

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Cookie Banner A/B Test Results

14 controlled tests across 220 sites. The playbook that moves opt-in rates by double digits.

Published by Consenttr • consentr.co.uk • 2026 edition

Why we ran this

Over 6 months, Consenttr ran 14 controlled A/B tests across 220 customer sites representing 12 million banner impressions. This report shares the playbook that consistently moved opt-in rates by double digits.

The 14 tests, ranked by impact

#	Test	Lift in opt-in	Significance
1	Bottom banner vs centre modal	+23.4%	99.9%
2	Brand-styled vs default vendor look	+18.1%	99.9%
3	"Accept all" prominence on right vs left	+11.7%	99.5%
4	Value-led copy vs mechanism copy	+9.8%	99.5%
5	Logo present in banner vs absent	+8.4%	99.0%
6	Overlay dim 30% vs 0%	+6.9%	99.0%
7	Mobile bottom-sheet vs full-screen	+6.1%	99.0%
8	Soft pill button vs sharp rectangle	+4.7%	95.0%
9	Two-line title vs one-line title	+4.2%	95.0%
10	"Got it" CTA vs "Accept all"	+3.6%	95.0%
11	Body text 14px vs 12px	+3.1%	95.0%
12	Show count of cookies vs hide	+1.4%	NS
13	Privacy icon vs no icon	+0.8%	NS
14	Animated entry vs instant	-2.3%	95.0%

Significance is two-sided z-test on the opt-in rate. NS = not statistically significant. Animated entry actually **hurt** opt-in — likely because motion drew attention to the banner as something to dismiss rather than something to read.

Test #1 in detail — Position

A 50/50 split across 18 ecommerce sites showed bottom banners winning 84.2% to 60.8%. The pattern held across desktop and mobile. Centre modals trigger users to look for the close button before reading; bottom banners are accepted as a normal page element.

Implementation note. If you must use a modal (e.g. for TCF compliance), at minimum remove the close X — it is the most-clicked control and counts as no-consent.

Test #2 in detail — Brand styling

We replaced the vendor-default banner with one matching the site's typography, button radius, and brand colour. Average lift: 18.1%. The largest lift on a single site was 31% — a fashion brand whose default-vendor banner clashed with their typography.

What "branded" actually means

- Match font family of the host site
- Match button corner radius (sharp ↔ rounded)
- Use a brand colour for the primary CTA, not the vendor blue
- Match background tone (light vs dark depending on site theme)
- Use brand-style microcopy (no legal-heavy language)

Test #4 in detail — Copy

Mechanism copy: "We use cookies and similar technologies to deliver our services."

Value copy: "Help us personalise your shopping and remember what's in your basket."

Value copy won in 12 of 14 sites. The two losses were in finance, where mechanism copy felt more trustworthy. Lesson: match copy register to audience expectations.

What did NOT work

- Reciprocity ("we don't use ads, just essential cookies") — felt manipulative
- Negative framing ("If you reject, parts of the site may break") — read as a threat
- Discount incentives ("Accept and get 10% off") — likely violates GDPR consent

- Multi-step wizards before banner — abandoned at step 1
- Animated mascots — distracting and unprofessional

A test plan you can copy

If you only run one test, run #2 (brand styling). It is the largest lift available with the lowest implementation cost and zero compliance risk. Expect a 10–20% lift on most consumer sites.

How we measure significance. Each test ran for a minimum of 7 days and 10,000 banner impressions per variant. Variants were assigned via deterministic hashing of visitor IDs to keep the audience consistent across sessions.

Want to actually improve your opt-in rate?

Consentr is the consent platform built for conversion. Set up a free account, add your first site in 5 minutes, and see your real opt-in rate within 24 hours.

→ Start free at consentr.co.uk