



THE UNREAL RADAR · PLAYBOOK

The Unreal Seller's Pricing Playbook

How to set a price on Fab when the median is \$19.99, everything clusters on .99, and the premium shelf is almost empty — written for sellers, from the real shape of the catalogue.

Playbook

2026-06-13

By Phil, MythicLemon

Catalogue to May 2026

Buyer demand to September 2024

A working pricing guide for Unreal asset sellers: where the prices actually sit, why the number barely moves, where the room to charge more is hiding, and the one rule you can never let yourself forget — price is not sales.

\$19.99

Median price
the anchor the whole
market gravitates to

\$19.99

Most common price
the modal tier —
sellers copy the
default

3.1%

Given away free
of the catalogue, as
of 2026-05

~150%

Unreal vs. elsewhere
typical premium on
assets cross-listed
on two stores

Read this first: price is not sales

I'm Phil, and I run MythicLemon. We sell on Fab too, so everything below is the advice I give myself. Before any of it, the one rule that governs this whole playbook: **a price is a label, not a result**. You can see what something is listed at; you cannot see how many copies it moved. Nobody outside Epic can.

I'm stressing this up front because it's the single most common way sellers — including experienced ones — talk themselves into a bad decision. They see a category full of high prices and conclude it must be lucrative. They see a flood of cheap listings and conclude the floor is collapsing. Neither conclusion is supported by anything you can observe. A \$79.99 listing and a \$4.99 listing tell you what two sellers *hoped* to charge. They tell you nothing about who actually paid.

So read every chart in this guide — and every chart anywhere — as a map of **asking prices**, not earnings. Our figures come from the MythicLemon Marketplace Index, our own compiled dataset. It is honest about price structure as of **2026-05**. It contains no field for units sold or revenue, and we will never pretend otherwise. When this playbook says a price band is 'crowded' or 'empty', it means crowded or empty *with listings* — not with money.

Everything that follows is built on that footing. If you take one thing away, take this: price to position your asset, not to chase a revenue number you cannot see.

The shape of the market: one number, repeated

Here is the landscape you're pricing into. The **median price across the catalogue is \$19.99**, and the **most common single price is also \$19.99**. That coincidence is the whole story: the middle of the market and the default choice are the same number. When a seller doesn't have a strong reason to do otherwise, they reach for \$19.99 — and most sellers don't have a strong reason.

The typical price has barely moved for years, even as the catalogue grew to **79,792 listings** (with **1,754** new in May 2026 alone). That's worth sitting with. Supply has multiplied many times over and the price needle hasn't followed. For a low-consideration, impulse-friendly purchase like a single

asset pack, **being found beats being cheap** — and shaving a few dollars off an already-cheap pack rarely changes whether a buyer reaches for it. It mostly just leaves money on the table.

About **3.1% of the catalogue is free**. Free is a legitimate, deliberate tool — not a failure tier — and I'll come back to how to use it on purpose. The rest of the catalogue is paid, and overwhelmingly bunched in the low-to-mid range around that \$19.99 anchor.

AS OF MAY 2026

The mass of listings sits low and mid; the premium shelf above ~\$50 is thin — read this as where listings live, never as where money lives. How the catalogue spreads across price bands (as of 2026-05).

↗ Live, interactive figure (with downloadable data): <https://www.mythiclemon.com/data/dashboards/pricing>

The .99 gravity well — and the gaps between the pegs

Look closely at where prices actually land and you see hard clustering on **.99 endings**: \$4.99, \$9.99, \$14.99, \$19.99, \$24.99, \$29.99 and so on. These are pegs, and the catalogue snaps to them. Almost nobody prices at \$17.00 or \$23.50; they round to the nearest psychological peg and, more often than not, to \$19.99 specifically.

The practical consequence is the **gaps between the pegs**. Because everyone clusters on the same handful of points, the spaces in between are quiet — and a price like \$24.99 or \$34.99 can stand out simply by not being the default \$19.99 while still reading as 'a normal price'. You don't need to be cheaper than the crowd; you frequently just need to be **legibly positioned** against it.

My advice: stay on the .99 convention — fighting it looks eccentric, not premium — but choose your peg deliberately rather than defaulting. The difference between \$19.99 and \$29.99 is one peg on the ladder, and if your pack genuinely carries more than the median pack, that peg is yours to take.

AS OF MAY 2026

Prices snap to .99 pegs and pile onto \$19.99; the gaps between common pegs are where a deliberately-chosen price gets room to breathe. Sellers cluster hard on .99 price points (as of 2026-05).

↗ Live, interactive figure (with downloadable data): <https://www.mythiclemon.com/data/dashboards/pricing>

The empty premium shelf above ~\$50

Here's the part most sellers walk straight past. Above roughly **\$50**, the catalogue thins out dramatically. The high tiers are nearly empty — not because buyers refuse to pay them, but because few sellers ever try. Remember the iron rule: empty-of-listings is not the same as empty-of-buyers. We can see that almost nobody **lists** up there. We cannot see what **sells** up there, in either direction.

