

Why Technical SEO Audits Matter for Agency Clients

When I first started working with agencies, I noticed a pattern. Clients would come in excited about their new site, but within a few months, organic traffic would plateau or even drop. The usual suspects were often to blame: slow pages, broken links, or content that search engines simply could not reach. That is where **technical seo audits** come into play. They are not just a checklist item. They are the foundation that makes every other SEO effort actually work.

Think about it this way. You can write the best content on the internet, but if Google cannot crawl, index, or render your pages properly, none of that effort matters. A thorough technical audit finds the cracks in that foundation. Over the years, I have run hundreds of these audits, and the most common issues are often the ones people assume are fine. Redirect chains, for example, look innocent in a report but can quietly drain your crawl budget. I have seen sites with five or six redirect hops on a single URL. That is wasted Googlebot time, and it directly impacts how many of your important pages get indexed.

What a Real Technical SEO Audit Looks Like

A proper audit starts with crawling. Tools like Screaming Frog, DeepCrawl, or Sitebulb give you a map of your site as a search engine sees it. The first pass usually reveals a mix of HTTP status codes - 200s, 301s, 404s, and sometimes 500s that nobody noticed. I always check the server logs too, because what a crawler reports and what the server actually returns can differ. You would be surprised how often a staging environment leaks into production, or a URL returns a soft 404 that looks fine to a human but tells Google to go away.

From there, the audit digs into indexation signals. Canonical tags are a frequent pain point. I have found pages where the canonical pointed to a different product variant entirely, or even to a different domain. Duplicate content issues often stem from session IDs, tracking parameters, or printer-friendly versions of pages that were never properly handled. A good technical seo audit catches these early, before they cause a manual action or a ranking drop.

Performance and Core Web Vitals

Page speed has been a ranking factor for years, but Core Web Vitals made it more concrete. Tools like PageSpeed Insights and Google Search Console's Core Web Vitals report give you lab data and real-world metrics. I have seen sites that pass the lab test but fail in the field because of third-party scripts or aggressive lazy loading that delays above-the-fold content. The tricky part is balancing performance with functionality. A client might want a rich carousel

or a live chat widget, but if those elements block the render, you are hurting both user experience and search visibility.

Render budget is another concept that does not get enough attention. When Googlebot processes a page, it has a limited amount of resources to execute JavaScript and render the final DOM. If your page loads dozens of scripts or relies heavily on JavaScript SEO patterns, the bot may give up before seeing your actual content. I have debugged sites where the entire navigation was generated by JavaScript, and Google could not follow any of the links. The fix often involves server-side rendering or pre-rendering critical content, which is a conversation that belongs in any technical audit.

Mobile-First Indexing and Crawl Budget

Mobile-first indexing means Google primarily uses the mobile version of your site for ranking and indexing. If your mobile site is stripped down or has different content than desktop, you risk losing visibility. I have audited sites where the mobile version hid important text behind tabs or accordions, assuming users would tap to expand. Google can handle some of that now, but it is safer to make critical content directly accessible. Structured data also plays a role here. If your mobile pages are missing structured data that desktop pages have, you are leaving rich results on the table.

Crawl budget is especially relevant for large sites. E-commerce platforms with thousands of product pages, or news sites with millions of articles, need to guide Googlebot toward the important content. A well-maintained robots.txt file and clean XML sitemaps are the first line of defense. I have seen robots.txt files that accidentally blocked the entire site, or XML sitemaps that included paginated URLs with noindex tags. Those mistakes can take weeks to recover from. A technical seo audit should always verify that your robots.txt is not blocking critical resources like CSS or JavaScript files, because blocking those can prevent Google from rendering your pages correctly.

