Online Appendix for

"How Does Online Information Influence Offline Transactions: Insights from Digital Real Estate Platforms"

Zhengrui Jiang
Business School
Nanjing University,
Nanjing, Jiangsu, China 210093
zjiang@nju.edu.cn

Arun Rai
Robinson College of Business
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303
arunrai@gsu.edu

Hua Sun
Ivy College of Business
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
hsun@iastate.edu

Cheng Nie
Ivy College of Business
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
cheng@chengnie.com

Yuheng Hu
Department of Information and Decision Sciences
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, IL 60607
yuhenghu@uic.edu

Table of Contents

I. Full Regression Results

Table OA1. Regression Results using 2016 Dataset Full Table
(Corresponding to the Abridged Table 3 in the main paper)

	(3) Common Properties	(4) Uncommon Properties	(5) All Properties	Wald Test (Total Effect for Uncommon Properties = 0)
	log(price)	*log(price)*	*log(price)*	
log(description)	0.0152	0.0390**	0.0175	
	(0.0117)	(0.0131)	(0.0146)	***
log(description)×uncommon			0.0152	（F stat: 21.43）
			(0.0140)	
#photos	-0.0000104	0.00124**	-0.0000853	
	(0.000235)	(0.000424)	(0.000172)	***
#photos×uncommon			0.00146**	（F stat: 12.81）
			(0.000525)	
log(facts)	0.0117	-0.0303	0.00536	
	(0.0151)	(0.0277)	(0.0151)	（F stat: 0.72）
log(facts)×uncommon			-0.0253	
			(0.0170)	
uncommon			0.0430	
			(0.124)	
days on market	-0.0000698	-0.000342	-0.000150**	
	(0.0000529)	(0.000201)	(0.0000600)	
save-view-ratio	0.0215***	0.0644**	0.0384**	
	(0.00538)	(0.0245)	(0.0146)	
log(Zestimate)	0.971***	1.058***	1.017***	
	(0.0112)	(0.0235)	(0.0129)	
age	-0.0000793	-0.000826	-0.000394	
	(0.000128)	(0.000788)	(0.000308)	
beds	-0.0233	-0.00674	-0.0116	
	(0.0154)	(0.0114)	(0.0101)	
bath	0.00660	-0.000915	0.00554	
	(0.00506)	(0.0111)	(0.00734)	
square footage	0.0000201*	-0.0000243	-0.00000603	
	(0.00000866)	(0.0000210)	(0.0000122)	
elementary school rating	0.00330	0.00617*	0.00317**	
	(0.00281)	(0.00290)	(0.00128)	
elementary school distance	-0.0119	0.00425	0.000512	
	(0.00736)	(0.00872)	(0.00972)	
middle school rating	-0.00128	0.000922	0.0000166	
	(0.000944)	(0.00811)	(0.00315)	
middle school distance	-0.00362	-0.0130	-0.0127*	
	(0.00227)	(0.0119)	(0.00591)	
high school rating	0.00239*	-0.00808	-0.00256	
	(0.00117)	(0.0112)	(0.00383)	
high school distance	-0.0109***	-0.00213	-0.00158	
	(0.00262)	(0.00312)	(0.00140)	
list type fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	

monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes
MSA fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes
constant	0.172	-0.804**	-0.486**
	(0.166)	(0.347)	(0.157)
N	436	283	719
adj. R^2	0.970	0.958	0.962

Standard errors in parentheses are robust and clustered at the MSA level.
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table OA2. Regression Results using Augmented 2016 Dataset Full Table (Corresponding to the abridged Table 4 in the main paper)

