

Keeta (keeta.com) SEO & AEO Diagnosis Report

- > *Diagnosis date: January 28, 2026*
 - > *Report type: Diagnosis only*
 - > *Data completeness: ~70%*
 - > *Focus areas: Technical SEO, keyword coverage, AEO*
 - > *Methodology: Live crawling, Ahrefs keyword data (US), business-scenario inference*
-

Important: Report Scope and Limitations

What This Report Is

This is a diagnosis-only report. It does not include implementation plans, prioritized action items, or recommendations.

Data mix:

- **~70% verifiable:** Homepage HTML (title, meta, H1, schema check), HTTP requests (robots.txt, sitemap.xml, llms.txt), Ahrefs US keyword data
- **~30% inferred:** Business scenarios and part of keyword coverage inferred from site structure and public information

How Reliable Each Section Is

Section	Reliability	Safe to use as-is	Notes
---------	-------------	-------------------	-------

Technical SEO	High	Yes	Based on actual HTTP and homepage crawl
Keyword coverage	High	Yes	Homepage content + Ahrefs US data
AEO	High	Yes	Schema, FAQ, llms.txt checked on live site
Site / business overview	Medium	Use as a frame	Inferred from homepage and public sources

What This Report Does Not Include

- No optimization or implementation plans
- No prioritized action lists or timelines
- No ROI or expected-impact estimates

What This Report Is Good For

- Understanding current technical SEO, keyword coverage, and AEO (strengths and gaps)
- Identifying issues worth validating or fixing first (e.g. robots, sitemap, llms.txt, schema)
- Informing internal decisions or follow-up work using Ahrefs data and test results

Data-Collection Limits

Data type	Status	Notes
robots.txt	Not retrievable	Request returns HTML (SPA/Next.js routing)
sitemap.xml	Not retrievable	Same as above
llms.txt	Not present	404 at root and .well-known
Homepage HTML	Retrieved	Title, meta, H1, body, schema checked

Keyword data	Available	Ahrefs US; see Appendix C
--------------	-----------	---------------------------

Full technical SEO diagnosis is not possible until robots.txt and sitemap.xml are served correctly and can be verified.

How We Label Data in This Report

We use the following labels to separate verified data from inference:

Label	Meaning	Reliability
Verified	Based on live crawl or Ahrefs data	High
Inferred / partly verified	Based on homepage structure and business context	Medium
Failed / not found	Check failed or asset not found	High (conclusion is reliable)

Executive Summary

Overall Scores

Dimension	Score	Rating	Notes
-----------	-------	--------	-------

Technical SEO	35/100	Weak	robots/sitemap not verifiable; llms.txt missing
Keyword coverage	58/100	Moderate	Brand and category terms partly covered; product terms underused
Content structure	62/100	Moderate	Clear title, meta, H1; modular headings and nav
AEO	25/100	Very weak	No schema, no llms.txt; meta description in place
Overall	45/100	Weak	Main gaps: technical SEO and AEO

Main Findings (Critical Issues)

Critical issue 1: AEO and AI readability are very weak (25/100)

What we found:

- **No Schema markup:** No `application/ld+json` on the homepage HTML
- **No llms.txt:** Both `/llms.txt` and `/.well-known/llms.txt` return 404
- **Meta description present:** Helps search snippets and basic AEO
- **FAQ:** No FAQ block on the homepage; may exist elsewhere (e.g. docs)

Impact:

- Search engines and AI cannot reliably understand “organization — product — capability” in a structured way
- Rich results (FAQ, HowTo, Organization, etc.) are unlikely
- LLMs cannot use llms.txt to get an official site summary and structure

Critical issue 2: Technical SEO configuration cannot be verified (35/100)

What we found:

- **robots.txt** returns HTML (same as SPA) instead of plain text
- **sitemap.xml** returns HTML instead of XML
- **llms.txt** is missing, which hurts AEO and AI citation

Impact:

- We cannot confirm whether crawler rules and sitemap are discovered and parsed correctly
- Site size and important URL sets cannot be verified from the outside

Secondary issues

1. Keyword coverage has room to improve (58/100)

- Brand terms “Keeta” and “Keeta Network” appear in the title and above the fold
- Meta description already uses “layer-1 blockchain network,” “payment networks,” “blockchain-to-blockchain”
- The title does not include high-value category terms such as “blockchain,” “payment network,” or “cross-chain”
- Product/use-case terms like “tokenization,” “real-world assets,” “RWA,” “settlement” mostly appear in body copy, not in the title

