase power requirem A company solving efficient wireless power transfer through inductive coupling ultrasound with high efficiency and small form factor would be enabling techno Similarly, ultra-wideband or other RF approaches optimized for body-area netw and high data rates could unlock next-generation devices.

Surgical tools and robotic systems specialized for BCI implantation complement do not compete with device companies. Neuralink built their own surgical robot other companies will need similar capabilities. A company developing automate planning software for electrode placement, robotic insertion systems, or imaging guided surgical tools could sell to multiple BCI companies plus traditional neurosurgery markets. The development path requires mechanical engineering a software but not the full neuroscience stack.

Animal model protocols and data analysis pipelines are unsexy but valuable. Eve BCI company needs extensive animal testing before human trials. Standardized protocols for rodent and primate studies, validated behavioral paradigms for dec training, and data analysis pipelines for benchmarking performance would accel development across the industry. A company building these tools and offering th software platforms or services could generate revenue while building relationshi with strategic acquirers.

The key selection criterion for picking which infrastructure component to pursu whether the strategic acquirer has explicitly mentioned it as a bottleneck or acti area of development. If Neuralink job postings are looking for spike sorting algo engineers or materials scientists, that tells you they see it as a gap. If Merge publications discuss challenges with signal-to-noise ratios in non-invasive recor

that is a clue. The best acquisition targets solve problems the acquirer has alread identified as important.

Building the Acquihire-to-Exit Company

The business model for an infrastructure component company targeting acquisit by Neuralink or Merge is fundamentally different from a normal startup. You ar building for long-term independent operation, you are building to become strategically essential within twenty-four to thirty-six months.

The company focus needs to be exceptionally narrow. Pick one specific technical problem and go absurdly deep on it. If you are doing spike sorting, that is the en company. Do not also work on decoders or electrodes or anything else. The value proposition is we are the world's best team at this one thing and we have a two-y technical lead over anyone else. That story works for acquirers. We kind of do sp sorting plus some other stuff does not.

The team composition should be small and exceptionally strong in the specific technical domain. Five to eight people total. Two to three PhD-level researchers top publications in the specific area. One or two senior engineers who can ship production-quality code or hardware. One business-focused co-founder who understands the strategic landscape and can manage investor and acquirer relationships. That is it. Do not hire generalists. Do not hire for future growth. H the absolute best people in the world at the one thing you are doing.

The publishing strategy is critical for building credibility and getting on the rad strategic acquirers. Target NeurIPS, ICML, Nature Neuroscience, eLife, or simil venues depending on whether your work is more ML or neuroscience focused. P early and often. Every paper is marketing to the technical teams at Neuralink an Merge who read this literature. Make sure your papers include comparisons to existing methods and show clear performance improvements on standard benchr Open source reference implementations to build community adoption.

The patent strategy should focus on narrow but defensible claims around your specific innovation. You do not need a huge patent portfolio, you need two to fiv really solid patents that cover the core technical approach and obvious variation provisionals within six months of starting the company, convert to full utility pa by eighteen months. Use patent filings to establish timeline and prior art before strategic acquirers try to build similar capabilities internally.

The funding strategy targets a single seed round of $3M to $6M at reasonable valuation, maybe $10M to $20M post-money. Investors should be seed-stage dee funds who understand the acquihire-to-exit model and are comfortable with concentrated bets on technical excellence. You are selling a binary outcome, eith acquired for $50M to $150M in two to three years or the company is worth zero. investors hate that risk profile but some specialized funds are built for it.

The milestone planning is backward from target acquisition date. If you want to acquired in month thirty, you need technical validation and published results by month eighteen, initial acquirer conversations by month twenty-four, and term s negotiation by month twenty-seven. That means the first twelve months are pure technology development with minimal external communication. Months twelve t twenty-four are publishing and building credibility. Months twenty-four to thirt strategic discussions and closing the deal.

The customer strategy is tricky because infrastructure component companies oft not have revenue before acquisition. That is actually fine if you are targeting acquihire. Your customers are academic collaborators who use your tools and pu papers validating the approach. Ideally you want five to ten academic labs using spike sorting algorithm or decoder architecture and publishing results showing works. That is social proof that matters more than revenue for this exit path.

The competitive positioning needs to acknowledge the elephant in the room, wh that Neuralink or Merge could just build your technology internally. The answe yes they could, but it would take them twelve to twenty-four months and distrac their core platform development. For $100M acquisition price, they get your technology immediately, your team who are world experts, and your IP. The buil

buy math favors buy when the technology is specialized, the team is exceptional, the timing matters for their product roadmap.