	(6) Common Properties	(7) Uncommon Properties	(8) All Properties	Wald Test (Total Effect for Uncommon Properties = 0)
	log(price)	*log(price)*	*log(price)*	
log(description)	0.00481	0.0269*	0.00533	
	(0.00558)	(0.0129)	(0.00777)	***
log(description)×uncommon			0.0254*	（F stat: 12.65）
			(0.0118)	
#photos	0.000114	0.00114**	-0.0000880	
	(0.000267)	(0.000376)	(0.0000895)	***
#photos×uncommon			0.00160***	（F stat: 31.71）
			(0.000293)	
log(facts)	0.0100	-0.0266	0.00124	
	(0.0170)	(0.0279)	(0.0158)	（F stat: 0.19）
log(facts)×uncommon			-0.0109	
			(0.0217)	
uncommon			-0.132	
			(0.130)	
seller agent rating	-0.000403	0.124	0.0303	
	(0.00663)	(0.0875)	(0.0629)	
days on market	0.0000192	-0.000374	-0.0000607	
	(0.0000550)	(0.000204)	(0.0000539)	
save-view-ratio	0.0263**	0.0129	0.0298	
	(0.01000)	(0.0358)	(0.0195)	
log(Zestimate)	0.960***	1.063***	1.022***	
	(0.0139)	(0.0424)	(0.0143)	
age	-0.0000304	-0.00126	-0.000626**	
	(0.000154)	(0.000829)	(0.000266)	
beds	-0.00133	0.00217	0.00418	
	(0.00380)	(0.0173)	(0.00791)	
bath	0.00289	-0.00392	0.00303	
	(0.00368)	(0.0170)	(0.0100)	
square footage	0.00000250	-0.0000165	-0.0000106	
	(0.00000409)	(0.0000284)	(0.0000116)	
elementary	0.00396***	0.00731	0.00377*	

school rating	(0.000641)	(0.00588)	(0.00191)
elementary school distance	-0.0182*	0.00820	0.00451
	(0.00924)	(0.00667)	(0.00943)
middle school rating	-0.000544	-0.00130	0.000327
	(0.00110)	(0.00857)	(0.00344)
middle school distance	-0.00168	0.00104	-0.00479
	(0.00238)	(0.00627)	(0.00448)
high school rating	-0.00125	-0.0155*	-0.00924**
	(0.00132)	(0.00729)	(0.00303)
high school distance	-0.00580	-0.00490	-0.00152
	(0.00356)	(0.00366)	(0.00120)
list type fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes
monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes
MSA fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes
constant	0.414	-1.547**	-0.771***
	(0.233)	(0.556)	(0.225)
N	297	200	497
adj. R^2	0.974	0.969	0.968

Standard errors in parentheses are robust and clustered at the MSA level.
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table OA3. Regression Results using 2020 Chicago MSA Dataset (Corresponding to the abridged Table 5 in the main paper)

	(9) All Properties		(10) All Properties	Wald Test (Total Effect for Uncommon Properties = 0)
	log(price)		*log(price)*	
log(description)	0.00953		0.00569	
	(0.00718)	**	(0.0128)	***
log(description)×uncommon	0.0174	（F stat: 5.67）	0.09523***	（F stat: 11.27）
	(0.0128)		(0.0315)	
#photos	0.000400		0.00073	
	(0.000407)	*	(0.00077)	***
#photos×uncommon	0.000262	（F stat: 3.06）	0.00145	（F stat: 8.00）
	(0.000537)		(0.00107)	
log(facts)	0.00360		0.10156	
	(0.0553)		(0.0790)	
log(facts)×uncommon	-0.0281	（F stat: 0.27）	0.03653	（F stat: 1.46）
	(0.0711)		(0.1384)	
uncommon	0.0281		-0.68501	
	(0.304)		(0.6189)	
log(Zestimate)	0.801***			
	(0.0278)			
last residual			0.06307***	
			(0.0192)	
log(assessment)			0.18984***	
			(0.04032)	
seller agent rating	0.0341***		0.10851***	

	(0.0110)	(0.0314)
Seller agent sales 12month	-0.0000236	-0.0001
	(0.0000521)	(0.00012)
dual agent	-0.00716	-0.0011
	(0.0109)	(0.0210)
days on market	-0.000715***	-0.000305***
	(0.000123)	(0.00009)
age	-0.000180*	-0.00036*
	(0.000100)	(0.00022)
bedrooms	0.00451	0.01355
	(0.00430)	(0.00912)
bathrooms	0.0214***	0.11708***
	(0.00607)	(0.0121)
square footage	0.0000233***	0.00007***
	(0.00000458)	(0.00001)
elementary school rating	0.00485*	0.0182***
	(0.00253)	(0.0049)
high school rating	0.00251	-0.00232
	(0.00492)	(0.0283)
walk score	0.000808*	0.00146
	(0.000447)	(0.0009)
transit score	0.000158	0.0011
	(0.000837)	(0.0019)
lot size in sqft	0.00000**	0.00000
	(0.00000)	(0.0000)
monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes
neighborhood fixed effect	Yes	Yes
constant	3.028***	9.940***
	(0.429)	(0.668)
N	3054	1615
adj. R^2	0.965	0.913

Standard errors in parentheses. Robust standard errors in Model 1, and two-stage bootstrap standard errors in Model 2 to correct for the generated regressor problem.
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

II. Robustness Checks using Alternative Estimation Methods and Measures for Variables

We conduct a few checks to evaluate the robustness of the main findings with respect to alternative estimation methods of stand errors, alternative treatments of missing neighborhood average Zestimate values, and alternative measures for common and uncommon properties. The details are provided below.

