

Beyond Rankings: Exploring the Impact of SERP Features on Organic Click-through Rates

Erik Fubel*, Niclas Michael Groll*, Patrick Gundlach*, Qiwei Han*, Maximilian Kaiser†

*Nova School of Business and Economics, Carcavelos, Portugal

{49155, 48699, 49594, qiwei.han}@novasbe.pt

†Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

maximilian.kaiser@uni-hamburg.de

Abstract—Search Engine Result Pages (SERPs) serve as the digital gateways to the vast expanse of the internet. Past decades have witnessed a surge in research primarily centered on the influence of website ranking on these pages, to determine the click-through rate (CTR). However, during this period, the landscape of SERPs has undergone a dramatic evolution: SERP features, encompassing elements such as knowledge panels, media galleries, FAQs, and more, have emerged as an increasingly prominent facet of these result pages. Our study examines the crucial role of these features, revealing them to be not merely aesthetic components, but strongly influence CTR and the associated behavior of internet users. We demonstrate how these features can significantly modulate web traffic, either amplifying or attenuating it. We dissect these intricate interaction effects leveraging a unique dataset of 67,000 keywords and their respective Google SERPs, spanning over 40 distinct US-based e-commerce domains, generating over 6 million clicks from 24 million views. This cross-website dataset, unprecedented in its scope, enables us to assess the impact of 24 different SERP features on organic CTR. Through an ablation study modeling CTR, we illustrate the incremental predictive power these features hold.

Index Terms—SERP features, Click-through rates prediction, Organic search

I. INTRODUCTION

Search Engine Optimization (SEO) is a strategic process used in online marketing with the aim of

*Note: these authors contributed equally to this work and shared first authorship

enhancing a website’s visibility in search engine results pages (SERPs). The objective is to attract the highest possible volume of organic traffic to a website, which is a cornerstone strategy for long-standing online marketing [1]. In the realm of e-commerce, it’s estimated that 33% of total web traffic originates from organic search results [2]. Organic traffic encompasses those instances where a user inputs a keyword in a search engine and lands on a website by clicking on one of the non-ad results. Given the high relevance of organic traffic, it is crucial for website providers to optimize their strategies to maximize the likelihood of generating clicks through search engines. Generally, the clicks to a website on a search result page for a specific keyword can be formulated as follows:

$$Clicks = Impressions * CTR \quad (1)$$

where CTR refers to the click-through rate of a result [3]. To enhance the CTR, SEO efforts usually center on a website’s rank on a result page, as top-ranked websites command more user attention and consequently receive more clicks [4]. To secure a high rank on a result page, a website needs to demonstrate relevance for the particular keyword. Achieving this typically involves aligning a website’s content and metadata with the keyword, a focus for many SEO practitioners [5]–[10].

Although introduced in the early 2000s, *SERP features* — a visually prominent component of

search results—have been heavily utilized by Google since the mid-2010s [11]. These SERP features are elements that encapsulate information from organic search results with the intent of making Google’s result pages more engaging [12]. They can take various forms, such as providing an instant answer to a user’s question, displaying a knowledge panel on the right of the result page, or including an image alongside a result [13]. Figure 1 provides an illustration of SERP features.



Fig. 1. Exemplification of SERP features on a Google result page adapted from [14], between organic results (1) and (3), such as answer box (2), video results (4), knowledge panel (5), among others.

Introducing these visual elements can significantly influence users’ clicking decisions, thus impacting CTR and the revenue funneling into e-commerce websites. Some argue that by integrating additional features into its result pages and leveraging information originally published on third-party websites, Google reduces users’ need to leave its ecosystem [15]. This could potentially disadvantage

the publishers of the original information who rely on website traffic. In contrast, Google asserts that inclusion in SERP features can significantly boost CTR, visits, and time spent on a website [12]. Despite the increasing prevalence of SERP features, their precise impact on CTR remains poorly understood. This gap in our knowledge raises an important research question: **To what extent do SERP features influence CTR, and how does their presence affect the importance of a website’s ranking position?**

In this study, we broaden the existing analysis of the influence of a website’s ranking position, which has been identified as the main direct influence on CTR, to include the characteristics of SERP features. This inclusion of SERP feature characteristics presents a novel aspect of CTR research. Furthermore, we compare the relative importance of SERP features with other result page characteristics.

This paper is structured as follows: Section II offers a comprehensive review of related works on the influences on CTR, including research on SERP features and CTR prediction models. Section III and IV provide detailed descriptions of the dataset used in this study and the methodology applied, respectively. Section V presents an exploratory data analysis of the interactions between SERP features, CTR, and other features. In Section VI, we investigate the importance of SERP features by examining their predictive power. Finally, Section VIII provides a discussion of the findings and concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORKS

A. Determinants of CTR

Search engine optimization (SEO) is one of the most widely adopted online advertising strategies in the present day, and it plays a crucial role in driving organic website traffic [10], [16]. A significant body of research in the field of SEO marketing has identified the ranking position of a website on a search engine results page (SERP) as the primary determinant of click-through rates (CTR), making it a central focus of SEO efforts [5]–[10]. SEO strategies aim to elevate the rank of a website by meticulously tailoring its content to align with specific keywords. This might involve adding new,

high-quality blog posts to improve the relevance of the website to search engines [9]. Other factors such as keyword characteristics or result characteristics have been studied predominantly for their impact on the position of a website in search results, and less so for their direct influence on CTR [17]. For instance, much of the literature on keywords aims to identify strong keywords and trends and recommends optimal keyword characteristics, content adaptation, linkage optimization, or structure adjustment to achieve higher rankings on search engine result pages [18]–[21]. While the position of a website has been widely recognized as the primary driver of CTR, it is equally important to consider additional characteristics such as result, keyword, and SERP features that directly influence CTR.

B. SERP Features

Although Google introduced the first SERP feature as early as 2002, it was not until the mid-2010s that their usage intensified [13]. Today, SERP features are among the most conspicuous and widely used elements on search engine result pages. Oliveira and Teixeira Lopes provide a comprehensive overview of the evolution of SERP features on Google Search and Microsoft Bing, noting that these features have become more common and diverse, aggregating content from different verticals and providing more features that give direct answers [13]. However, critics argue that Google’s addition of more SERP features and use of information originally published on third-party websites has reduced the need for users to leave Google’s ecosystem, thereby disadvantaging the publishers of the original information who depend on traffic to their websites. According to a Semrush study, zero-click searches, where a user does not leave Google’s ecosystem, account for 25.6% of all searches [15].

Despite the long-standing existence of SERP features and their visual dominance on search engine result pages, their influence on user behavior has only been sporadically studied. For instance, one study analyzes the positive effect on CTR when a website appears in the featured snippet, but this analysis relies on information found on blogs from influential SEO companies [22]. Numerous influ-

ential marketing blogs tout the benefits of appearing in SERP features, with many suggesting that SERP features can enhance the visibility of websites featured in them and reduce the CTR of websites that appear alongside SERP features without being featured [14], [23], [24]. Google advertises significant improvements in click-through rate, visits, and time spent on websites when websites are chosen to be shown in SERP features [12]. Despite these claims, the actual effect of SERP features on CTR remains largely unexplored and under-theorized. This gap in the literature indicates that there is significant potential for this work to illuminate the opaque role of SERP features in Google’s search engine ecosystem and provide the first empirical research on the SERP features’ impact on website performance [24].

