

Sparse Regularization in Marketing and Economics*

Guanhao Feng[†]Nicholas G. Polson[‡]Yuexi Wang[§]Jianeng Xu[¶]

College of Business

Booth School of Business

Department of Statistics

Booth School of Business

City University of Hong Kong

University of Chicago

University of Chicago

University of Chicago

February 6, 2018

Abstract

Sparse alpha-norm regularization has many data-rich applications in Marketing and Economics. Alpha-norm, in contrast to lasso and ridge regularization, jumps to a sparse solution. This feature is attractive for ultra high-dimensional problems that occur in demand estimation and forecasting. The alpha-norm objective is nonconvex and requires coordinate descent and proximal operators to find the sparse solution. We study a typical marketing demand forecasting problem, grocery store sales for salty snacks, that has many dummy variables as controls. The key predictors of demand include price, equalized volume, promotion, flavor, scent, and brand effects. By comparing with many commonly used machine learning methods, alpha-norm regularization achieves its goal of providing accurate out-of-sample estimates for the promotion lift effects. Finally, we conclude with directions for future research.

Key Words: Machine learning, Regularization, Proximal Algorithm, Nonconvex Optimization, Marketing Demand Forecasting

*We would like to thank Miaoyu Yang for sharing the data.

[†]Address: 83 Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong. E-mail address: gavin.feng@cityu.edu.hk.

[‡]Address: 5807 S Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. E-mail address: ngp@chicagobooth.edu.

[§]Address: 5747 S Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. E-mail address: yxwang99@uchicago.edu.

[¶]Address: 5807 S Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA. E-mail address: jianeng@uchicago.edu.

1 Introduction

High-dimensional sparse regression is central to prediction with massive datasets and many predictors. Amazon, Facebook, Google, and Walmart employ data analytics to analyze customer behavior and to maximize customer value given purchase histories. For example, Amazon has an “anticipatory shipping” patent to pre-ship products to reduce waiting times based on purchase order history, search history, and shopping cart activities¹. Netflix and Spotify rely heavily on extensive user databases to provide recommendations, make bids for rights of television dramas, and suggest movies to license². Uber calculates fares automatically and dynamically using GPS and street data, the rider’s history, traditional routes, and other factors. Its carpooling service helps reduce average cumulative trip miles by 40%, and the process takes millions of cars off the roads.

Alpha-norm (ℓ_α -norm) regularization provides an attractive high-dimensional predictor selection method to handle massive datasets. Proximal algorithms can find sparse solutions as they are scalable and use Majorization-Minimization (MM) and Iterative Shrinkage-Thresholding (IST) for convergence. Our algorithm design uses coordinate-descent ([13, 14]) together with a closed-form proximal operator of ℓ_α penalty ([17]). Convergence results are provided in [4] which describes the ℓ_α objective and derives its necessary Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz (KL) condition. [21] improves this by eliminating the requirement that the columns of the design matrix be normalized, and introduces a step-size parameter to enhance the algorithm. [7] provide convergence results for MM-based algorithms.

Our approach uses the closed-form proximal operator for ℓ_α sparsity, where $0 < \alpha < 1$. Under ℓ_0 sparsity, which penalizes the number of non-zero coefficients directly, Single Best Replacement (SBR) provides a fast, scalable alternative to direct posterior sampling using spike-and-slab priors, see [18]. [15] discuss the limitations of the lasso ℓ_1 -norm versus ℓ_α -norm. The key property of ℓ_α regularization is that it “jumps” to a sparse solution, which we exploit in our application.

Sparsity in marketing and economics arises due to large internet-related economic transactional data where machine-learning tools are required for estimation and forecasting. Market-demand forecasts are necessary for predicting future sales, inventory planning, and understanding

¹<https://www.marketingweek.com/2014/01/22/amazon-has-seen-the-future-of-predictability/>

²<https://blog.kissmetrics.com/how-Netflix-uses-analytics/>

the effects of potential marketing strategies. Two approaches are used to avoid in-sample overfitting: imposing an informative structure and regularization and model selection through penalizations on parameter proliferation. Model selection is especially useful with well-defined subpopulations or segments. Nonparametric approaches are used to estimate incremental effects, see [19]. Quantitative variables of interests include lift of non-targeted promotions (see [8]), targeted promotions (see [11]), and joint lift of price and promotions predictions (see [9] and [16]).