Team Architecture for Speed and Specialization

Building a team optimized for acquihire-to-exit is fundamentally different from building a team for long-term independent company. You are hiring for depth n breadth, for technical excellence not organizational scalability, and for speed no sustainability.

The technical co-founder and team lead should be someone with PhD from top l multiple publications in target area, and ideally some previous startup experienc They need to be technically brilliant but also understand commercialization and working under time pressure. This person is probably post-doc or early faculty v ready to leave academia for industry but has not fully committed yet. The pitch i can do your best technical work, publish in top venues, and get a great financial outcome in three years rather than grinding through tenure track for a decade.

The senior researchers should be recent PhDs or advanced graduate students fr labs like Karl Deisseroth's at Stanford, Ed Boyden's at MIT, Krishna Shenoy's gr focused on BCI decoding, or similar top-tier neuroscience or neuroengineering l These people are choosing between post-docs paying $60K, faculty positions wit brutal job markets, or industry jobs at big tech. The offer is $130K to $160K bas meaningful equity in a company that should exit in three years, and opportunity technically ambitious work with publication freedom. For the right people, that compelling.

The engineering talent should have production ML experience if you are doing algorithms, or manufacturing and process development experience if you are doi hardware. They need to translate research prototypes into reliable systems that c integrated into product pipelines. These are not researchers, these are people wl ship code or hardware at quality levels strategic acquirers expect. Expect to pay to $200K for senior engineers with relevant experience.

The business co-founder needs to be someone with previous startup exits, ideall life sciences or medical devices, who understands strategic M&A and can manag acquisition process. This person handles fundraising, investor management, stra partnerships, and ultimately running the sale process. They should have strong network in BCI space and relationships with folks at Neuralink, Synchron, or ot companies. Comp is probably lower base salary around $120K but larger equity given critical role in exit.

The compensation structure should heavily weight equity over cash. For technic team, target 60th percentile of market on base salary but 90th percentile on equ value assuming successful exit. A senior researcher might get $140K base plus 1. percent to 3 percent equity vesting over four years. If company exits at $100M in three, that is $1.5M to $3M pre-tax for three years of work. That is a great deal compared to academic career economics.

The equity vesting should have one-year cliff to protect against early departures then accelerate significantly on acquisition. Standard is 25 percent at one year th monthly thereafter, but consider 25 percent at one year then quarterly with full acceleration on change of control. This aligns incentives around the exit event ra than long-term retention post-acquisition.

The culture should be research lab meets startup intensity. People are publishin papers and presenting at conferences like academia but working with startup ur on shipping timelines. Monday morning meetings review weekly goals and block Friday afternoon is lab meeting discussing recent results and literature. Encoura collaboration with academic labs, conference attendance, and external visibility.

The retention strategy recognizes that in an acquihire exit, the team is the produ The acquiring company wants to retain the key technical talent for at least one t years post-acquisition. Structure equity and employment agreements to make th attractive. Discuss retention packages during acquisition negotiation. Make sure members understand the economics and are committed to staying post-acquisiti

Technology Development for Strategic Buyers

The technology development process for an infrastructure component company to balance research novelty with practical utility for the strategic acquirer. You a not publishing papers just for academic credit, you are building technology som will pay $100M to acquire.

The technical validation needs to happen on benchmarks and datasets the strate acquirer cares about. If you are doing spike sorting, validate on the same publicl available datasets Neuralink or academic BCI labs use. Show your algorithm ach 95 percent accuracy versus 85 percent for existing methods. Show it runs in real· on standard hardware versus requiring offline processing. Show it scales to 1,00(channels versus breaking down at 100 channels. These comparisons make the va proposition concrete.

The technology stack needs to be compatible with acquirer infrastructure. If Neuralink uses NVIDIA chips for on-device processing, make sure your algorith runs efficiently on NVIDIA hardware. If Merge is all-in on Python and PyTorch, not build your system in MATLAB. Technical integration friction kills acquisiti Make it easy for the acquirer to drop your technology into their system.

The software engineering quality needs to be production-grade not research-gra That means documented code, unit tests, continuous integration, version contro proper abstractions. Strategic acquirers will do technical diligence and evaluate quality. Research code that is duct-taped together will get you dinged on valuati killed the deal entirely. Invest in engineering best practices from day one.