C. CTR Prediction Models

Generally, CTR prediction research has largely been concerned with binary classification problems, asking questions such as “Will user X click on item Y?” The items under consideration are typically ads on a search engine result page, but they can also be articles in an online shop [25]. This approach differs fundamentally from the problem formulation in this work, which treats CTR prediction as a regression problem, predicting a continuous value based on aggregated data, as opposed to making a classification for a single observation. This difference is also reflected in the nature of the datasets and models used for classification. Datasets consisting of individual users and items are often highly sparse and high-dimensional after one-hot encoding [25], [26]. As a result, the research and the resulting models have been developed to handle this high dimensionality and sparsity [26].

The field of CTR prediction has seen the development of a range of models, including multivariate statistical models [27], [28], factorization machines and field-aware factorization machines [29]–[31], and combinations of deep learning models and factorization machines [32]–[37]. Yang provides a detailed overview of CTR prediction in the context of user-item interactions [25]. However, these models, which were developed for classification on

sparse ad-click datasets, are not suitable candidates for predicting aggregated organic CTR (see section IV-A). While recent research has focused on predicting user-item interactions, to our knowledge, only one work has proposed a model for predicting aggregated CTR [38]. However, this work is concerned with the prediction of ad CTR rather than organic results.

To summarize, although a substantial body of literature exists on CTR prediction, these works differ from the problem at hand in terms of the nature of prediction (individual vs. aggregated) and the type of clicks (organic results vs. ads). This suggests that the models proposed in these works may not be directly well-suited to the prediction problem in our study, especially in light of understanding the importance of SERP features.

III. DATASET DESCRIPTION

A. Data Acquisition and Preprocessing

The primary dataset employed for this study was provided by Grips, a German startup that endeavors to generate a comprehensive map of online commerce for retailers and brands [39]. The dataset is an aggregation of historical Google search data, specifically gathered from US-based desktop searches during the period spanning May 31st, 2022, to August 18th, 2022. With more than 24 million views and over 6 million user clicks on search engine result pages, the dataset presents an extensive source of information. The data has been collected across approximately 67,000 distinct search terms, commonly referred to as keywords, and 43 different e-commerce stores representing a broad array of industries.

Each data point in the dataset provides insight about a specific URL and keyword, encapsulating metrics related to the performance of the URL for the corresponding keyword. To illustrate, the data could reflect metrics pertinent to the performance of the URL 'www.amazon.com/' for the searched keyword 'amazon'. Thus, the data is presented in a tabular, heterogeneous format.

The primary dataset was further enhanced with additional features derived from a leading search engine marketing company and Google's Keyword

Planner. These features encompass a diverse range of aspects, from the searched keyword and metadata about the result page to information specific to the result and the displayed SERP features. The dataset also includes the click-through rate for each result. In its raw form, the dataset comprises 70 features, among which is information about the presence of 24 distinct SERP features (see the source of each feature in appendix A). The dataset also provides granular data about which specific result was included in which SERP feature. As such, given its extensive set of result page features, which encompass real-world, non-publicly accessible data for numerous e-commerce stores, this dataset represents a unique and innovative resource for research.

In order to prepare the data for subsequent analysis and modeling, the guidelines for data preprocessing as outlined by Google adhered to [40], [41]. To reduce the potential for noise in the data due to the observations of result pages that received minimal user exposure, an impression threshold of 20 impressions per result was imposed. As a result, 58,898 data entries remain for analysis.

B. Feature Categorization and Engineering

To facilitate a comprehensive comparison of the impact of SERP features on CTR, in relation to other characteristics of the result page, the variables within the dataset were divided into three distinct categories or subsets: *Position*, *Keyword*, and *SERP features*. Moreover, self-generated features were incorporated, where relevant, to augment these subsets. These engineered feature subsets are employed in both the overall data analysis and the modeling process. A brief overview of these subsets is provided below. For a comprehensive list of features within each subset, please see appendix B, and for a detailed description of all features, please refer to the data dictionary in appendix A.

- **Position:** This subset includes features that are explicitly related to the ranked position of the result. These features encompass the current result position at the time of measurement, the monthly average position, and the positional difference from the previous measurement. While the position subset is treated as

a distinct subset in the subsequent analysis, it is crucial to acknowledge that the position feature plays a pivotal role in addressing the problem at hand. As emphasized by the literature review and the findings of this study, the position is the most significant predictor of CTR. Therefore, the analysis will be conducted using an ablation study approach, using the position subset as a baseline and incorporating the additional subsets as components to assess their relative importance beyond that of position.

- **Keywords:** This subset comprises the keyword itself and all directly resulting elements from the keyword a user inputs into the search engine. This includes details about the keyword, such as the length of the keyword, information indirectly related to that keyword like the level of competition or the search volume, and finally, the search intent. To provide a numerical representation of the complexity of each keyword, the Flesch reading ease score was computed [42]. Although more recent readability measures have been developed, Flesch’s reading ease score was chosen for its widespread acceptance and straightforward interpretability. This score is calculated based on the average number of words per sentence and the average number of syllables per word. A high score signifies good readability, typically characterized by short sentences and words.
- **SERP features:** The SERP features in the dataset are binary features that denote for each entry whether a specific SERP feature is present (1) or absent (0). These features can be further divided into page SERP features and positional SERP features. Page SERP features indicate whether a certain feature is present anywhere on the page. In contrast, positional SERP features specify whether a result is included in a particular SERP feature. This can manifest in various forms. For instance, a Review could be displayed beneath a URL, or a Snippet from the URL could be featured in the Knowledge Panel. Consequently, if a positional SERP feature is present, the correspond-

ing page SERP feature must also be present, although the converse is not necessarily true. Page SERP features also include details about the type of ads displayed on a result page. We have consolidated this information into a binary feature that describes whether ads are shown. To enhance the interpretability of the dataset, it was further enriched with the total count of SERP features for both page and positional features.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Examined Models

This research treats the task of predicting Click-Through Rates (CTR) as a regression problem. Based on a review of relevant literature and the characteristics of the dataset at hand, three primary categories of off-the-shelf regression models were chosen for examination: linear regression models and tree-based models, and neural network models.

Linear regression models are favored for their computational efficiency and interpretability. Ordinary least squares regression (OLS) was chosen as a baseline model, given its statistical robustness and popularity in the field. To account for potential feature interactions, an adapted version of the OLS model was utilized, incorporating interactions between two features as the product of their values (Poly2). However, to control the exponential growth in the number of features, only interactions between two features with a Pearson correlation coefficient greater than 0.05 in the training dataset were included in the model. A Ridge regression model was introduced as a third variant to address potential overfitting. The Ridge model employs L2-Norm for implicit feature selection.

Tree-based models were the second category selected, specifically, ensemble models based on decision trees. These models are advantageous as they do not require specific data distributions and perform swiftly without preprocessing while being capable of modeling feature interactions. The top three performing tree-based models for tabular data from a recent comparative benchmark—Random Forest, Gradient Boosting Decision Trees (GBDT), and XGBoost—were tested, along with CatBoost,

another tree-based model that has shown strong performance in recent studies.

