

Economics of Web-Design

Yury Lifshits

Caltech

<http://yury.name>



CS Club, Steklov Institute, 2008

1 / 35

A camel is a horse designed by a committee

Vogue'1958

Less is more

1855, Robert Browning
(English poet)

2 / 35

Outline

- 1 Anti-AdWords Theorem
- 2 Dynamic Design
- 3 Hit Counter Project Proposal

3 / 35

1

Anti-AdWords Theorem

4 / 35

Problem Statement

Given 10 organic search results
and 5 sponsored results
place them on 15 slots on a webpage

5/35

Math model (1/2)

Every link i :

Price p_i

Relevance r_i

Attractiveness a_i

Every slot j :

Attention share s_j

6/35

Math Model (2/2)

Matching M :

Place every link i to slot $j = M(i)$

User clicks on link i
with probability proportional to
 $s_{M(i)} + a_i$

7/35

Payoffs

Expected relevance:

$$Rel(M) = \sum_{i=1}^{15} (s_{M(i)} + a_i) \cdot r_i$$

Expected revenue:

$$Rev(M) = \sum_{i=1}^{15} (s_{M(i)} + a_i) \cdot p_i$$

Attractiveness is not important

8/35

Pareto-Optimal Matching

M is Pareto-Optimal iff there is no M' such that

$$Rel(M) < Rel(M'), \quad Rev(M) < Rev(M')$$

Otherwise M is stupid

9/35

Example (1/2)

Attention	Link	Relevance	Price
50%	O1	2	-
40%	A1	0	25\$
10%	A2	1	20\$
		1.1	12\$

10/35

Example (2/2)

Attention	Link	Relevance	Price
50%	A2	1	20\$
40%	O1	2	-
10%	A1	0	25\$
		1.3	12.5\$

11/35

Anti-AdWords

Left — organic, right — advertising

Under presented model
AdWords design can be stupid

That is, another presentation
can improve **both** relevance
and revenue

12/35

Notation

Page attention structure \mathcal{P} :

20% 18% 15% ... 4% 2%

Fixed design \mathcal{D} :

Ad slots, organic slots

20% 18% 15% ... 4% 2%

13/35

Anti-AdWords Theorem

$$\forall \mathcal{P} \quad \exists \mathcal{D}$$

\exists links \mathcal{L} such that
any matching $M \in \mathcal{D}$
is stupid for \mathcal{L}

14/35

Alternative to AdWords

Single list for sponsored and
organic results

Tradeoff ranking

15/35

Further questions

Do we need to keep 10 Organic
guarantee?

Adwords redundancy?

Quantify possible Adwords
improvements

Find all rankings on a trade-off
curve

16/35

2

Dynamic Design

17/35

Increase Key Numbers

- Owners utility
- User utility

18/35

Key Numbers for Owner

- Ad revenue
- Number of users
- Volume of content
- Amount of feedback
- User time online
- Brand recognition

19/35

Key Numbers for User

- # of matches (dating)
- # of job offers
- # of answers (QA)
- # interesting stories (news)
- # of compliments (social networks)

20/35

Design
=
tool for increasing
key numbers

21 / 35

Main Challenge

Quantify Design

22 / 35

Design Decisions

- What to display
- With what priorities?

23 / 35

Quantify Internal Priorities

Attention budgets and auctions

24 / 35

Dynamic Design

Choices based on opportunity
(user, action, time) knowledge

25 / 35

Design Mechanisms

- Chosen by owner
- Fresh
- User voted
- Random
- Personalized
- Paid

26 / 35

Minimalism?

- Design complexity = # of links
- Links with CTR < .001 are worse than ads
- One random big instead many static small

27 / 35

Links to kill

- Amazon: "Add to wedding registry"
- Google: "Report yourself"
- Yahoo: "Horoscopes"

28 / 35

Django MTV Tricks

- Template inheritance
- If/for loops in templates
- Exceptions

29 / 35

3

Hit Counter Project Proposal

30 / 35

Hit Analysis

- Easy: incoming hits
- Hard: outgoing hits

31 / 35

Outgoing Hits

- Ajax solution
 - Can be blocked
- Inverted index
 - Internal hits only
- Goto
 - Bad for SEO

32 / 35

Call for Feedback

- Volunteers for hit counter project?

33 / 35

Links

<http://yury.name>

Homepage

<http://yury.name/newweb.html>

Tutorial "The New Web"

<http://yury.name/reputation.html>

Tutorial "Reputation Systems"

34 / 35

Thanks for your attention!
Questions?

35 / 35