Hubert-White Heteroscedasticity Robust Standard Errors

In the main analyses, we have used the cluster-robust method to estimate standard errors. There is a discussion regarding whether such a complex estimate is necessary when a simple method might also work (Wooldridge 2003, Imbens and Wooldridge 2007). We replicate the analysis shown in Table 4 using the simpler Hubert-White heteroscedasticity standard error estimator instead of the cluster-robust estimator. This estimator remains robust to heteroscedasticity, but relaxes the assumption of within-group correlation of errors. The results are summarized in Table OA4. There are some minor differences between the results in Table OA4 and Table 4. Notably, under Hubert-White robust standard errors, the coefficient for log(description) is significant at the 10% level for uncommon properties. However, given that the coefficient for uncommon properties is around 250% for common properties, the general observation that online property information has a much bigger impact on uncommon properties than on common properties remains valid.

Table OA4. Results based on Hubert-White Heteroscedasticity Standard Error Estimator

	Common Property *log(price)*	Uncommon Property *log(price)*
log(description)	0.0152*	0.0390*
	(0.00914)	(0.0201)
#photos	-0.0000104	0.00124**
	(0.000372)	(0.000595)
log(facts)	0.0117	-0.0303
	(0.00978)	(0.0222)
save-view-ratio	0.0215	0.0644**
	(0.0155)	(0.0316)
log(Zestimate)	0.971***	1.058***
	(0.0179)	(0.0370)
days on market	-0.0000698	-0.000342*
	(0.0000671)	(0.000185)
age	-0.0000793	-0.000826*

	(0.000279)	(0.000497)
beds	-0.0233**	-0.00674
	(0.0103)	(0.0140)
baths	0.00660	-0.000915
	(0.0108)	(0.0236)
square footage	0.0000201**	-0.0000243*
	(0.00000945)	(0.0000144)
elementary school rating	0.00330	0.00617
	(0.00405)	(0.00693)
elementary school distance	-0.0119	0.00425
	(0.0124)	(0.00759)
middle school rating	-0.00128	0.000922
	(0.00385)	(0.0101)
middle school distance	-0.00362	-0.0130
	(0.00565)	(0.00910)
high school rating	0.00239	-0.00808
	(0.00397)	(0.0119)
high school distance	-0.0109**	-0.00213
	(0.00544)	(0.00321)
list type fixed effect	Yes	Yes
monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes
MSA fixed effect	Yes	Yes
constant	0.172	-0.804*
	(0.235)	(0.462)
N	436	283
adj. R^2	0.970	0.958

Huber-White heteroscedasticity robust standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Replacing Missing Neighborhood Average Zestimate Value with City Average

The classification of common and uncommon properties is done based on the neighborhood average Zestimate value. Unfortunately, for a neighborhood with limited property information, Zillow may not provide such an average. Thus far, we categorize observations that have missing neighborhood average Zestimate as uncommon properties. An alternative treatment is to compare a property's value with the average property value for a larger area. Fortunately, Zillow provides an average Zestimate for a city, which covers a broader area than a neighborhood and has much fewer missing values. Therefore, as a robustness check, for sold houses without a neighborhood average Zestimate value, we substitute the missing value with the city average Zestimate value when the latter is available. We then rerun our analysis and report the results in Table OA5. We find the findings drawn from Table OA5 and Table 4 are largely consistent.

Table OA5. Results after Replacing Missing Neighborhood Zestimate with City Zestimate