The third category included neural network regression models. While Deep Neural Networks (DNN) have shown outstanding performance with homogeneous data types like images, audio, and text, they have been less successful with heterogeneous, tabular data [43] in comparison to tree-based models. However, other study reports that DNNs can match or even surpass the performance of traditional machine learning models on tabular data with over 10 million samples [44]. Given that some of the best-performing models in recent CTR prediction research incorporate neural networks, this study also tests TabNet [45], a neural network structure specifically designed for tabular data, as well as Wide&Deep [33] and DeepFM [34], which are recommended by recent CTR prediction research.

B. Subset Combinations

To assess the predictive power of each subset, combinations of subsets were tested using the selected models. Drawing from both the literature review in section II, the position subset, highlighted in the literature review and our analysis as the most significant feature, serves as the baseline for an ablation study. When testing a model on a subset combination, all features from the combined subsets are utilized for prediction. The position subset is consistently included, with the other subsets added incrementally.

Initially, the position subset is individually combined with each of the other subsets to evaluate the additional predictive power contributed by each subset. Subsequently, the predictive power of all three subsets combined—position, keyword, and SERP features—is examined to understand their collective impact. Consequently, four subset combinations are tested on each model presented in IV-A. To maximize the potential of each model, hyperparameter tuning was conducted where reasonable. Please find the full documentation on tested parameter ranges in appendix C and the resulting parameters in appendix D.

C. Evaluation Metric

A common evaluation metric, the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE), is employed for a comparative analysis of the different feature subsets across models, as defined in the equation:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2} \quad (2)$$

This metric effectively penalizes larger errors, which aligns with the objectives of the present business case where substantial errors can lead to significant misallocations of SEO resources. Moreover, the RMSE serves as a convenient optimization metric across all model categories, offering advantages over alternative metrics like Mean Absolute Error (MAE).

D. Feature Importance Evaluation

To evaluate the significance of SERP features in predicting CTR and to compare them with position and keyword characteristics, this research employs model interpretation techniques. These techniques assign importance values to features in a machine learning model. A high importance value indicates a greater impact on the overall prediction compared to a feature with a lower importance value. By grouping features into subsets as described earlier, we can examine the collective importance of SERP features in relation to position and keyword features. The XGBoost model is utilized for assessing the feature importance, as it has shown superior performance.

Three techniques were employed: SHAP, permutation importance, and average gain in XGBoost splits. These were chosen for two reasons: their ability to compare the global relevance of features for the prediction and their effectiveness in providing a more holistic conclusion when used together. They also serve as a way to cross-check the results.

SHAP importances are based on Shapley explanations, a game-theoretic approach that assigns individual features a share of an aggregated outcome [46]. It measures the average contribution of a feature to the prediction across all observations [47], [48]. Permutation importance is calculated by randomly shuffling each feature and measuring the decrease in a model’s performance caused by

the permutation [49]. Features that cause a large decrease in performance when shuffled are ones that the model heavily relies on to make predictions [48]. The average gain in XGBoost’s tree splits is calculated based on the intrinsic structure of the XGBoost model by averaging the improvement of the loss function in all splits in a feature is used [50]. According to the gain metric, features with a larger average contribution to reducing the loss function are more relevant for the overall prediction.

V. EXPLORATORY DATA ANALYSIS (EDA)

A. *The Broad Impact of SERP Features*

The first stage of this study’s exploration involves a high-level analysis of the influence of SERP features on CTR. A notable trend is observed when the count of positional SERP features, those attached to a single result, increases. This trend shows a positive correlation with CTR ($\rho = 0.22$). However, an increase in the number of page SERP features appearing on the entire results page doesn’t exhibit a similarly clear trend ($\rho = -0.11$), suggesting a potential negative influence on CTR. This overall negative trend, albeit slight, can be better understood by differentiating the unique SERP features, thereby illuminating the individual drivers of this influence illustrated in Figure 2).

The data suggest that the presence of most SERP features correlates negatively with CTR. This implies that businesses aiming to optimize their search engine performance should potentially focus on keywords associated with fewer SERP features. However, the dataset indicates that SERP features are almost ubiquitous, with 99.8% of the result pages showcasing at least one SERP feature and the majority displaying between four and six features. Given this prevalence, it becomes essential for website providers to comprehend the specific effects and dynamics of individual SERP features, especially those that could enhance their CTR. The impact of appearing in certain SERP features will be further examined in section V-C.

B. *Variations in Effects Across Positions*

The general analysis in section V-A revealed a negative overall influence of the presence of SERP

features on CTR. However, when incorporating the position of a result as an additional variable, intriguing trends emerge. For some SERP features, the average CTR per position remains relatively unaffected by the presence of the SERP feature. For others, the presence significantly influences the average CTR. Two primary patterns are observable: with the presence of a SERP feature, either the average CTR declines across all positions (pattern: ‘Lower’), or the average CTR decreases for the initial three positions and then increases for subsequent positions (pattern: ‘Lower \rightarrow Higher’). Figure 3 exemplifies these patterns and lists the SERP features to which they apply.

The reasons for the emergence of these patterns for specific SERP features aren’t immediately evident. Nonetheless, it’s worth noting that certain features have a considerable correlation with user intents. For instance, the presence of Image SERP features is strongly correlated with transactional search intent ($\rho = 0.29$). Therefore, while interpreting these results, it is crucial to bear in mind that the observed effects might be influenced by other feature categories, such as the search intents.

While it is a well-established notion that a high-ranking position is vital for maximizing CTR, the detailed investigation into the impact of SERP features prompts the question of whether the importance of top-ranking positions varies in different scenarios. As discussed above, the effects of individual SERP features have been isolated for analysis. However, in real-world situations, SERP features often appear concurrently, which likely leads to inter-feature influence. To account for this, we examine the importance of positions for each combination of page SERP features. For a more comprehensive comparison, the CTR is normalized to the average value at the first position for each combination that appears more than 200 times. Subsequently, the rate of decay for each subsequent position is calculated. The analysis reveals that patterns identified for individual SERP features persist across combinations of them. Among the top three combinations by count, two show a faster decay in CTR, while the other decays much slower compared to the entire dataset. For instance, the presence of




Fig. 2. Correlation of SERP features with CTR when they are generally present on a result page. The color represents the strength of the effect: dark red refers to a strong negative correlation while dark green refers to a strong positive correlation.




Fig. 3. Mean CTR per position if a SERP feature is present (1) compared to when it is not present (0). The left plot shows the pattern ‘Lower’ and the right plot pattern ‘Lower → Higher’. SERP features without a clear pattern or $n < 1000$ are not listed.




Fig. 4. Loss in CTR per position. Values are the average CTR loss for each position in the percentage of average CTR on position 1. Only combinations with more than 200 occurrences are considered ($n=59$). Dashed lines represent the top three most frequent SERP feature combinations. Shaded areas represent the range in which 50% and 90% of all values fall.

three different SERP features can double the CTR at the third position, as demonstrated by the contrast between the green and blue combinations in Figure 4.

C. Differential Impact of SERP Features on Included and Excluded Results

Sections V-A and V-B established that SERP features significantly affect consumer click behavior on search result pages. Initially, the investigation of SERP features was conducted at the page level, evaluating their overarching impact on all results on a page. However, it is critical to acknowledge that SERP features are not merely passive elements on a page; they actively link to some of the websites listed on the results page, thereby directly contributing to the CTR of those specific results.