The IP development should target specific claims that cover your core innovatio create freedom to operate for the acquirer. Work with experienced patent couns understands both the technical domain and strategic M&A. File continuations a improvements as the technology evolves. Build a patent portfolio that is small bu robust, maybe five to ten patents total by acquisition time.

The data generation strategy is critical for validation. You probably cannot affor do your own animal studies, so partner with academic labs to test your technolo their experiments. Offer your tools for free to collaborators in exchange for co-authorship on papers and validation data. Build a portfolio of third-party valida showing your technology works across different labs, different animals, and diff experimental paradigms.

The benchmarking and comparison needs to be rigorous and transparent. Publis negative results when your method does not work. Clearly state assumptions and limitations. Over-promising or fudging results will blow up in due diligence. Be be honest about current capabilities and show roadmap for improvement.

The documentation and knowledge transfer planning should start early. The acquiring company needs to be able to understand and maintain your technolog acquisition. That means comprehensive technical documentation, design docum architecture overviews, and training materials. This stuff is boring but essential acquisition.

Partnership Strategy with Strategic Intent

The partnership approach for an infrastructure component company should be explicitly designed to build relationships with strategic acquirers and position t company for acquisition.

The academic partnerships serve multiple purposes. First, they provide validatic data showing your technology works in real experimental settings. Second, they credibility through co-publications with well-known labs. Third, they create adv if a respected professor says your technology is the best solution for spike sortin that carries weight with strategic acquirers. Target three to five partnerships wi labs by month twelve.

The conference presence is critical for visibility with the technical teams at strat acquirers. Present at Society for Neuroscience, Computational and Systems

Neuroscience, NeurIPS workshops on neuroscience, and any BCI-specific confer Do not just present posters, aim for oral presentations and organize workshops. want to be top-of-mind when someone at Neuralink or Merge thinks about your technical domain.

The direct engagement with strategic acquirers needs to start early but be subtl not cold-email executives saying you want to be acquired, that is desperate and v Instead, reach out to technical staff about potential collaborations or just to disc technical challenges. Offer to share early results or get feedback on your approa Build relationships with engineering teams who will eventually do technical dili

The advisory board should include people with direct connections to strategic acquirers. Former Neuralink engineers who left on good terms. Academic collaborators who consult for BCI companies. Investors with portfolio companie the space. These advisors provide intelligence on what the strategic acquirers ar working on, where their pain points are, and when they might be in acquisition

The media and PR strategy should be minimal and targeted. Do not do broad pr releases or TechCrunch coverage, that just attracts competition. Instead, do tech blog posts explaining your approach, participate in podcasts or panels focused o technology, and maybe one or two interviews in IEEE Spectrum or similar techn publications. You want visibility in the industry but not broad consumer awaren

The funding sources can include strategic investors if it makes sense. If there is corporate venture arm from a medical device company or AI company investing BCI infrastructure, taking their money builds relationships and signals to other strategic acquirers that you are a serious player. But be careful about strategic investors who might block acquisition by competitors.

Capital Strategy for Fast Exit

The capital raise approach for an infrastructure component company needs to b efficient and focused on reaching acquisition discussions, not building a sustain independent business.

The seed round targets $3M to $6M at $10M to $20M post-money valuation. Thi might seem low given technical risk, but you are selling a short timeline to exit a highly specialized team. Investors are betting on technical execution and strateg M&A, not building a platform company. The pitch is this team can solve this spe problem better than anyone else in the world, and Neuralink or Merge will pay $ to $150M to acquire that capability in two to three years.

The investor selection should prioritize funds that understand deep tech, have d acquihire exits before, and have portfolio companies that could validate your technology. Funds like Pillar, Root, Creative Destruction Lab, Activate, or simila deep tech seed funds. You want investors who can open doors to strategic acquir and who will support the exit rather than pushing for Series A and independent growth.

The use of funds should be heavily weighted toward team compensation and res expenses. Maybe 65 percent personnel costs, 20 percent research expenses like equipment and animal studies through partners, 10 percent IP and legal, 5 perce miscellaneous. Do not spend money on office space, sales and marketing, or anyt not directly related to proving the technology works.

The burn rate should target $175K to $300K per month depending on team size research intensity. With $5M in the bank, that is eighteen to twenty-eight montl runway. You want to be starting acquisition conversations by month eighteen, so timeline works. If you have not made meaningful technical progress by month tw you need to either pivot fast or shut down.