That emptiness is an opportunity for the right product. If you have assembled something genuinely comprehensive — a large, coherent bundle; a complete toolset; a system rather than a single prop — the premium shelf is where you can **anchor higher** without sitting shoulder-to-shoulder with a thousand \$19.99 packs. A \$59.99 or \$79.99 'everything in one place' pack isn't competing in the median scrum at all; it's offering a different kind of purchase (save-me-time, one-decision, studio-grade).

Two honesty checks before you reach for the high shelf. First, the price has to be **earned** by scope and finish, not asserted — a thin pack at \$79.99 just looks mispriced, and your store page has to carry the weight (more on presentation below). Second, I genuinely cannot tell you the premium shelf converts, because there is no sales data to tell anyone that. What I can tell you is that the shelf is **uncrowded**, that anchoring high is a legitimate strategy the catalogue is leaving on the table, and that you should treat a premium listing as a deliberate experiment you watch, not a guaranteed win.

The cross-marketplace premium: you have more room than you think

One more structural fact that should change how you price. Across **2,260 assets that are cross-listed on two storefronts**, the Unreal listing is typically about **150% more expensive than the same asset elsewhere**. Same files, same creator — markedly higher price on the Unreal side.

Read carefully. This is **not** me telling you to gouge, and it is **not** evidence that the higher price earns more (again: no sales field, ever). What it tells you is that the Unreal marketplace already sustains a meaningfully higher price level than adjacent 3D-asset stores, and that buyers here are not shopping purely on lowest-number. The Unreal buyer is often buying **integration** — a pack that drops cleanly into UE5, behaves, and saves engine-specific work — and that's worth more to them than a raw mesh on a generic store.

The takeaway for your own pricing: if you've been benchmarking against generic 3D-asset prices and pricing timidly to match, you're probably leaving the Unreal premium on the table. Price for the value of Unreal-native, ready-to-use integration — not for the lowest comparable file you can find on another store. (For the wider context, adjacent 3D-asset publishing looks to be cooling and past its peak as of 2026-05 — another reason to lean into what's specifically valuable about being Unreal-native rather than racing a softening generic market to the bottom.)

AS OF MAY 2026

Cross-listed Unreal assets carry a typical ~150% premium — the Unreal market sustains higher prices; this measures asking prices, not earnings. Price of the same asset, Unreal listing vs. the other store (as of 2026-05).

↗ Live, interactive figure (with downloadable data): <https://www.mythiclemon.com/data/dashboards/cross-marketplace>

A price-band map (qualitative — choose by what your pack IS)

Use the table below as a positioning map, not a calculator. The bands are deliberately described by *what tends to live there* and *when to use them*, with the canonical anchors (\$19.99 median/modal, free at 3.1%, the thin premium shelf above ~\$50) marked. I have not put listing counts on the bands and you shouldn't either — invented per-band counts are exactly the kind of false precision this playbook exists to prevent.

Find the row that matches what your asset honestly *is* — its scope, finish and how much engine-specific work it saves — and let that, not a revenue fantasy, pick your peg. Then read the do/don't list that follows before you commit.

Do / Don't

The short version of everything above, as rules you can apply in the five minutes before you publish.

- ✓ DO price to position: match your peg to your pack's real scope and finish, not to a sales figure you cannot see.
- ✓ DO stay on the .99 convention, but choose your peg on purpose instead of defaulting to \$19.99 because everyone else did.
- ✓ DO consider the empty premium shelf (above ~\$50) for genuinely comprehensive bundles or complete toolsets — anchor where you're not in the median scrum.
- ✓ DO lean into the Unreal premium: price for ready-to-use, engine-native integration, not for the cheapest comparable file on a generic store.
- ✓ DO use free (the 3.1%) deliberately — as a funnel, a sample, or a reputation play — never as a panic reaction.
- ✓ DO make the store page earn the price: video, clear scope, honest screenshots. A higher peg needs the page to carry it.
- ✓ DON'T ever read price as sales or revenue. We cannot see units sold; neither can you. Say it to yourself before every pricing decision.
- ✓ DON'T assume a high-priced category is lucrative or a cheap one is dying — both are asking-price signals, nothing more.
- ✓ DON'T race to the bottom on an already-cheap pack: for impulse purchases, being found beats being a dollar cheaper.
- ✓ DON'T slap a premium price on a thin pack — an unearned high peg reads as mispriced, not prestigious.
- ✓ DON'T treat a young, quiet category as proof a price won't work — recent assets are quiet because our demand data froze in 2024-09, not because buyers said no.

If you reference demand, stamp it: a freeze, not a verdict

This is a pricing playbook, so it's built on supply-side structure that's honest as of **2026-05**. But sellers always, reasonably, want to fold demand into a price decision — 'are people even asking about this kind of thing?' If you do, you must handle one trap carefully.