To gain a comprehensive understanding of SERP features’ impact, it becomes imperative to differentiate between their influence on results they link and those they do not. An illustrative example can be derived from analyzing images shown next to a result. We need to differentiate between (i) the effect the image has on the result it is linked with and (ii) the effect on a result that does not have an accompanying image, while others do. This differentiation warrants the introduction of a new set of feature categories, encapsulating whether a result is displayed within a SERP feature (termed as “Result in feature”) or not included within the SERP feature (“Result not in feature”). For

example, the general trend observed in Figure 2, which indicates a negative correlation, encapsulates the effect of SERP features without considering whether the results are included within them or not. A more nuanced understanding can be obtained by differentiating these two possibilities.

Figure 5 underscore the divergent effects between the two categories. Not being included in most SERP features negatively affects the CTR, while being included within a feature generally increases the CTR. This dichotomy prompts an investigation into what makes clicking on links within SERP features attractive to users, and how website providers can leverage this to their advantage. One noteworthy pattern emerges from the analysis of the Image Pack feature. This feature, representing a collection of images on the results page, exhibits a negative correlation ($\rho = -0.3$) with CTR when a result is not included. Conversely, when a result is part of the Image Pack, the correlation with CTR is positive ($\rho = 0.25$). The SERP feature, "People Also Ask", exhibits a similar pattern, albeit with a less pronounced magnitude.

Further analysis reveals that the presence of SERP features tends to negatively influence the CTR of the first position, regardless of whether the result is included within the SERP feature. The positive effect of "Result in feature", as seen in Figure 5, only becomes evident from the second position onward. In contrast, the effect of "Result not in feature" remains negative across all positions.

In conclusion, SERP features can have varying impacts on the CTR depending on the position of a result, regardless of whether the result is included within them. Results in the first position are particularly susceptible to decreased CTR due to increased SERP features. For results in lower positions, being featured within SERP features tends to be beneficial, while not being included in SERP features can adversely affect a result's CTR.

VI. EVALUATION AND INTERPRETATION OF MODEL RESULTS

A. Comparative Analysis of Models

Table I presents a comprehensive performance breakdown of each model and subset combination,

forming the basis of our analysis in this section. In the evaluation of the model performance, a conspicuous trend surfaces. Tree-based models consistently outperform linear models and neural networks. In particular, GBDT and its variants, such as CatBoost and XGBoost, produce the most impressive results. To better understand the reduction in RMSE and the importance of the features, we decided to concentrate on a single model best suited to address the problem in question. This approach ensures that our interpretations are not skewed by outliers from models that perform poorly or are unsuitable. Because both CatBoost and XGBoost perform equally well, we use XGBoost for further analysis due to its widespread recognition and familiarity in the field.

B. Assessing the Explanatory Power of Feature Subsets

By running the models on various combinations of feature subsets, we can assess the explanatory power of each subset and infer their overall relevance for CTR prediction. When evaluating the improvement in RMSE resulting from the inclusion of additional feature subsets, we focus primarily on the results from XGBoost. To further validate these comparisons, we also conduct paired t-tests on the results of the top five models on average. This allows us to determine if the observed differences in RMSE across feature subsets are statistically significant. We observe that RMSE scores improve upon the addition of other subsets to the position subset. Notably, the inclusion of the keyword subset results in a significant reduction in RMSE (-22.6%). This subset demonstrates a greater explanatory power than the SERP features subset, which further improves the RMSE (-9.8%). When SERP features are added to the position + keyword combination, which was previously the best, there is an additional improvement in prediction (-4.9%). All these differences are statistically significant according to the paired t-test.

Collectively, these findings suggest that all feature subsets are valuable, as they decrease error when added and enhance the baseline model that solely relies on the position feature. Consequently, we can deduce that the additional SERP features




Fig. 5. Correlation of SERP features with CTR differentiating between "Result in feature" and "Result not in feature". For some features, not enough results were included, which is why there are more features in the "Result not in feature" category than "Result in feature".

RMSE of subset combinations

Model	Position	Position + Keyword	Position + SERP Feat	Position + Keyword + SERP Feat
OLS	0.153	0.145	0.145	0.137
Poly2	0.143	0.129	0.131	0.122
Ridge	0.152	0.144	0.144	0.137
Random Forest	0.137	0.108	0.120	0.100
GBDT	<u>0.134</u>	0.109	0.122	0.108
XGBoost	0.133	0.104	0.120	0.098
CatBoost	<u>0.134</u>	0.103	0.120	<u>0.099</u>
TabNet	0.137	0.121	0.130	0.118
Wide&Deep	0.137	0.123	0.152	0.128
DeepFM	0.136	0.135	0.137	0.133

TABLE I

BENCHMARK RESULTS ON DIFFERENT FEATURE SUBSETS. THE TOP RESULTS FOR EACH FEATURE SUBSET ARE **BOLD**. WE ALSO UNDERLINE THE SECOND-BEST RESULTS.

do have an impact on CTR and, by extension, user behavior. The larger reduction in RMSE for the keyword subset compared to the SERP feature subset indicates that they have a more pronounced effect on CTRs. However, this observation is merely indicative, as the importances of the features are not quantified from the perspective of the model. The next section provides a quantification of feature importances.

C. Assessing the Importances of Features

To evaluate the relevance of the feature subsets defined in section IV-B, we applied three different metrics: gain, permutation importance, and SHAP importance. Table II presents the comparison of

feature subset importance as per different measures, and corroborates our previous findings. The position subset consistently demonstrates the highest importance score across all metrics, followed by the keyword and SERP feature subsets. Regarding attributing feature importances, SHAP importance offers the most balanced perspective, with all subsets having an importance value between 28.9% and 36.7%. In contrast, permutation importance presents the most variance, with the 'position' subset receiving 55.9% and 'SERP features' only 16.2%.

This difference can be explained by the methodology underlying each calculation. Both permutation importance and average gain rely heavily on RMSE as an evaluation metric, which tends

Feature Subset	Importance Measure		
	Gain	Permutation Importance	SHAP Importance
Position	44.7%	55.9%	36.7%
Keyword	35.9%	27.9%	34.4%
SERP Features	19.3%	16.2%	28.9%

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF FEATURE SUBSET IMPORTANCE AS PER
DIFFERENT MEASURES

to penalize large deviations disproportionately. For instance, the 'position' feature, which has a major impact and sets a range of plausible CTR values, will be greatly affected by permutations. To illustrate, a permutation of the 'position' feature from 1 to 10 would yield a significantly different range of expectable CTRs compared to permuting the presence of a single SERP feature, which would have a much smaller impact on RMSE.

Nonetheless, the interpretation of SHAP values indicates that, on average, SERP features contribute to 28.9% of the difference between a given prediction and the average prediction, suggesting that SERP features may have a greater significance for CTR than previously assumed. These findings, which are both data and model-driven, highlight the need for further research that could delve into the behavior of individual users and explore the significance of SERP features for non-e-commerce searches.

VII. DISCUSSION

A. Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to the knowledge of search engine optimization (SEO) practices by comparing the influence exerted by ranked positions, keyword-related characteristics, and SERP features on CTR. Our findings not only confirm the widely accepted view that the ranking position of a search engine page result greatly influences its click-through rate (CTR) but also reveal that other SERP characteristics — such as the presence of specific SERP features, the nature of the searched keyword — can considerably affect CTR.