Scanner-panel data typically includes many discrete categorical variables, such as product and store attributes, over a long time span and dummy variables to control for the individual effects. [2] show that a homogeneous demand model with random in-store heterogeneity can achieve similar accuracy to model with various heterogeneity specification. Tailored methods have been developed to deal with discrete quantities and quantity discounts for packaged goods (see [1]) and endogenous dummy regressors, see [3]. In our empirical study, we find that ℓ_α regularization provides better out-of-sample performance compared to linear and traditional shrinkage methods.

The rest of the paper is outlined as follows. Section 2 shows the performance of the alpha norm in simulation studies. We demonstrate how the ℓ_α can achieve better prediction and reduce bias in coefficient estimation in a general setting. Section 3 shows the alpha norm can also produce more accurate prediction (smaller RMSE) in a simulated log-linear model and demand-estimation context. Section 4 applies our methodology to scanner-panel data of sales for salty snacks within one grocery store chain. Our model can achieve smaller out-of-sample RMSE and substantially shrink the number of predictors. Section 5 concludes with directions for future research.

2 Sparse ℓ_α Regularization

Consider an ultra high-dimensional regression model for an output, y , with many predictors $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$. The columns of X are standardized such that $\|x_i\|_2 = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. Hence, our model assumes:

$$y = X\beta + \epsilon, \tag{1}$$

where $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1}$ are the response observations, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times 1}$ is the sparse coefficient of interest, $X \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times p}$ is the design matrix, and $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_N)$ is the noise.

The ℓ_α regularization is equivalent to an optimization problem which minimizes the following objective function with penalty parameter $\lambda > 0$,

$$J(\beta) := \frac{1}{2} \|y - X\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_\alpha^\alpha, \text{ where } \|\beta\|_\alpha := \left(\sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i^\alpha| \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \quad (2)$$

For a given λ , we calculate a regularization path for $\hat{\beta}_\lambda$.

Define the proximal operator, $\tau_\lambda(z)$, by $\tau_\lambda(z) = \operatorname{argmin}_\beta \frac{1}{2}(z - \beta)^2 + \lambda |\beta|^\alpha$. Then all its solutions are given by

$$\tau_\lambda(z) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } |z| < h_{\lambda, \alpha} \\ \{0, \operatorname{sgn}(z)b_{\lambda, \alpha}\}, & \text{if } |z| = h_{\lambda, \alpha} \\ \operatorname{sgn}(z)\bar{\beta}, & \text{if } |z| > h_{\lambda, \alpha} \end{cases}$$

where $b_{\lambda, \alpha} := [2\lambda(1 - \alpha)]^{\frac{1}{2-\alpha}}$ and $h_{\lambda, \alpha} := b_{\lambda, \alpha} + \lambda \alpha b_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\alpha-1}$, and $\bar{\beta} > 0$ satisfies $\bar{\beta} + \lambda \alpha \bar{\beta}^{\alpha-1} = |z|$. We derive two solutions, and set $\bar{\beta} \in (b_{\lambda, \alpha}, |z|)$ to be the larger one in implementation.

Our algorithm is based on the result of [12] who provide a solution to ℓ_α minimization. First, as $\alpha \rightarrow 0^+$, the limit of $\tau_\lambda(z)$ is hard thresholding with the threshold value $h_{\lambda, 0} = \sqrt{2\lambda}$, whereas as $\alpha \rightarrow 1^-$, the limit of $\tau_\lambda(z)$ is soft thresholding with the threshold value λ . For comparison, $\tau_\lambda(z)$ for different α are plotted in Figure 1. The value of $\tau_\lambda(z)$ at the point $z = h_{\lambda, \alpha}$ is not unique with solution set $\{0, \operatorname{sgn}(b_{\lambda, \alpha})\}$.

To show an improvement in the objective function, we use Lemma 1 of [14]:

$$J(\beta_{-i} + \tau_\lambda(z_i)e_i) \leq J(\beta), \quad \text{for any } \beta. \quad (3)$$

Define $z_i = z(\beta_{-i})$ as $x_i^T(y - X\beta_{-i})$ is the adjusted gradient for the i -th coordinate and $\beta_{-i} := \beta - \beta_i e_i$ where e_i has a 1 in the i -th position and 0's in the rest. Similar to the soft-thresholding rule of lasso, $\tau_\lambda(z)$ function maps the gradient z to 0 when it's smaller than the threshold $h_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Therefore, ℓ_α regularization selects a null model (all coefficient estimates are 0) if $\max_i |x_i, y| < h_{\lambda, \alpha}$ (we assume x and y are centered and $\|x\|_2 = 1$).