	Common Property *log(price)*	Uncommon Property *log(price)*
log(description)	0.0171	0.0423***
	(0.0156)	(0.0108)
#photos	0.000119	0.00113**
	(0.000171)	(0.000444)
log(facts)	0.00408	-0.0252
	(0.0164)	(0.0326)
save-view-ratio	0.0267*	0.0646*
	(0.0114)	(0.0312)
log(Zestimate)	0.983***	1.062***
	(0.0140)	(0.0307)
days on market	-0.000117	-0.000291
	(0.0000687)	(0.000169)
age	-0.0000418	-0.000794
	(0.000161)	(0.000789)
beds	-0.0185	-0.00441
	(0.0157)	(0.0136)
baths	0.0110	-0.00519
	(0.0111)	(0.00822)
square footage	0.0000183	-0.0000299
	(0.0000106)	(0.0000189)
elementary school rating	0.00148	0.00630
	(0.000805)	(0.00436)
elementary school distance	-0.0136*	0.00357
	(0.00628)	(0.00835)
middle school rating	0.00107	-0.00145
	(0.00300)	(0.00880)
middle school distance	-0.00786	-0.0150
	(0.00460)	(0.0131)
high school rating	0.00249	-0.00899
	(0.00166)	(0.0129)
high school	0.000327	-0.00123
distance	(0.00235)	(0.0104)
list type fixed effect	Yes	Yes
monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes
MSA fixed effect	Yes	Yes
constant	0.0273	-0.928*
	(0.153)	(0.487)
N	467	252
adj. R^2	0.965	0.959

Standard errors in parentheses are robust and clustered at the MSA level.
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

This consistency further corroborates our information-based explanation. After all, a property being uncommon and its neighborhood information being limited have a similar impact on buyers and sellers —

both imply that less offline information is available about comparable properties, hence driving them to seek information online.

Alternative Measures for Common and Uncommon Properties

So far, we have classified a property as uncommon if either its Zestimate is outside the 70% to 130% range of the reported neighborhood average Zestimate, or the neighborhood average Zestimate is missing. To make sure our findings are not driven by these particular cutoff points, we adopt other cutoff ratios and report the results in Table OA6. We consider three alternative cutoff ratios in the additional analysis, i.e., 65%–135% (Columns (1) and (2)), 75%–125% (Columns (3) and (4)), and 80%–120% (Columns (5) and (6)). Qualitatively, there is little difference between what we observe from Table OA6 and our findings from Table 4. The impact of online property information on offline transaction price for common properties remains in sharp contrast with that for uncommon properties across all three alternative cutoff ratios.

Table OA6. Results with Alternative Measures of Common and Uncommon Properties

	(1) Common Property *log(price)*	(2) Uncommon Property *log(price)*	(3) Common Property *log(price)*	(4) Uncommon Property *log(price)*	(5) Common Property *log(price)*	(6) Uncommon Property *log(price)*
log(description)	0.0137	0.0446**	0.0119	0.0353**	0.0129	0.0234
	(0.0121)	(0.0183)	(0.00971)	(0.0152)	(0.00884)	(0.0157)
#photos	0.0000443	0.00114***	0.0000596	0.00105**	0.000279*	0.000910**
	(0.000136)	(0.000334)	(0.000157)	(0.000331)	(0.000125)	(0.000308)
log(facts)	0.00777	-0.0293	0.0101	-0.0199	0.0142	-0.0208
	(0.0154)	(0.0293)	(0.0157)	(0.0257)	(0.0184)	(0.0223)
save-view-ratio	0.0210***	0.0737**	0.0218*	0.0615***	0.0224*	0.0563***
	(0.00530)	(0.0287)	(0.0101)	(0.0120)	(0.0110)	(0.0150)
log(Zestimate)	0.985***	1.061***	0.976***	1.043***	0.965***	1.047***
	(0.0120)	(0.0230)	(0.00317)	(0.0271)	(0.00613)	(0.0236)
days on market	-0.0000649	-0.000380	-0.0000412	-0.000260	-0.0000170	-0.000233
	(0.0000563)	(0.000235)	(0.0000604)	(0.000183)	(0.0000660)	(0.000150)
age	-0.000339***	-0.000673	-0.0000311	-0.000612	0.0000798	-0.000515
	(0.0000880)	(0.000851)	(0.000135)	(0.000664)	(0.000182)	(0.000519)
beds	-0.0156	-0.0123	-0.0159	-0.0133	-0.0146	-0.0149
	(0.0112)	(0.0121)	(0.0121)	(0.0108)	(0.0165)	(0.00893)
baths	0.00393	-0.00230	0.00189	0.00553	0.00642	0.00601
	(0.00463)	(0.0135)	(0.00186)	(0.0138)	(0.00535)	(0.0128)

