Semantic Coverage From Terms to Decisions

Review the questions, relationships and constraints a reader needs, rather than counting related words.

Working draft · v0.1 · research brief

WORDS ON THE PAGE VS. AN ANSWER THE READER CAN USE

airport · shuttle · late arrival · evening · transfer · flexible · 24/7? · pickup

→

READER QUESTION

Can I reach the hotel after a late flight?

Entity	Airport shuttle, Terminal 1
Attribute	Last pickup time
Relationship	Which arrivals it serves
Constraint	Booking cutoff and fallback

Illustrative example. A page can use every one of these words and still **leave the decision unanswered**.

04	02	01
coverage layers	worked examples	proposed test

Ameneh Saeednia
Senior SEO and Generative Search Strategist

Research question

Does the page help the reader decide?

A page can mention the right topics without explaining the relationships that make an answer useful. A hotel page might include *airport*, *shuttle* and *late arrival* while leaving the reader unable to tell **whether the shuttle runs after their flight lands**.

Primary-source observation	Implication for the method
Google describes concept matching and passage understanding in its ranking-systems guide. [1]	Review meaning and context. Exact-word presence is not a complete proxy for usefulness.
Google says AI features may search related subtopics through query fan-out. [2]	Map plausible related questions, but **do not label generated questions** as observed internal queries.
Google emphasizes useful, original information and prescribes no preferred word count. [3]	Choose scope from the reader's task. Do not expand a page just to match competitor vocabulary.

Conclusion and boundary

Use lexical analysis to suggest **what to investigate**. Use answer completeness, relevant facts and supported relationships to decide **what to write**. This is an editorial recommendation, not a verified model of Google's scoring.

Why term lists aren't enough

Older semantic-keyword methods, including the micro and macro keyword notes in my archive, are good at finding **vocabulary**. N-grams catch jargon and variant names. Neither tells you whether the page answers the question under the reader's conditions.

Four coverage layers

Move from the subject to the answer

Use **one decision question**, not one keyword, as the working unit. For each question, identify the relevant facts, their relationship and the evidence needed.

1

Entities

Identify the **people, organizations, products, places or concepts** the page must distinguish for this task.

Evidence: Correct identity and the relevant version or variant, not a list of every related entity.

2

Attributes

Record the properties that affect the choice: **dimensions, timing, capacity, price basis or eligibility**.

Evidence: Verified value, unit, date and scope where relevant.

3

Relationships

Explain **how the facts connect**: which price applies to which room, or which pickup serves which arrival.

Evidence: An explicit statement linking subject, attribute and condition.

4

Constraints and evidence

Check **exceptions, exclusions, uncertainty** and the source supporting the answer.

Evidence: A usable answer under the reader's real circumstances, with unsupported parts left unresolved.

The unit of review

A term can be present while the answer remains missing. Coverage is judged question by question, **not by vocabulary totals**.

Fictional travel example

Late arrival changes the question

Illustrative hotel scenario. No real hotel, policy or observed traveler behavior is represented.

Reader question	Words alone might cover	A decision-ready answer needs
Can I reach the hotel after a late flight?	airport / shuttle / evening	Operating hours, pickup point, arrival cutoff, booking requirement and a verified fallback.
Can we fit two adults and two children?	family / spacious / room	The actual room variant, permitted occupancy, bed arrangement, child ages and pricing basis.
Can I cancel if my flight changes?	flexible / cancellation	The booked rate's deadline, time zone, charges and applicable exceptions.
Is the room usable for my mobility needs?	accessible / elevator	Specific access features and constraints. A label does not answer every need.

From missing term to missing fact

If shuttle hours are absent, adding the phrase *late airport transfer* **does not fix the answer**. Ask the property for verified hours and the fallback. If those facts are unavailable, tell the traveler to confirm them rather than inventing a schedule.

Possible content placement

Put material **booking conditions near the relevant rate or room**, with a clear policy link for detail. Put destination background in a guide when it does not help the immediate decision.

Fictional e-commerce example

A rain jacket is not a bag of terms

Illustrative product-review scenario. The examples are not test results or product claims.

Decision	Candidate vocabulary	Information that would resolve it
Will it suit my wet commute?	waterproof / breathable / rain	Verified intended use, relevant test or specification, conditions and limitations.
Will it fit over a winter layer?	fit / size / shell / layering	Variant-specific measurements and sizing guidance; verified first-hand fit notes if actually tested.
Can I compare two models?	weight / membrane / durability	Comparable units and conditions. Explain the trade-off rather than listing unrelated numbers.
What if the size is wrong?	returns / easy / guarantee	Actual return period, exclusions, costs and condition requirements for the purchase market.