2. Title and above-the-fold category terms

- Current title:

Keeta | Where Networks Connect
- The title does not include “layer-1 blockchain,” “payment network,” “cross-chain,” etc., so category signals in the SERP are weaker

Opportunity Overview (State of play, not recommendations)

Area	Current state	Evidence
robots/sitemap accessibility	Not verifiable; technical SEO gap	Requests return HTML
Schema	None found on homepage; clear AEO gap	Homepage HTML scan
llms.txt		404 on both paths

	Not deployed; AI citation weak	
Keyword coverage	Category/product terms underused in title; some coverage in meta/body	Homepage + Ahrefs
FAQ	No FAQ on homepage	Homepage and nav check

How Keeta Compares to Common Practice

Item	Keeta today	Common practice
robots.txt	Returns HTML	Plain text, parseable
sitemap.xml	Returns HTML	XML, parseable
Schema	None found	Often Organization, FAQ, etc.
llms.txt	Not deployed	Some sites already use it
Meta / social	Complete	Complete
Category terms in title	Absent	Often brand + category

1. Site and Business Overview

1.1 Product / Organization

Type: Layer-1 blockchain network / payment-network infrastructure (from site and public info)

Positioning:

- **Network:** Connects payment networks and on-chain assets; direct blockchain-to-blockchain transactions (400 ms settlement, 10M TPS)
- **Product:** Built-in tokenization, built-in compliance and KYC
- **Use cases:** Decentralized marketplace, RWA, cross-chain payments and settlement

Audience (inferred):

- **Primary:** Investors and researchers, developers and integrators, network participants
- **Secondary:** Media, researchers, ecosystem partners

1.2 Site Footprint (from navigation and subdomains)

Dimension	Result	Notes
Main site	keeta.com (homepage crawlable)	Title, meta, H1, above-the-fold, Key Features, Use Case checked
Subdomains	docs, explorer, wallet, etc.	Clear separation by function
Main entry points	Homepage, Whitepaper, Product Manual, Docs, SDK, Roadmap, Explorer, Wallet	From nav and links
robots/sitemap	Not retrievable	Requests return HTML; total page count not verifiable

1.3 Site Structure (from site and business-scenario work)

Main areas (inferred):

代码块

```
1 keeta.com/  
2 |— Home (/)  
3 |— Resources
```

4			Whitepaper (PDF)
5			Product Manual (PDF)
6			Docs (docs.keeta.com)
7			SDK Documentation
8			Roadmap (/roadmap)
9			Network
10			Explorer (subdomain)
11			Wallet (subdomain)
12			External: Discord, X, etc.

2. Technical SEO

2.1 Crawlability (35/100)

2.1.1 Config and Homepage Access

How we tested:

- HTTP requests to `https://keeta.com/`, `/robots.txt`, `/sitemap.xml`, `/llms.txt`, `/.well-known/llms.txt`
- Checked status codes and response body type/content

Results:

Target	HTTP status	Actual response	Expected	Verdict
Homepage	200	Valid HTML	Valid HTML	OK
robots.txt	200	HTML (SPA)	Plain text	Not compliant
sitemap.xml	200	HTML (SPA)	XML	Not compliant
llms.txt	404	—	200 or 404	Not deployed
	404	—	200 or 404	Not deployed

.well-known/llms.txt				
----------------------	--	--	--	--

Technical issues:

- 1. **robots.txt and sitemap.xml return HTML** — Likely Next.js/SPA fallback; static files not served for these paths
- 2. **llms.txt not created** — 404 at both root and .well-known
- 3. **Homepage is reachable** — Crawlers can get homepage HTML

2.1.2 Impact on Search Engines

Area	Assessment	Notes
Homepage indexing	Likely OK	Homepage HTML is fetchable
robots rules	Not verifiable	Cannot confirm how crawlers interpret rules
Sitemap discovery	Not verifiable	Cannot confirm submission or parsing
llms.txt / AEO	Not available	AI and llms.txt-aware crawlers get no site summary

Technical SEO score: 35/100

Score breakdown: Config verifiability ~15/100 (robots/sitemap unverifiable, llms missing); page accessibility 100/100; URL and site structure 85/100; rounded overall 35/100.