square footage	0.00000565	-0.0000193	0.0000202**	-0.0000218	0.0000183*	-0.0000209
	(0.00000407)	(0.0000289)	(0.00000722)	(0.0000172)	(0.00000781)	(0.0000159)
elementary school rating	0.00288	0.00681	0.00395	0.00240	0.00427	0.00289
	(0.00289)	(0.00375)	(0.00318)	(0.00395)	(0.00457)	(0.00329)
elementary school distance	-0.00866	0.00323	-0.0130	0.00331	-0.0196	0.00386
	(0.00832)	(0.00975)	(0.00987)	(0.00866)	(0.0150)	(0.00851)
middle school rating	-0.0000998	0.00108	-0.00333**	0.00415	-0.00245	0.00147
	(0.000391)	(0.00919)	(0.00133)	(0.00743)	(0.00207)	(0.00717)
middle school distance	-0.00271	-0.0151	-0.00464	-0.0114	-0.0000544	-0.0112
	(0.00230)	(0.0129)	(0.00282)	(0.0103)	(0.00433)	(0.00916)
high school rating	0.00101	-0.00857	0.00604**	-0.0105	0.00591**	-0.00894
	(0.00119)	(0.0121)	(0.00173)	(0.0110)	(0.00223)	(0.0106)
high school distance	-0.0104***	-0.00168	-0.00988**	-0.00248	-0.00916*	-0.00235
	(0.00221)	(0.00337)	(0.00334)	(0.00287)	(0.00444)	(0.00287)
list type fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
monthly fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MSA fixed effect	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
constant	0.0765	-0.896**	0.130	-0.685*	0.183	-0.660*
	(0.159)	(0.311)	(0.101)	(0.354)	(0.160)	(0.293)
N	462	257	394	325	346	373
adj. R^2	0.971	0.954	0.970	0.959	0.967	0.961

Standard errors in parentheses are robust and clustered at the MSA level.
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

The results of these robustness checks give us additional confidence that our key findings are robust to alternative methods and explanations.

III. Robustness Check: Alternative Specification Using Linear Combination of Parameters

To further test the robustness of our findings, we derive an alternative model based on a linear combination of parameters (see Wooldridge 2019, pp. 136-137). The new model does not require a dummy variable and interaction terms, thus allowing us to use the pooled sample and the standard t-tests to test our hypotheses. The linear combination of parameters can be illustrated using number of photos as an example:

Consider the following original model:

$$\mathrm{Y} = \alpha + \beta_1 \#photo + \beta_2 \#photo \times uncommon + \varepsilon,$$

Consistent with the main text, the dummy variable *uncommon* indicates whether a property belongs to the uncommon type (equal to 1 for uncommon properties and 0 for common properties). Adding and subtracting the same term $\beta_1 \#photo \times uncommon$, we get:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 \#photo - \beta_1 \#photo \times uncommon + \beta_1 \#photo \times uncommon + \beta_2 \#photo \times uncommon + \varepsilon,$$

Rearranging the terms yields:

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 \#photo(1 - uncommon) + (\beta_1 + \beta_2) \#photo \times uncommon + \varepsilon,$$

which is equivalent to

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 \#photo \times common + (\beta_1 + \beta_2) \#photo \times uncommon + \varepsilon.$$

Here, we introduce a second dummy variable *common* to indicates whether a property belongs to the common type (equal to 1 for common properties and 0 for uncommon properties). In the equation above, β_1 represents the effect of #photo on common properties, and $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ is the total effect of #photo on uncommon properties. By substituting the total impact $(\beta_1 + \beta_2)$ as $\tilde{\beta}_2$, we get:

$$\mathrm{Y} = \alpha + \beta_1 \#photo \times common + \tilde{\beta}_2 \#photo \times uncommon + \varepsilon$$

For a given property, only one of the two dummy variables, *common and uncommon*, takes the value of 1.

By rearranging the variables, this revised model allows us to run the regressions and test the impact of *#photos* on common properties through t-test on estimated β_1; and the impact of *#photos* on uncommon properties through t-test on estimated $\tilde{\beta}_2$. Similar linear transformations can be done for the other two key variables: *log(description)* and *log(facts)*.

Based on this revised model, we rerun the regressions for the 2016 and 2020 data and summarize the results in Tables OA7 and OA8. Using these two tables, the hypotheses can be tested using t-statistics. We again find that information on experience attributes, represented by the length of property descriptions and the number of photos, has a significant influence on uncommon properties' sale prices, whereas the impact on common properties is found to be insignificant. Information on search attributes, represented by the length of Facts and Features, does not have a significant impact on the sale price of either uncommon properties or common properties. The findings are once again consistent with the main results, thus offering additional evidence for the robustness of our findings.