Our analysis, which encompasses a vast array of relevant SERP characteristics, is facilitated by an extensive and novel dataset that surpasses previous studies in its scope and comprehensiveness. This study also marks the first attempt to incorporate many diverse SERP features into a single analytical framework, thereby expanding upon existing research that typically only assesses the impact of individual SERP features. Furthermore, this research provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of various off-the-shelf machine learning models for predicting aggregated CTR. Notably, we demonstrate that easily applicable tree-based models can outperform state-of-the-art CTR prediction models.

B. Implications for Practitioners

The findings from this study hold significant implications for SEO practitioners. While securing a high ranking remains a crucial optimization goal, our analysis also emphasizes the considerable potential of other SERP characteristics, particularly SERP features, in enhancing CTR.

The implications of SERP features can be distilled into three key insights. Firstly, SERP features typically reduce the click-through rate of results, leading to an increase in zero-click searches. Consequently, website providers should anticipate that the continual introduction of higher quality and a greater quantity of SERP features may lead to increased searches where users do not leave the SERP, thereby negatively impacting providers' revenues. Secondly, the presence of certain SERP features, especially in specific combinations, can significantly affect the importance of a high ranking on a results page. Some SERP features can either divert CTR away from or concentrate it towards the top positions. Therefore, efforts to secure a high ranking should be strategically directed towards keywords that, in conjunction with the present SERP features, yield high CTR. Lastly, appearing within SERP features emerges as a new potential focus for SEO efforts. Similar to securing a high ranking, having a website linked within a SERP feature can significantly enhance CTR, irrespective of the position of the actual result.

However, optimizing for SERP feature appearances presents a unique challenge. Although website developers can increase the likelihood of their content being selected by Google’s crawlers through the appropriate use of metadata descriptions, there are no guarantees. This process is largely dependent on Google’s discretion, and the algorithmic process determining feature selection remains largely opaque.

Looking forward, one potential game-changer in the SERP landscape is the integration of Large Language Models (LLM) like ChatGPT. These AI models have demonstrated their ability to surpass traditional search engines in terms of user experience and problem resolution. If Google were to incorporate its own LLM as a SERP feature or in another capacity within its search engine, this could have an even more profound impact than the findings of this study suggest. Therefore, it is imperative for practitioners to stay abreast of changes in SERP features.

C. Limitations

Despite our findings, some limitations inherent to the dataset warrant mention. The data only includes US-based desktop searches. As such, we cannot conclusively state whether these findings are applicable to mobile searches or searches conducted in other countries. Although the structure of Google’s search result page is largely uniform globally, user behaviors may differ across countries, and even more so across devices. Furthermore, our dataset was of medium size and did not allow for the analysis of rare combinations of result page characteristics due to a limited sample size. Lastly, our findings are based on data collected between May and August 2022. However, Google’s search result pages are subject to frequent changes, including the introduction and adjustment of SERP features. As a result, our findings may have limited applicability to result pages that have undergone substantial changes post-dataset collection.

D. Future Research

Future research could address the limitations of the current study by extending the scope of the

dataset to include searches from other countries, mobile devices, and a larger time horizon. This would enable a more comprehensive time series analysis. In addition, future studies could delve deeper into the analysis of result page characteristics other than position and SERP features, such as keyword or result characteristics, which this study has revealed to be significant. Finally, given the importance of appearing in SERP features highlighted in our study, future work could explore the factors that determine the likelihood of a result appearing in these features.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This paper aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the influence that Search Engine Results Page (SERP) features exert on the Click Through Rates (CTR) of organic search engine results. The results of our study confirm that SERP features, on average, exert a negative influence on CTR. Nevertheless, it has been emphasized that the specific circumstances surrounding a result - such as its position, the specific SERP features shown, and whether a website is included in particular SERP features - can significantly modulate this influence. As such, it has been demonstrated that websites that are featured in specific SERP features, or those that are ranked lower in the results, can actually derive benefits from the presence of SERP features. This paper also provides a comparative analysis of the influence of SERP features against other result page characteristics. The findings underscore that SERP features have a tangible impact on CTR, thereby holding their own against other result page characteristics. Despite this, it remains clear that the most dominant determinant of CTR is the result’s position.

Our work offers several major contributions. Primarily, we conducted a comprehensive, wide-reaching analysis using a dataset that is novel in its scope and detail. With this dataset, we have examined the impact of more than 20 different SERP features, thereby offering a holistic view of the landscape of SERP features. Additionally, we have compared the importance of SERP features to virtually all other relevant result page characteris-

tics, thereby offering a well-rounded perspective on the factors that influence CTR.

Our findings also have strong practical applications. The insights derived from this work can be highly valuable to SEO practitioners, shedding light on the relevance of SERP features as a new dimension to consider in website optimization. The study elucidates the SERP features it is most beneficial to be featured in, and also provides insights into the specific combinations of SERP features that can either increase or decrease the importance of high ranking on a results page.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. L. Ledford, *Search Engine Optimization Bible*. Wiley, 2009.
- [2] S. Chevalier, "Global online e-commerce traffic by source and medium," <https://www.statista.com/statistics/820293/online-traffic-source-and-medium-e-commerce-sessions/>, 2022, accessed October 28, 2022.
- [3] Google, "Click through rate definition," Clickrate (CTR) - Google Ads-Support, 2022, accessed September 20, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://support.google.com/google-ads/answer/2615875?hl=de>
- [4] D. Lewandowski, S. S"unkler, and N. Yagci, "The influence of search engine optimization on google's results: A multi-dimensional approach for detecting seo," in *13th ACM Web Science Conference 2021*, 06 2020, pp. 12–20.
- [5] M. Cui and S. Hu, "Search engine optimization research for website promotion," in *2011 International Conference of Information Technology, Computer Engineering and Management Sciences*. IEEE, 2011.
- [6] B.-Y. Shih, C.-Y. Chen, and Z.-S. Chen, "Retracted: An empirical study of an internet marketing strategy for search engine optimization," *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing and Service Industries*, vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 11 2013.
- [7] M. Bala and D. Verma, "A critical review of digital marketing," *International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 10 2018.
- [8] C. Ziakis, M. Vlachopoulou, T. Kyrkoudis, and M. Karagkiozidou, "Important factors for improving google search rank," *Future Internet*, vol. 11, no. 32, pp. 01 2019.
- [9] S. Das, *Search Engine Optimization and Marketing: A Recipe for Success in Digital Marketing*. CRC Press/Taylor and Francis Group, 2021.
- [10] E. M. Olson, K. M. Olson, A. J. Czapski, and T. M. Key, "Business strategy and the management of digital marketing," *Business Horizons*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 285–293, April 2021.
- [11] B. Oliveira and C. Teixeira Lopes, "The evolution of web search user interfaces - an archaeological analysis of google search engine result pages," in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*, ser. CHIIR '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 55–68. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576840.3578320>
- [12] Google, "Enable search result features for your site — documentation," Google Developers, 2022, accessed November 14, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/search-result-features>
- [13] B. Oliveira and C. Teixeira Lopes, "From 10 blue links pages to feature-full search engine results pages - analysis of the temporal evolution of serp features," in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*, ser. CHIIR '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, p. 338–345. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3576840.3578307>
- [14] Semrush, "What are serp features? an in-depth guide," SEMrush, Jan 2022, accessed May 11, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semrush.com/blog/serp-features-guide/>
- [15] M. Tober, "Zero-clicks study," Semrush, 2022, accessed November 28, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.semrush.com/blog/zero-clicks-study/>
- [16] S. Kingsnorth, *Digital Marketing Strategy: An Integrated Approach to Online Marketing*. Kogan Page, 2022.
- [17] J. P. Sheffield, "Search engine optimization and business communication instruction: Interviews with experts," *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 153–183, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329490619890335>
- [18] A. Erdmann, R. Arilla, and J. M. Ponzoa, "Search engine optimization: The long-term strategy of keyword choice," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 144, pp. 650–662, 2022.
- [19] R. A. Malaga, "Worst practices in search engine optimization," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 12, p. 147–150, dec 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1409360.1409388>
- [20] M. Nagpal and J. A. Petersen, "Keyword selection strategies in search engine optimization: How relevant is relevance?" *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 97, no. 4, pp. 746–763, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022435920300944>
- [21] N. Yalçın and U. Köse, "What is search engine optimization: Seo," *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 487–493, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042810022901>
- [22] K. Sam-Martin, *Google's featured snippets in the Context of Strategic Content Marketing*. E-Book - Kristina Sam-Martin, 2020.
- [23] Moz, "What is a serp feature? common types and how to win them," Moz, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://moz.com/learn/seo/serp-features>
- [24] Wheelhouse, "How serp features can negatively impact your business (updated 2022)," Wheelhouse DMG, 2022, accessed December 9, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.wheelhousedmg.com/blog/important-google-serp-features-and-how-to-optimize-for-them/>
- [25] Y. Yang and P. Zhai, "Click-through rate prediction in online advertising: A literature review," *Information Processing & Management*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 03 2022.
- [26] G. Zhou, X. Zhu, C. Song, Y. Fan, H. Zhu, X. Ma, Y. Yan, J. Jin, H. Li, and K. Gai, "Deep interest network for