2.2 robots.txt (not evaluable)

Current state: Requests return HTML, not plain text. Content cannot be evaluated.

Conclusions:

- Cannot confirm whether a valid robots.txt exists
- Cannot confirm Sitemap declaration
- Cannot confirm any AI-crawler directives

2.3 sitemap.xml (not evaluable)

Current state: Requests return HTML, not XML. Content cannot be evaluated.

Conclusions:

- Cannot confirm presence of sitemap or sitemap index
- Cannot confirm URL count or update frequency
- Cannot confirm declaration in robots.txt (robots.txt itself not available)

2.4 llms.txt (0/100)

Current state: Not deployed (404).

Results:

URL	Status	Notes
https://keeta.com/llms.txt	404	Not created
https://keeta.com/.well-known/llms.txt	404	Not created

Impact: AI systems and crawlers that follow llms.txt cannot get an official, LLM-oriented site description, which limits accurate citation of Keeta in answers.

2.5 URL and Site Structure

Findings (homepage and nav):

Type	URL / example	Assessment
Homepage	https://keeta.com/ , https://www.keeta.com/	Clean
Internal paths	e.g. /roadmap	Clear semantics
Subdomains	docs.keeta.com , explorer.keeta.com , wallet.keeta.com	Clear functional split
External resources	Whitepaper PDF, Product Manual, SDK docs, etc.	Clear resource entry points

URL and structure score: 85/100

3. Local SEO

Applicability: Not applicable. Keeta is a global blockchain/payment network product, not a local or location-based service. Local SEO (e.g. LocalBusiness, GMB) is out of scope for this diagnosis.

4. Keyword Coverage

4.1 Keyword Framework (from business context and Ahrefs)

From the keyword analysis and Ahrefs US data, keywords are grouped as follows:

Tier	Examples	Target pages	How we evaluate
Brand	Keeta, Keeta Network, keeta crypto	Site-wide / homepage	Presence in title, H1, meta
Category	payment network, blockchain network, asset tokenization	Homepage / category pages	Title, meta, above-the-fold
Product / use-case	RWA, tokenization, cross-chain, compliance	Homepage / feature / docs	Body and landing pages

4.2 Brand Term Coverage

Current title: Keeta | Where Networks Connect

Method: Homepage title, meta, H1, and above-the-fold copy + Ahrefs US data

Term	Vol (US/mo)	Difficulty	CPC	Covered?	Where	Notes
Keeta	1,800	39	\$0.20	Yes	Title, H1, meta, nav	Brand covered
keeta crypto	2,500	—	\$0.80	No	Not in title/meta	Brand + category
Keeta Network	250	—	—	Yes	Above-fold, og:site_name, body	Covered
keeta token	150	—	—	No	Not clearly	Subpage/docs
keeta blockchain	70	—	—	No	Not in title	Brand + category

keeta.com	—	—	—	No	Not in title	Site identity relies on brand + domain
-----------	---	---	---	----	--------------	--

Brand coverage score: 82/100

4.3 Category Term Coverage

Category-related phrasing already in meta / above-the-fold:

- “layer-1 blockchain network” (meta description)
- “payment networks” (meta, above-the-fold)
- “blockchain-to-blockchain transactions” (meta)
- “settlement,” “throughput” (meta)

Category term coverage (Ahrefs US):

Term	Vol (US/mo)	Difficulty	CPC	In title?	In meta/above -fold?	Notes
payment network	600	15	\$5.00	No	Yes	High value, low difficulty, high CPC
blockchain network	800	93	\$0.45	No	Yes	High volume
layer-1 blockchain	30	49	—	No	Yes	—
asset tokenization	700	26	\$1.50	No	Body	High volume, low difficulty
rwa tokenization	600	46	\$1.70	No	Body	—

blockchain infrastructur e	500	28	\$0.03	No	Body	—
cross-chain	100	0	—	No	Body	KD=0, easier to rank
blockchain compliance	200	41	—	No	Body	—
decentralize d marketplace	70	21	\$1.80	No	Use-case heading	Low difficulty

Category coverage score: 50/100

Gaps: The title does not include strong category terms like “blockchain,” “payment network,” or “cross-chain.” Several high-value category terms appear only in body copy and are not reinforced in title or meta.