Tools of the Trade

Over the years, I have settled on a core set of tools that cover most scenarios. Screaming Frog is great for crawling small to medium sites, and its ability to integrate with Google Search Console makes it easy to spot coverage issues. For larger sites, DeepCrawl or Sitebulb handle the scale better and provide visualizations that help explain problems to clients. Semrush and Ahrefs both offer site audit features that complement crawling with backlink and keyword data. I use Ahrefs to check for broken backlinks and Semrush to track changes in visibility over time. PageSpeed Insights is indispensable for performance, but I always cross-check its results with real user monitoring data from Google Search Console.

The key is not to rely on any single tool. Each one has blind spots. For example, Screaming Frog might miss JavaScript-rendered content unless you configure it with a headless browser. DeepCrawl handles JavaScript better out of the box but can be slower on very large sites. Knowing which tool to use for which scenario comes with experience, and a good technical audit acknowledges those trade-offs.



Your Clients Get Rankings. You Get The Credit.

Done-For-You SEO fulfillment & strategic advisory
trusted by 200+ agencies and founders since 2007.



livadaras.com • Enterprise SEO Consulting & Agency Infrastructure

Prioritizing Fixes for Developers

One of the biggest challenges I see agencies face is getting developers to act on audit findings. Developers are busy, and they want clear, actionable tasks. A report that lists 200 issues without priority is going to be ignored. That is why I always organize findings by impact and effort. Critical issues - like a noindex tag on your entire homepage, or a 500 error on a top landing page - go first. Then come high-impact, low-effort fixes like fixing broken redirect chains or updating canonical tags. Lower-impact items, like minor duplicate content across similar product pages, can wait for a sprint or a content refresh.

I also make sure to include reproduction steps and expected outcomes. Telling a developer "fix the redirect chain" is not enough. Show them the specific URLs, the number of hops, and the recommended target URL. If possible, include a screenshot from a tool like Screaming Frog or Google Search Console. This reduces back-and-forth and builds trust. Over time, agencies that deliver developer-ready remediation plans earn a reputation for being easy to work with, which is a huge competitive advantage.

Common Pitfalls I Still See

Even experienced teams make mistakes. One common one is ignoring the interaction between robots.txt and XML sitemaps. If your sitemap lists URLs that are blocked by robots.txt, Google will see a conflict and may not index those pages. Another is assuming that all 301 redirects are fine. A 301 from an old URL to a new one is standard, but if that new URL then redirects again, you have a chain. Chains waste crawl budget and can pass less link equity. I have seen chains of ten or more redirects on sites that have been through multiple redesigns.

Duplicate content is another area where tools can mislead. A tool might flag two pages as duplicates when they are actually just similar. The real problem is when Google sees multiple URLs with identical content and has to choose which one to show. That dilutes ranking signals and can cause the wrong page to rank. Canonical tags are the standard fix, but they only work if they are consistent across the entire site. I have found sites where the canonical tag on a page pointed to itself, but the page was also accessible via a different URL that had no canonical. That is a recipe for confusion.

JavaScript SEO issues are becoming more common as sites adopt modern frameworks. React, Angular, and Vue.js can create beautiful user experiences, but they also introduce complexity for search engines. I have audited sites where the entire product catalog was loaded via JavaScript, and Google could not see any of it. The fix usually involves server-side rendering or using a headless browser to pre-render pages for bots. But that is a significant engineering effort, and it needs to be planned carefully. A technical seo audit that flags JavaScript issues early can save a team months of rework later.

Closing Thoughts

[Technical seo audits](#) are not a one-time event. They should happen regularly, especially after any major site change or migration. I recommend at least a quarterly deep dive, with monthly light checks on key metrics like crawl errors, index coverage, and Core Web Vitals. The tools and processes I have described here are the same ones I use with my own clients. They work, but only if you act on the findings. A report that sits in a drawer is just a document. A report that drives changes is what moves the needle.

If you are an agency looking to offer technical SEO as a service, or if you are a marketing team trying to get more from your existing efforts, start with a solid audit. It will show you exactly where your site is leaking traffic and what needs to be fixed first. And when you deliver those findings to your developers in a clear, prioritized format, you will see results faster than you thought possible.