- click-through rate prediction,” in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 07 2018, pp. 1059–1068.
- [27] F. Wang, W. Suphamitmongkol, and B. Wang, “Advertisement click-through rate prediction using multiple criteria linear programming regression model,” *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 17, pp. 803–811, 2013.
- [28] L. Yan, W.-J. Li, G.-R. Xue, and D. Han, “Coupled group lasso for web-scale ctr prediction in display advertising,” in *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2014, pp. 802–810.
- [29] C. Ma, Y. Liao, Y. Wang, and Z. Xiao, “F2m: Scalable field-aware factorization machines,” in *30th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- [30] J. Pan, J. Xu, A. L. Ruiz, W. Zhao, S. Pan, Y. Sun, and Q. Lu, “Field-weighted factorization machines for click-through rate prediction in display advertising,” in *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference*, 2018.
- [31] J. Yuchin, Y. Zhuang, W.-S. Chin, and C.-J. Lin, “Field-aware factorization machines for ctr prediction,” in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*, 09 2016, pp. 43–50.
- [32] J. Chen, B. Sun, H. Li, H. Lu, and X.-S. Hua, “Deep ctr prediction in display advertising,” in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 2016, pp. 811–820.
- [33] H.-T. Cheng, L. Koc, J. Hermsen, T. Shaked, T. Chandra, H. Aradhye, G. Anderson *et al.*, “Wide & deep learning for recommender systems,” in *DLRS 2016: Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Deep Learning for Recommender Systems*, September 2016, pp. 7–10.
- [34] H. Guo, R. Tang, Y. Ye, Z. Li, and X. He, “Deepfm: A factorization-machine based neural network for ctr prediction,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017, pp. 1725–1731.
- [35] Z. Gharibshah, X. Zhu, A. Hainline, and M. Conway, “Deep learning for user interest and response prediction in online display advertising,” *Data Science and Engineering*, vol. 5, pp. 12–26, 2020.
- [36] W. Deng, J. Pan, T. Zhou, D. Kong, A. Flores, and G. Lin, “Deeplight: Deep lightweight feature interactions for accelerating ctr predictions in ad serving,” in *WSDM ’21: Proceedings of the 14th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, March 2021, pp. 922–930.
- [37] Z. Wang, Q. She, and J. Zhang, “Masknet: Introducing feature-wise multiplication to ctr ranking models by instance-guided mask,” in *Proceedings of DLP-KDD 2021*, 2021.
- [38] M. Richardson, E. Dominowska, and R. Ragno, “Predicting clicks: estimating the click-through rate for new ads,” in *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web*, 2007, pp. 521–530.
- [39] Grips, “About us,” About us, Jan 2023, accessed May 10, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://gripsintelligence.com/about>
- [40] Google, “Data preprocessing for ml: options and recommendations — cloud architecture center,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://cloud.google.com/architecture/data-preprocessing-for-ml-with-tf-transform-pt1?hl=de>
- [41] —, “List of google search ranking updates,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://developers.google.com/search/updates/ranking>
- [42] R. Flesch, “A new readability yardstick,” *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 221–233, 1948.
- [43] L. Grinsztajn, E. Oyallon, and G. Varoquaux, “Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on tabular data?” *arXiv:2207.08815*, Jul. 2022.
- [44] V. Borisov, T. Leeman, K. SeBler, J. Haug, M. Pawelczyk, and G. Kasneci, “Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey,” June 2022.
- [45] S. O. Arik and T. Pfister, “Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 8, May 2021, pp. 6679–6687.
- [46] E. Winter, “The shapley value,” in *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*. Elsevier, 2002, vol. 3, pp. 2025–2054. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1574000502030163>
- [47] S. M. Lundberg and S.-I. Lee, “A unified approach to interpreting model predictions,” in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [48] C. Molnar, *Interpretable Machine Learning: A Guide for Making Black Box Models Explainable*. Leanpub, 2020.
- [49] L. Breiman, “Random forests,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–32, October 2001.
- [50] J. H. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer New York, 2013.

APPENDIX

A. Data Dictionary

TABLE III:

Variable	Description	Data Source	Example
<i>Ads</i>	Any type of ad on the page. This can include ads on top of the search, at bottom, or shopping ads. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	Self-engineered	1
<i>AdWords Bottom</i>	A series of ads (up to 4) that appear at the bottom of the first search results page. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data 1
<i>AdWords Top</i>	A series of ads (up to 4) that appear at the top of the first search results page. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data 1
<i>AMP</i>	AMP pages (i.e., results marked with the word "AMP" and a gray lightning bolt) shown in search results on mobile devices.	SEO provider	data 1
<i>Avg. Monthly Volume</i>	Search volume averaged over months	Keywordplanner	1312.65
<i>Branded</i>	If the keyword includes a brand name.	Grips	1
<i>Carousel</i>	A row of horizontally scrollable images displayed at the top of search results. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data 1
<i>Clicks</i>	Number of clicks on targeted search result	Grips	25
<i>Competition</i>	Measure of competition on search term with 0.0 being the lowest and 1.0 being the highest.	Keywordplanner	0.22
<i>Count Page SERP Feat.</i>	Count of positive (=1) page SERP features for search result page.	Self-engineered	2
<i>Count Positional SERP Feat.</i>	Count of positive (=1) positional SERP features for search result.	Self-engineered	5
<i>CPC</i>	Cost per click of ad entry.	Keywordplanner	2.34
<i>CTR</i>	Click-through rate (clicks divided by impressions).	Grips	0.25
<i>Domain</i>	Domain of the URL of each search result.	SEO provider	data 'jomashop.com'