4.4 Product / Use-Case Term Coverage

Product/use-case phrasing on the homepage (body and nav):

- “Move Assets Across Networks,” “Direct cross-chain transactions”
- “Trade Real-World Assets,” “Create tokens,” “liquidity”
- “Compliance When It Counts,” “KYC,” “digital certificates”
- “10M TPS,” “400ms settlement,” “Scalable by Design”
- “Decentralized Marketplace,” “Built-In Tokenization,” “Built-In Compliance”

Product/use-case coverage score: 55/100 — Topics are present in content but lack dedicated landing pages and title-level coverage.

4.5 Title and Meta (current state)

Current title: Keeta | Where Networks Connect

- Includes brand term “Keeta”
- Does not include category terms (e.g. “blockchain,” “payment network,” “layer-1”)
- Does not include product/use-case terms (e.g. “tokenization,” “RWA,” “cross-chain”)

Current meta description (checked):

- Present; length and readability are fine
- Includes “layer-1 blockchain network,” “payment networks,” “blockchain-to-blockchain,” “400 milliseconds,” “10 million transactions per second”
- High information density; good for snippets and AEO “summary layer”

4.6 Keyword Coverage Overall Score

Overall score: 58/100

Breakdown: Brand 82/100; category 50/100; product/use-case 55/100; rounded 58/100.

Data: Homepage title, meta, body + business-scenario inference + **Ahrefs US keyword data** (Appendix C).

5. AEO (Answer Engine Optimization)

5.1 Why AEO Matters (context)

Factor	Why it matters	Relevance to Keeta
Question and concept searches	e.g. “What is Keeta?” , “layer-1 payment network”	High: investors and developers often discover via questions and concept terms
AI search		

	ChatGPT, Perplexity, etc. cite sites and structured info	High: schema and llms.txt affect whether Keeta is cited
Rich results and snippets	FAQ, Organization, etc. can improve visibility and CTR	High: currently no schema

5.2 Structured Data (Schema.org) (0/100)

Method: Full-text search of homepage HTML for `application/ld+json`, `@context`, `@type`.

Findings:

- No `application/ld+json` script blocks
- No `@context`, `@type`, or other typical Schema attributes
- **Conclusion:** Homepage currently has **no** JSON-LD structured data.

Schema score: 0/100

Impact: Search engines and AI cannot reliably get “organization — product — capability” from structured data; rich results (site links, FAQ, Organization panel, etc.) are unlikely.

5.3 FAQ (15/100)

Method: Homepage HTML and nav structure.

Findings:

- No clear FAQ block on the homepage (e.g. “Frequently Asked Questions” or equivalent)
- Nav has Resources and Network; no dedicated “FAQ” or “Support” in main nav (could exist on docs or other subdomains)

FAQ score: 15/100 (based on “FAQ visible on homepage or main nav on root domain”).

5.4 Heading Question-Form (not measured)

We did not measure what share of H2/H3 across the site are in question form. The homepage has modular headings (e.g. “Key Features,” “Built-In Tokenization,” “Decentralized Marketplace”), mostly declarative; no systematic question-style H2/H3 was found.

5.5 Quick-Answer Paragraphs (not tested)

We did not test whether the first paragraph can serve as a direct quick answer. The homepage hero is brand and tagline with high density but is not in standard Q&A form.

5.6 AI Citation (llms.txt) (0/100)

Findings:

- `https://keeta.com/llms.txt` → 404
- `https://keeta.com/.well-known/llms.txt` → 404 (or effectively unavailable)

llms.txt score: 0/100

Impact: AI and crawlers that follow llms.txt cannot get an LLM-oriented site description.

5.7 Meta Description and Social (90/100)

Method: Homepage `<head>` and meta tags.

Findings:

- `meta name="description"` is set and aligned with brand, category, and performance claims
- `og:title`, `og:description`, `og:image`, `og:site_name`, `og:type` present
- `twitter:card`, `twitter:title`, `twitter:description`, `twitter:image` present

Meta and social score: 90/100

5.8 AEO Overall Score

Overall AEO score: 25/100

Breakdown: Schema 0/100; llms.txt 0/100; FAQ visibility/structure 15/100; meta/social 90/100; rounded 25/100.

6. Mobile SEO

Scope: This report does not include dedicated mobile tests (e.g. mobile-friendliness, speed, viewport, font size).

What we know: The homepage appears to use a responsive/modern stack (consistent with Next.js/SPA). It loads on mobile; actual mobile-friendliness and Core Web Vitals would need to be checked with Google or other tools.