Why word overlap is insufficient

Two pages can use the same product terms while only one explains the use case. Different natural wording can express the same useful fact. The review asks whether the reader can **recover the needed answer accurately**.

Evidence dependency

When a claim needs testing, specifications or policy confirmation, the next task is **evidence collection**. Length, formatting or a semantic score cannot replace the missing source. Use *Claim to Source Verification* for that check.

Practical coverage map

Turn a question into a content action

One row per decision question. Label where each question came from.

Field	What to record
Audience / decision	Who is choosing, and what do they need to settle?
Question / provenance	Exact question and whether it came from support logs, user research, Search Console or a generated hypothesis.
Entity and variant	The particular product, place, rate, service or person.
Facts and relationships	Needed attributes and how they connect under the relevant conditions.
Evidence / owner	Verified source and the person who maintains the information.
Answer location	Existing section, linked detail, missing answer or fragmented information.
Assessment	Answered / Partial / Missing / Conflicting / Not assessed. Explain the boundary.
Action and recheck	Obtain evidence, revise wording, reorganize a section or link to the correct page. Assign an owner.

Prioritize questions, not vocabulary

First fix **incorrect or missing facts** that could produce the wrong decision. Then address recurring unanswered questions with observed demand. Treat generated questions as candidates until validated.

Keep the denominator visible

Report the reviewed question set and unresolved evidence. A count of answered questions describes **that chosen sample**. It does not measure topical authority or expected rankings.

Proposed experiment

Test answers against added vocabulary

The planned home for this test is my **Passage Retrieval Lab**, which tests whether structural rewrites change passage retrieval. **Not yet run**; no results reported here.

Design element	Proposal
Question	Does adding missing decision information outperform adding related terminology for finding a correct answer in a closed corpus?
Sample	A bounded set of pages and independently collected user questions, frozen before writing variants.
Conditions	Original text; terminology-focused rewrite keeping original facts; decision-focused rewrite adding verified missing facts and relationships.
Controls	Record length, readability and structure for each condition. Keep corpus and retrieval settings fixed. New facts change answer availability; disclose this rather than claiming an isolated wording effect.
Leakage control	Keep evaluation questions hidden from rewrite authors where practical. Separate development and held-out questions.
Evaluation	Identical held-out questions. Assess passage rank and whether the retrieved passage supports a correct answer, with blinded human checks.

Hypothesis

The decision-focused condition should provide more answer-supporting information for some questions. That expectation is **untested**. A term-only condition may still improve matching; report its performance rather than assuming failure.

Measurement and limits

Do not turn a retrieval test into a visibility claim

What each measure can report, and what it cannot.

Measure	Report	Do not infer
Answer availability	Whether the source condition contains the needed facts.	That a missing answer is only a retrieval failure.
Retrieval rank	Within-method ranks for each question and condition.	That raw similarity values are comparable across models.
Answer support	Whether the returned passage resolves the question.	That a high rank guarantees factual correctness.
Sample differences	Per-question outcomes, uncertainty and reviewer disagreement.	A universal ideal length or semantic-density target.
External outcomes	Only separately observed platform or business results.	That a closed-corpus result predicts citations, traffic, bookings or revenue.

Threats to validity

A small topic sample may favor certain question types. Adding facts changes the information available, not just phrasing. **Headings that copy evaluation questions** can inflate results. Reviewer judgment and retrieval settings affect conclusions.

A useful first release

Pilot the coverage map **manually** before writing a Skill. Two reviewers assess the same questions, reconcile disagreements and note where source access is missing. Publish the method before calling it a study.

Sources and scope

What supports this review

01 **A guide to Google Search ranking systems. Google**
Concept matching and passage understanding. No keyword-density formula is derived from it.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/ranking-systems-guide

02 **AI features and your website. Google**
Possible query fan-out and existing SEO requirements. It does not expose internal queries.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/ai-features

03 **Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content. Google**
Reader usefulness, original information and no preferred word count.
https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content

How it connects

Use this map to find missing decision information, **Claim to Source** to verify it, **Proof on the Page** to place it and **Content Review Decisions** to choose the editorial action.

Scope

v0.1, November 2026. By Ameneh Saeednia, prepared with AI assistance. The method and examples are my proposal; the experiment is planned, not yet run.