Continued on next page

TABLE III: (Continued)

<i>FAQ</i>	A list of questions related to a particular search that shows up for a particular organic search result. When clicked on, each of the questions reveals the answer. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>FAQ (Positional)</i>	A list of questions related to a particular search that shows up for a particular organic search result. When clicked on, each of the questions reveals the answer. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Featured Images</i>	A collection of images is usually displayed at the top of the SERP if Google considers visual results to be more relevant than text results. Only for mobile devices. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Featured Snippet</i>	A short answer to a user's search query with a link to the third-party website it is taken from that appears at the top of all organic search results. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Featured Snippet (Positional)</i>	A short answer to a user's search query with a link to the third-party website it is taken from that appears at the top of all organic search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Featured Video</i>	A video result to a search query that is displayed at the top of all organic search results. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Flights</i>	A block that displays flights related to a search query. Flight results include information on flight dates, duration, the number of transfers and prices. Data is taken from Google Flights. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Hotels Pack</i>	A block that displays hotels related to a search query. Hotel results include information on prices and rating, and allows users to check availability for certain dates. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1

Continued on next page

TABLE III: (Continued)

<i>Image</i>	An image result with a thumbnail displayed along with other organic search results. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Image (Positional)</i>	An image result with a thumbnail displayed along with other organic search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Image Pack</i>	A collection of images related to a search query that is usually displayed between organic search results. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Image Pack (Positional)</i>	A collection of images related to a search query that is usually displayed between organic search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Impressions</i>	Impressions of the result, including estimates for results on the second search page..	Grips		100
<i>Instant Answer</i>	A direct answer to a user’s search query that is usually displayed at the top of organic search results in the form of a gray-bordered box. Describes whether the SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Intent: Commercial</i>	Trying to learn more before making a purchase decision (e.g. “Subaru vs. Nissan”)	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Intent: Informational</i>	Trying to learn more about something (e.g., “What’s a good car?”)	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Intent: Navigational</i>	Trying to find something (e.g., “Subaru website”)	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Intent: Transactional</i>	Trying to complete a specific action (e.g., “buy Subaru Forester”)	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Jobs Search</i>	A number of job listings related to a search query that appear at the top of the search results page. Job listings include the job title, the company offering the job, a site where the listing was posted, etc. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Keyword</i>	The searched keyword.	SEO provider	data	‘jomashop burberry scarf’

Continued on next page

TABLE III: (Continued)

<i>Keyword Complexity Score</i>	Flesch reading ease score (Flesch 1948) of the keyword, with higher values indicating easier-to-read keywords.	Self-engineered		112
<i>Keyword Count</i>	Number of words the search query (keyword) consists of.	Grips		3
<i>Keyword Difficulty</i>	Difficulty to rank for given keyword expressed from 0 to 100	SEO provider	data	87
<i>Keyword Included in Domain</i>	Keyword Included in Domain.	Self-engineered		0
<i>Keyword Included in URL</i>	Keyword Included in URL.	Self-engineered		1
<i>Keyword Length</i>	Number of characters in keyword	Grips		23
<i>Knowledge Panel</i>	Panel on right side of results that often includes images, facts, social media links, and other relevant information to the search query. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Knowledge Panel (Positional)</i>	Panel on right side of results that often includes images, facts, social media links, and other relevant information to the search query. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Local Pack</i>	Embedded Google Maps frame on top of search results. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Local Pack (Positional)</i>	Embedded Google Maps frame on top of search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Number of Results</i>	Total number of results for search of keyword	SEO provider	data	456789
<i>People Also Ask</i>	A series of questions that may relate to a search query that appears in an expandable grid box labeled "People also ask" between search results. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1

Continued on next page

TABLE III: (Continued)

<i>People Also Ask (Positional)</i>	A series of questions that may relate to a search query that appears in an expandable grid box labeled "People also ask" between search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Position</i>	Position of the result among other search results	SEO provider	data	3
<i>Position (monthly)</i>	Average position in the last month.	Grips		2.45
<i>Position Difference</i>	Position subtracted from previous position, i.e. positive values mean a decrease in position	SEO provider	data	-1
<i>Previous Position</i>	Position last month	SEO provider	data	2
<i>Reviews</i>	Organic search results marked with star ratings and including the number of reviews the star rating is based on. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Reviews (Positional)</i>	Organic search results marked with star ratings and including the number of reviews the star rating is based on. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Search Volume</i>	The search volume of a keyword, cleaned from the original (inflated) value.	Grips		75643
<i>SERP Features by Keyword</i>	SERP features listed by ID, before one-hot-encoded.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Shopping Ads</i>	A row of horizontally scrollable paid shopping results that appear at the top of a search results page for a brand or product search query, and include the website's name, pricing, and product image. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Site Links</i>	A set of links to other pages of a website that is displayed under the main organic search result and for brand-related search queries. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Site Links (Positional)</i>	A set of links to other pages of a website that is displayed under the main organic search result and for brand-related search queries. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1

Continued on next page

TABLE III: (Continued)

<i>Top Stories</i>	A card-style snippet presenting up to three news-related results relevant to user’s search query, which is usually displayed between organic search results. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Top Stories (Positional)</i>	A card-style snippet presenting up to three news-related results relevant to user’s search query, which is usually displayed between organic search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Trends</i>	How much interest web searchers have shown in a given keyword in the last 12 months.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Tweet</i>	A card-style snippet displaying the most recent tweets related to a search query. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>URL</i>	The url of a google search result	SEO provider	data	‘https://www.jomashop.com/burberry-4031051.html’
<i>Video</i>	Video results with a thumbnail displayed along with other organic search results. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Video (Positional)</i>	Video results with a thumbnail displayed along with other organic search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Video Carousel</i>	A row of horizontally scrollable videos displayed among search results. Describes whether SERP feature appears at least once on the page.	SEO provider	data	1
<i>Video Carousel (Positional)</i>	A row of horizontally scrollable videos displayed among search results. Describes whether the result is featured in the SERP feature.	SEO provider	data	1

B. Feature Subsets

Subset	Features		
	Position	Position	Position Difference

Continued on next page

(Continued)

Keyword	Number of Results Keyword Difficulty Intent: Commercial Intent: Informational Intent: Navigational	Intent: Transactional Competition CPC Search Volume Avg. Monthly Search Vol.	Keyword Length Keyword Count Branded Complexity Score
SERP Feat.	Instant Answer Knowledge Panel Carousel Local Pack Top Stories Image Pack Site Links Reviews Tweet Video Featured Video	Featured Snippet Image Jobs Search Video Carousel People Also Ask FAQ Flights Knowledge Panel (Positional) Local Pack (Positional) Top Stories (Positional) Image Pack (Positional)	Site Links (Positional) Reviews (Positional) Video (Positional) Featured Snippet (Positional) Image (Positional) Video Carousel (Positional) People Also Ask (Positional) FAQ (Positional) Ads Count Page SERP Feat. Count Positional SERP Feat.
Result	Keyword in Domain	Keyword in URL	Domain (<i>One-Hot-Encoded</i>)