The follow-on capital question comes up if acquisition discussions take longer t expected or strategic acquirers want more validation before pulling the trigger. probably do not want to raise a full Series A at this stage because it resets the ex economics and brings in investors who want to build independent company. Inst consider small bridge rounds from existing investors or convertible notes that ge repaid in acquisition.

The grants and non-dilutive funding can extend runway meaningfully. NIH SBIF grants are $300K for Phase I, up to $2M for Phase II. BRAIN Initiative has speci programs supporting BCI development. These take six to twelve months to secu apply early, but if you can get $1M to $2M in grants that is meaningful runway extension without dilution.

The valuation expectations for exit need to be realistic. An infrastructure compc company with proven technology, strong team, and clear strategic value might g acquired for $50M to $150M. The high end of that range requires either multipl strategic acquirers competing or the technology being genuinely essential to pro roadmap. Do not pitch investors on $500M exit expectations, you are not buildir platform company.

Making Yourself Irresistible to Neuralir or Merge

The acquisition strategy needs to start months before you want to close a deal. Y are engineering a situation where the strategic acquirer needs your technology a team at the exact moment you want to sell.

The timing is everything. Strategic acquirers are most motivated to buy when th a technical bottleneck that is blocking their roadmap. If Neuralink is trying to s from tens of patients to hundreds and their spike sorting is rate-limiting surgica throughput, that is when your spike sorting company becomes valuable. If Merg getting poor signal quality in primate studies and needs better materials, that is your biocompatible coatings company gets acquired. You need intelligence on th development roadmaps to time your approach.

The proof points need to be irrefutable before you start acquisition discussions. Published papers in top venues showing clear performance advantages. Indepen validation from multiple academic labs. Comparison data showing you beat exist methods on metrics the acquirer cares about. Ideally, testimonials from respecte researchers saying your approach is state of the art. Walk into acquisition conversations with overwhelming evidence that your technology is the best solut

The team story is just as important as the technology. Strategic acquirers want te that can integrate smoothly and continue developing the technology post-acquis Your team should have complementary skills to what the acquirer has in-house. Neuralink has hardware engineers but weak on ML, your ML-heavy team is mor attractive. If Merge has neuroscientists but needs manufacturing expertise, your materials and process development team fills a gap.

The integration story needs to be simple and concrete. The acquirer should be a see exactly how your technology drops into their product pipeline. If you built a sorting algorithm, show how it interfaces with their existing data acquisition sys If you built electrode materials, show how they can be incorporated into their cu manufacturing process. Minimize integration friction.

The competitive pressure can be manufactured through careful communication. can get multiple strategic acquirers interested simultaneously, the fear of a competitor acquiring you creates urgency. But this is high-risk because if you pl companies against each other too aggressively, they might all walk away. Better approach is to focus on primary target and have backup options if primary does work out.

The acquihire component should be emphasized because that is often what strat acquirers really want. They are buying the team as much as the technology. Mak clear that key technical people are committed to staying post-acquisition for at l eighteen to twenty-four months. Discuss retention packages during negotiation. that the acquirer is not just getting IP, they are getting the world's best team in t domain.

The pricing justification needs to be based on build-vs-buy analysis. If the strate acquirer would need to hire five engineers for two years at $200K each to build equivalent technology, that is $2M in fully loaded costs plus opportunity cost of delayed product roadmap. Paying $80M to acquire your company and get it immediately is actually cheap. Walk through this math explicitly.

The deal structure might include earnouts or milestones tied to integration succ Strategic acquirers sometimes prefer this because it reduces upfront risk. You m get $60M at close plus $40M if the technology integrates successfully and hits performance targets within twelve months. This aligns incentives and can actual increase total consideration if you are confident in your technology.

The relationship management throughout the process requires careful balancing want to be responsive and helpful during diligence without seeming desperate. Y want to negotiate firmly on valuation without blowing up the deal. You want to maintain momentum without rushing the acquirer into a no. Having an experien M&A advisor or investment banker managing this process is worth the fee.

The bottom line on building an infrastructure component company targeting acquisition by Neuralink or Merge is it requires exceptional technical execution smart positioning, perfect timing, and some luck. But the path to $50M to $150M in two to three years is much more realistic than trying to compete head-to-head multi-billion dollar platform companies. Pick the right infrastructure gap, build absolute best solution in the world, prove it works, and put yourself in front of t strategic acquirer at exactly the moment they need what you have built. That is a viable strategy that plays to startup advantages of focus and speed rather than competing on dimensions where the giants will always win.

2 Likes • 1 Restack

← Previous

Nex

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...