Coordinate-descent can then be used to iteratively minimize the objective function. In each iteration, the algorithm minimizes along one coordinate and solves the scalar optimization problem with z_i replaced by the adjusted gradient. If $\alpha = 1$, this is equivalent to the R package `glmnet` of [10]. At each step of the coordinate-descent, we use the closed-form proximal operator for ℓ_α .

Unlike soft-thresholding, $\tau_\lambda(z)$ jumps immediately from 0 to $b_{\lambda,\alpha}$ when z arrives to $h_{\lambda,\alpha}$, which results in discontinuity of the coefficient-regularization path. When λ is small, $h_{\lambda,\alpha} > \lambda$, and when λ is large, $h_{\lambda,\alpha} < \lambda$, thus the estimates are sparser than those given by lasso when we choose a small λ (increase the shrinkage of $\hat{\beta}$ when true $\beta = 0$). On the other hand, they are more robust for λ 's that are too large (reduce the shrinkage of $\hat{\beta}$ when true $\beta \neq 0$). In Figure 2, we show $\tau_\lambda(z)$ when $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 1, 10$. The larger α is, the quicker $h_{\lambda,\alpha}$ changes with λ .

Appendix A provides full details of the algorithm.

3 Applications

3.1 Linear Regression Simulation

To illustrate the ℓ_α -norm estimator, we simulate data from the model:

$$y = X\beta + \epsilon, \text{ where } \epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_N), \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma^2 = 1,$$

and we minimize the objective function over a regularization path $\lambda > 0$:

$$J(\beta) = \|y - X\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_\alpha^\alpha. \tag{4}$$

The design matrices $X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p]$ are drawn from a multivariate normal distribution where each X_i has variance 10^2 and mean 0. We also introduce correlation among X_i 's, $\text{Cor}(X_i, X_j) = 0.1^{|i-j|/3}$. The noise variance $\sigma^2 = 1$ and β is the coefficient vector. For three different values of $\alpha \in (0.1, 0.5, 0.9)$, we show how coefficient estimates given by ℓ_α change with regularization parameter λ . We set three different data dimensions— $p = 50, 100$, and 500 —whereas the true model dimension is fixed as small as 5. Specifically, $\beta = [5, 5, \dots, 5, 0, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that only the first five coefficients are non-zero. The number of observations is $N = 600$.

Figure 3 shows simulation results. The dataset dimension p 's are 50, 100, and 200 from top to bottom. The left column illustrates the case of non-zero coefficient $\beta_1 = 5$. As λ increases, the estimate $\hat{\beta}_1$ is penalized from 5 to 0. Also note the jumps in the ℓ_α -paths, especially when $\alpha = 0.1$, which is expected and due to the discontinuity nature of the τ function, as discussed previously. As the columns X_1, X_2, \dots, X_5 are positively correlated, the drop of one $\hat{\beta}$ increases the estimated value of others. Figure 3 shows the path of lasso ($\alpha = 1$) looks smoother and shrinks quickly. The behavior of $\ell_{0.9}$ regularization is similar to the lasso.

The larger α is, the quicker $\hat{\beta}_1$ shrinks. This finding suggests the ℓ_α estimator is less biased than the lasso estimator ($\alpha = 1$) regarding the true non-zeros, and we can further reduce estimation bias by choosing a smaller α . Figure 4 shows that when $\hat{\beta}$ drops to 0 as λ increases, the regularization paths of other $\hat{\beta}$'s are affected and immediately make jumps.

For a suitable range of λ , ℓ_α regularization introduces more sparsity than lasso. The right column in Figure 3 shows how the number of non-zero $\hat{\beta}_i$'s change with λ . We point out that, the path of $\ell_{0.1}$ drops most quickly when $\log(\lambda)$ is less than 0. Though the regularized models with this range of λ are still redundant since number of non-zero $\hat{\beta}_i$'s is greater than the true value, ℓ_α gives a more sparse model than lasso.

Once the true model is achieved, ℓ_α tends to stay on it though the regularization parameter λ keeps increasing, especially when α is small. In other words, when λ is small and there are many redundant variables in the model, the regularization of ℓ_α is stronger than lasso; when λ is large and we are close to the true model, the regularization of ℓ_α is weaker than lasso. In Figure 3, we see that when $\log(\lambda)$ is close to 0, the performances of $\ell_{0.1}$ and lasso are similar. This is where the relative strength of regularization gets reversed. The plots summarize the estimated regularization paths and indicate again that ℓ_α regularization is less biased and more robust for variable selection. ℓ_α regularization possesses better performances with a wider range of λ .