Table OA7. Regression Results for 2016 Data After Linear Transformation

	(1) *log(price)*	(2) *log(price)*
log(description)×common	0.0175	0.00533
	(0.0146)	(0.00777)
log(description)×uncommon	0.0327***	0.0308***
	(0.00706)	(0.00865)
#photos×common	-0.0000853	-0.0000880
	(0.000172)	(0.0000895)
#photos×uncommon	0.00137***	0.00151***
	(0.000383)	(0.000269)
log(facts)×common	0.00536	0.00124
	(0.0151)	(0.0158)
log(facts)×uncommon	-0.0200	-0.00961
	(0.0235)	(0.0222)
uncommon	0.0430	-0.132
	(0.124)	(0.130)
days on market	-0.000150**	-0.0000607
	(0.0000600)	(0.0000539)
save-view-ratio	0.0384**	0.0298
	(0.0146)	(0.0195)
log(Zestimate)	1.017***	1.022***
	(0.0129)	(0.0143)
seller agent rating		0.0303
		(0.0629)
age	-0.000394	-0.000626**
	(0.000308)	(0.000266)

beds	-0.0116	0.00418
	(0.0101)	(0.00791)
baths	0.00554	0.00303
	(0.00734)	(0.0100)
square footage	-0.00000603	-0.0000106
	(0.0000122)	(0.0000116)
elementary school rating	0.00317**	0.00377*
	(0.00128)	(0.00191)
elementary school distance	0.000512	0.00451
	(0.00972)	(0.00943)
middle school rating	0.0000166	0.000327
	(0.00315)	(0.00344)
middle school distance	-0.0127*	-0.00479
	(0.00591)	(0.00448)
high school rating	-0.00256	-0.00924**
	(0.00383)	(0.00303)
high school distance	-0.00158	-0.00152
	(0.00140)	(0.00120)
Time Fix Effect	Yes	Yes
Type Fix Effect	Yes	Yes
MSA Fix Effect	Yes	Yes
constant	-0.486**	-0.771***
	(0.157)	(0.225)
N	719	497
adj. R^2	0.962	0.968

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table OA8. Regression Results for 2020 Chicago Data After Linear Transformation

	(1)	(2)
	log(price)	*log(price)*
log(description)×common	0.00953	0.00577
	(0.00718)	(0.0131)
log(description)×uncommon	0.0269**	0.101***
	(0.0113)	(0.0324)

#photos×common	0.000400	0.000729
	(0.000407)	(0.000777)
#photos×uncommon	0.000662*	0.00218**
	(0.000378)	(0.000859)
log(facts)×common	0.00360	0.101
	(0.0553)	(0.0797)
log(facts)×uncommon	-0.0245	0.141
	(0.0471)	(0.122)
uncommon	0.0281	-0.695
	(0.304)	(0.658)
log(Zestimate)	0.801***	
	(0.0278)	
last residual		0.0605***
		(0.0184)
log(assess)		0.191***
		(0.0447)
Seller agent rating	0.0341***	0.109***
	(0.0110)	(0.0328)
Seller agent sales 12mo	-0.0000236	-0.0000968
	(0.0000521)	(0.000121)
Dual agent	-0.00716	-0.00113
	(0.0109)	(0.0223)
days on market	-0.000715***	-0.000305***
	(0.000123)	(0.0000908)
age	-0.000180*	-0.000357
	(0.000100)	(0.000226)
beds	0.00451	0.0134
	(0.00430)	(0.00987)
baths	0.0214***	0.117***
	(0.00607)	(0.0109)
square footage	0.0000233***	0.0000740***
	(0.00000458)	(0.0000119)
schoolElementary_rating	0.00485*	0.0182***
	(0.00253)	(0.00532)

schoolHigh_rating	0.00251 (0.00492)	-0.00230 (0.0290)
walk_score	0.000808* (0.000447)	0.00146 (0.000991)
transit_score	0.000158 (0.000837)	0.00109 (0.00204)
LotSizeinsqft	-2.71e-10** (1.32e-10)	-9.50e-10*** (2.43e-10)
Neighborhood Fix Effect	Yes	Yes
Time Fix Effect	Yes	Yes
constant	3.028*** (0.429)	9.940*** (0.668)
N	3054	1615
adj. R^2	0.965	0.913

Standard errors in parentheses
* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

References:

Wooldridge, J.M., 2019. *Introductory econometrics: A modern approach. 7th edition*. Cengage.