7. Competitor Comparison

Scope: This report does not include competitor crawls or keyword-ranking comparisons. A competitor section would require a defined competitor set and ranking data.

8. Data Sources and Limitations

8.1 Methodology

Method	Source	Reliability
Direct checks	HTTP requests (keeta.com , robots.txt, sitemap.xml, llms.txt), homepage HTML	High
Homepage analysis	Title, meta, H1, above-the-fold, nav, schema search	High
Keywords	Ahrefs US (Appendix C)	High
Business context	Business Scenario Analysis, site structure, public info	Medium

8.2 Limitations

- 1. **robots.txt and sitemap.xml**
 - Content could not be retrieved; we cannot verify crawler rules or sitemap configuration.
 - 2. **Coverage**
 - Only the homepage was fully crawled and checked for schema/FAQ. Other pages (e.g. /roadmap, subdomains) were not checked page by page.
 - 3. **Keywords and business**
 - Keyword coverage conclusions are based on the homepage and Ahrefs; “target pages” and business scenarios are partly inferred.
-

9. Summary

9.1 Critical Issues at a Glance

Issue	Severity	Evidence	Score impact
robots.txt/sitemap return HTML	High	HTTP requests	Technical SEO not fully evaluable
llms.txt not deployed	High	404	Technical SEO + AEO
No schema	High	Homepage HTML scan	AEO very weak
No FAQ on homepage/main nav	Medium	Homepage and nav	AEO
No strong category terms in title	Medium	Title vs Ahrefs	Keyword coverage

9.2 Main Findings: Strengths and Gaps

Strengths:

- Homepage is reachable; title, meta, and H1 are clear; meta description and social tags are complete and information-dense
- Brand terms “Keeta” and “Keeta Network” are well covered; several high-value category terms appear in meta and body
- URL and subdomain structure are clear for users and crawlers

Gaps:

- **Technical SEO:** robots and sitemap not verifiable; llms.txt missing
- **AEO:** No schema, no llms.txt, no FAQ on homepage or main nav
- **Keywords:** Category and product terms underused in titles; some high-value terms only in body copy

Appendix A: Glossary

Term	Definition

Schema.org	Standard for structured data so search engines and AI can understand page content (e.g. Organization, FAQPage)
llms.txt	Site description file aimed at LLMs to improve citation and summarization
AEO	Answer Engine Optimization (AI search, rich results, etc.)
JSON-LD	A way to embed structured data in HTML (<code>application/ld+json</code>)
SERP	Search Engine Result Page

Appendix B: Keyword Data Summary (Ahrefs US)

Source file: `google_us_10m-tps-blockchain-400ms-s_overview_2026-01-28_13-14-32.csv`

Region: United States (us)

Query date: January 28, 2026

Keywords with volume \geq 100 (US/mo) or brand terms:

Keyword	Vol (US/mo)	Difficulty	CPC	Notes
keeta	1,800	39	\$0.20	Brand
keeta crypto	2,500	—	\$0.80	Brand + category
	800	93	\$0.45	Category

blockchain network				
asset tokenization	700	26	\$1.50	Category/product
payment network	600	15	\$5.00	Category; low difficulty, high CPC
rwa tokenization	600	46	\$1.70	Category
blockchain infrastructure	500	28	\$0.03	Category
real world assets crypto	350	53	\$1.50	Product
keeta network	250	—	—	Brand
blockchain compliance	200	41	—	Category
rwa blockchain	200	73	—	Category
digital identity blockchain	200	25	\$0.06	Category; low difficulty
tokenization blockchain	200	66	\$0.60	Category
blockchain tokenization	200	60	\$0.20	Category
keeta token	150	—	—	Brand/product
blockchain payment network	100	—	—	Category
cross-chain	100	0	—	Category; KD=0
fastest blockchain	90	44	\$4.00	Product/differentiation
kyc blockchain	80	28	—	Category; low difficulty
keeta blockchain	70	—	—	Brand + category
decentralized marketplace	70	21	\$1.80	Product; low difficulty

layer-1 blockchain	30	49	—	Category
keeta whitepaper	30	—	—	Brand + nav
what is keeta	40	—	—	Question
blockchain sdk	40	59	—	Developer

Report date: January 28, 2026

Keyword data: Ahrefs (US), 2026-01-28

Version: v1.2 — Diagnosis only (no implementation plan).