C. Tested Hyperparameters

TABLE IV:

Model	Parameter	Values considered for hyperparameter tuning
Random Forest	Max depth	Categorical: [None, 2, 3, 4], p=[0.7, 0.1, 0.1, 0.1]
	Number of estimators	Integer Log Uniform: 10 \rightarrow 3000
	Criterion	Categorical: ['squared_error', 'absolute_error']
	Max features	Categorical: ['sqrt', 'log2', None, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9]
	Min samples split	Categorical: [2, 3], p=[0.95, 0.05]
	Min samples leaf	Integer Log Uniform: 1 \rightarrow 50
	Bootstrap	Categorical: [True, False]
	Min impurity decrease	Categorical: [0.0, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05], p=[0.85, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05]
GBDT	Loss	Categorical: ['squared_error', 'absolute_error', 'huber']
	Learning rate	Real Log Uniform: 0.01 \rightarrow 10.0
	Subsample	Real Uniform: 0.5 \rightarrow 1.0

Continued on next page

TABLE IV: (Continued)

	Number of estimators	Integer Log Uniform: 10 \rightarrow 1000
	Criterion	Categorical: ['friedman_mse', 'squared_error']
	Max depth	Categorical: [None, 2, 3, 4, 5], p=[0.1, 0.1, 0.6, 0.1, 0.1]
	Min samples split	Categorical: [2, 3], p=[0.95, 0.05]
	Min samples leaf	Integer Log Uniform: 1 \rightarrow 50
	Min impurity decrease	Categorical: [0.0, 0.01, 0.02, 0.05], p=[0.85, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05]
	Max leaf nodes	Categorical: [None, 5, 10, 15], p=[0.85, 0.05, 0.05, 0.05]
XGBoost	Max depth	Integer Uniform: 1 \rightarrow 11
	Number of estimators	Integer Uniform: 100 \rightarrow 1000
	Min child weight	Integer Log Uniform: 1 \rightarrow 100
	Subsample	Real Uniform: 0.5 \rightarrow 1.0
	Learning rate	Real Log Uniform: 1e-5 \rightarrow 0.7
	Col sample by level	Real Uniform: 0.5 \rightarrow 1.0
	Col sample by tree	Real Uniform: 0.5 \rightarrow 1.0
	Gamma	Real Log Uniform: 1e-8 \rightarrow 7.0
	Lambda	Real Log Uniform: 1.0 \rightarrow 4.0
	Alpha	Real Log Uniform: 1e-8 \rightarrow 100.0
CatBoost	Max depth	Integer Uniform: 3 \rightarrow 10
	Learning rate	Real Log Uniform: 1e-5 \rightarrow 1.0
	Bagging temperature	Real Uniform: 0.0 \rightarrow 1.0
	L2 leaf regression	Real Log Uniform: 1.0 \rightarrow 10.0
	Leaf estimation iterations	Integer Uniform: 1 \rightarrow 10
TabNet	Number decision steps	Categorical: [3, 5, 10]
	Layer size	Categorical: [8, 16, 64]
	Learning rate	Categorical: [0.01, 0.02]
WideDeep	Layer 1 size	Categorical: [64, 128, 256]
	Layer 2 size	Categorical: [64, 128, 256]
	Layer 3 size	Categorical: [None, 64, 128, 256]
	Dropout ratio	Categorical: [0.0, 0.01, 0.05]

Continued on next page

TABLE IV: (Continued)

	Embedding dimension	Categorical: [4, 16, 32]
DeepFM	Layer 1 size	Categorical: [64, 128, 256]
	Layer 2 size	Categorical: [64, 128, 256]
	Layer 3 size	Categorical: [None, 64, 128, 256]
	Use batch normalization	Categorical: [True, False]
	Dropout ratio	Categorical: [0.0, 0.01, 0.05]
	Embedding dimension	Categorical: [4, 16, 32]

D. Used Hyperparameters

Model	Parameter	Default	Used for Subset					
			Position	Position + Key-word	Position + SERP Feat	Position + Result	Position + Keyword + SERP Feat	Position + Key-word + SERP Feat + Result
Random Forest	Max depth	None	None	None	None	None	None	None
	Number of estimators	100	897	823	3000	3000	175	516
	Criterion	squared_error	squared_error	squared_error	squared_error	squared_error	squared_error	squared_error
	Max features	1.0	0.1	sqrt	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.6
	Min samples split	2	3	2	2	3	2	2
	Min samples leaf	1	38	5	8	9	1	2
	Bootstrap	True	True	False	False	True	False	True
	Min impurity decrease	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Continued on next page

(Continued)

GBDT	Loss	squared _error	squared _error	squared _error	squared _error	squared _error	squared_error	huber
	Learning rate	0.10	0.067	0.033	0.030	0.351	0.126	0.767
	Subsample	1.0	0.517	1.0	0.711	0.833	0.634	0.819
	Number of esti- mators	100	128	497	220	196	487	268
	Criterion	friedman _mse	friedman _mse	friedman _mse	friedman _mse	friedman _mse	friedman_mse	friedman_mse
	Max depth	3	2	None	None	4	5	2
	Min samples split	2	3	2	2	3	3	2
	Min samples leaf	1	24	50	1	10	24	9
	Min impurity decrease	0.0	0.010	0.050	0.050	0.010	0.010	0.010
	Max leaf nodes	None	15	None	15	5	5	15
XGBoost	Max depth	6	11	11	8	11	11	11
	Number of esti- mators	100	406	689	603	786	460	714
	Min child weight	1	100	1	1	1	1	1
	Subsample	1.0	1.0	0.993	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.668
	Learning rate	0.30	0.015	0.030	0.035	0.016	0.039	0.031
	Col sample by level	1.0	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.917	0.50

Continued on next page

(Continued)

	Col sample by tree	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.50	0.50	0.708	1.0
	Gamma	0.0	1.0e-08	7.7e-05	0.009	1.0e-08	1.0e-08	0.001
	Lambda	1.0	4.0	4.0	2.859	1.0	4.0	1.0
	Alpha	0.0	1.0e-08	0.080	0.113	1.0e-08	0.014	1.0e-08
CatBoost	Max depth	6	5	10	9	9	10	9
	Learning rate	0.030	0.013	0.041	0.033	0.026	0.056	0.054
	Bagging temperature	1.0	0.885	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
	L2 leaf regression	3.0	6.601	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Leaf estimation iterations	<i>Dynamic</i>	10	10	1	6	10	10
TabNet	Num decision steps	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Layer size	8	8	8	8	8	8	64
	Learning rate	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.025
WideDeep	Layer size 1	256	256	256	256	256	256	256
	Layer size 2	128	128	128	128	128	128	128
	Layer size 3	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
	Dropout ratio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.01

Continued on next page

(Continued)

Embedding 4 dimension		4	4	4	4	4	16
DeepFMLayer size	1	256	256	256	256	256	256
Layer size	2	128	128	128	128	128	128
Layer size	3	64	64	64	64	64	64
Use batch normalization		False	False	False	False	False	False
Dropout ratio		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.01
Embedding 4 dimension		4	4	4	4	4	16