Our demand signals — buyer questions, reviews, ratings — are **frozen at September 2024**. They are not current and must never be extrapolated forward. The proxy we use for interest is **buyer questions per listing**; there is no unit-sales number hiding behind it. Crucially, roughly **45% of the catalogue was released after that freeze and therefore shows zero questions or reviews — because the data stopped, not because those assets failed**. A quiet, young category is not a dying one. Don't let a frozen 'nobody's asking' reading scare you out of a fair price on a fresh product, and don't price a recent niche as if it's saturated when all you're really seeing is a freeze.

Used with that caution, the frozen demand map is still instructive for pricing: it's where the marketplace's signature 'demand inverts supply' pattern lives — sellers crowd into 3D models (57.1% of the catalogue) where buyers historically asked the **least** (~2.5 questions per listing), while templates and tools were thin in supply yet the most asked-about (game templates ~43 questions per listing, around 17x the 3D-model rate, all frozen 2024-09). The pricing lesson isn't to copy those old numbers into a spreadsheet — it's that scarcity-plus-interest is exactly the profile that earns a higher peg, and ubiquity is exactly what gets price-compressed. Position accordingly, and stamp the date whenever you cite it.

The pricing-band map

Band	What tends to live here	When to price here
Free	Samples, taster packs, lead-ins, reputation/community plays — about 3.1% of the catalogue.	Deliberately: to seed a series, build a following, or offer a sample that points at a paid pack. Never as a panic move.
Entry (~\$4.99–\$9.99)	Small, single-purpose assets: one prop, one material set, a tiny utility.	When the pack is genuinely small and the goal is volume and low-friction impulse buys. Don't undercut here — you're already cheap.
Median core (~\$14.99–\$24.99)	The heart of the catalogue, anchored on \$19.99 — solid single packs of normal scope.	The safe default for a competent, normal-sized pack. Pick a peg above \$19.99 if your scope clearly beats the median pack; don't default blindly.
Upper-mid (~\$29.99–\$49.99)	Larger packs, small bundles, capable tools — above the default scrum but below the premium shelf.	When your pack is meaningfully bigger or more capable than the median and you want to read as a step up without leaving 'normal price' territory.

Band	What tends to live here	When to price here
Premium shelf (~\$50+)	Comprehensive bundles, complete toolsets, systems rather than single assets — and the catalogue is thin up here.	When scope and finish genuinely earn it. Anchor high to escape the median scrum — but treat it as a watched experiment and make the store page carry the price.

Qualitative positioning bands, not a count. Anchors are canonical (median & modal \$19.99; 3.1% free; premium shelf above ~\$50 is thin), all as of 2026-05. These describe asking prices and what tends to occupy each band — never sales or revenue, which are not observable.

FAQ

Can these figures tell me which price makes the most money?

No — and be very wary of anyone who says theirs can. Our dataset (the MythicLemon Marketplace Index) records asking prices and catalogue structure as of 2026-05. It has no field for units sold or revenue. Every chart here maps where listings sit, not where money flows. Price to position your pack; you cannot price by a sales number nobody can see.

Should I just price at \$19.99 like everyone else?

It's the median and the modal price, so it's a defensible default for a normal-sized, competent pack — but defaulting to it without thinking is the most common pricing mistake. If your pack clearly carries more scope or finish than the median pack, step up a peg (\$24.99, \$29.99). The gaps between common .99 points are where a deliberately-chosen price stands out.

Is the premium shelf above \$50 worth trying?

It's the least-crowded part of the catalogue, which makes it a legitimate place to anchor a genuinely comprehensive bundle or complete toolset away from the \$19.99 scrum. But two honest caveats: the price has to be earned by real scope and a store page that carries it, and I can't promise it converts — there's no sales data for anyone to make that promise from. Treat a premium listing as a deliberate experiment you watch, not a sure thing.

Cross-listed Unreal assets are ~150% dearer elsewhere — does that mean I should hike my price?

It means the Unreal market sustains a higher price level than adjacent generic 3D-asset stores, because buyers here are paying for engine-native, ready-to-integrate work — not just for files. So don't price timidly by benchmarking against the cheapest generic comparable. It does NOT mean a higher price earns more; that 150% is an asking-price gap, not an earnings gap (there is no earnings data).

A category looks quiet — does that mean a price won't sell there?

Not necessarily, and this is a real trap. Our demand signals are frozen at September 2024, and about 45% of the catalogue was released after that — so it shows zero questions or reviews because the data stopped, not

because buyers rejected it. A young, quiet niche is not a dying one. Don't let a frozen 'nobody's asking' reading talk you out of a fair price on a fresh product.

Why has the typical price barely moved while the catalogue exploded?

Because a single asset pack is a low-consideration, impulse-friendly purchase: for the buyer, being found and being trusted matter more than being a dollar cheaper. With supply now at 79,792 listings, discoverability and presentation move the needle far more than shaving the price of something that's already inexpensive. That's why this playbook pushes positioning over discounting.

HOW TO CITE

MythicLemon, "The Unreal Seller's Pricing Playbook" (2026-06-13). The Unreal Radar.
<https://www.mythiclemon.com/radar/reports/unreal-seller-pricing-playbook-2026>