We also show the performance of ℓ_α regularization under two different correlation strengths: $\text{Cor}(X_i, X_j) = \rho^{|i-j|/3}$, where $\rho = 0.1, 0.6$, representing low and high correlation, respectively. In this example, the regularization parameter λ is chosen using five-fold cross-validation. The sizes of the datasets are $N^{\text{train}} = 600, N^{\text{test}} = 600$, and the total number of runs is 100. In Table 1, we list the average prediction RMSE (out of sample), and the bias/variance of coefficient estimates (in

sample) of ℓ_α with other linear methods, including lasso, OLS, and the elastic net. For the elastic net, we always use the penalty $\frac{1}{2}\|\beta\|_1 + \frac{1}{4}\|\beta\|_2^2$. The dataset dimensions are $p = 50, 100,$ and 500 as before. Lasso is a benchmark, and normalize results by their counterparts under lasso. The RMSE is simply calculated as

$$\text{RMSE}(Y, \hat{Y}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}$$

where (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) are observed values and $(\hat{y}_1, \hat{y}_2, \dots, \hat{y}_n)$ are the predicted values.

We find that ℓ_α gives more accurate predictions in all dimensional and correlation settings. By comparing the average RMSE, we see that small α produces small prediction errors. ℓ_α also produces less bias than lasso and elastic net in almost all cases, though the estimator variances get larger for those non-zero estimates. For $\beta_6 = 0$, we also emphasize that in the high-correlation setting, ℓ_α estimates β_6 with great accuracy. Both $\ell_{0.1}$ and $\ell_{0.5}$ give the correct $\hat{\beta}_6 = 0$ with zero estimator variance. ℓ_α performs extremely well when dealing with those redundant variables. Imagining ℓ_α encourages sparser models than the lasso and elastic net is therefore not hard. This advantage of ℓ_α regularization tends to stay even under a high-correlation and high-dimensional design setting.

3.2 Predictive Performance

The purpose of this section is to compare the prediction performance of our ℓ_α regularization and other commonly used machine-learning methods. We follow the literature of market-demand estimation, particularly [5, 6]. Marketing researchers use measures such price elasticities and lift estimates to assess the effectiveness of promotions. ℓ_α provides less biased estimates with a prediction error that is only slightly higher for those black-box nonlinear methods. We compare the performance of the alpha norm with other widely used machine-learning methods: OLS, generalized linear model boosting (GLMBoosting), random forests, support vector machines (SVMs), lasso, ridge, and the elastic net.

GLMBoosting improves the predictive ability by iteratively reweighting the estimated regression and classification functions. Reducing the bias is profitable but may sacrifice some prediction accuracy as the trade-off. Random forests are the most popular machine-learning method. During the training process, the model constructs multiple decision trees and outputs the class that is

the mode of the classes (classification) or mean prediction (regression) of the individual trees. This method is often time-consuming and overfits the data without proper trimming. A Support Vector Machine(SVM) map points into different categories in space, and choose the hyperplane that maximizes the distance between the nearest data points on each side.

Adding machine-learning methods checks the robustness of our results. Random forest can achieve better prediction in some cases, whereas ℓ_α is easier to interpret. From a computational perspective, the ℓ_α estimator takes a far shorter time in tuning and run-time relative to non-parametric tree methods.

3.2.1 Discrete Choice Model

The goal is to analyze customers' preferences among products, where our products are collectively exhaustive, mutually exclusive, and finite. Suppose we have J products and observe their sales in M markets, and each market has N_m customers. Assuming each customer only chooses one product based on higher expected utility, the probability of customer n in market m choosing product j is defined as

$$P_{mnj} = \text{P}(\text{customer } n \text{ in market } m \text{ choose product } j).$$

Since each customer only chooses one product in each market, $\sum_j P_{mnj} = 1, 0 \leq P_{mnj} \leq 1, j = 1, \dots, J$. The choice of product j by person n in market m , denoted by y_{mnj} , is given by

$$y_{mnj} = \begin{cases} 1, & U_{mnj} > U_{mnk}, k \neq j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here U_{mnj} is the utility of product j for customer n in market m :

$$U_{mnj} = \beta_0 + X_{mj}\beta + \epsilon_{mnj}, \tag{5}$$

where X_{mj} is a vector of characteristics of product j in market m . The parameter β is a set of parameters giving the effects of variables on probabilities in the market, and ϵ_{mnj} captures the individual difference for product j in market m , specifically for person n . The choice probability is

given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{mnj} &= \mathbb{P}(y_{mnj} = 1) = \mathbb{P}(\cap_{k \neq j} \{U_{mnk} < U_{mnj}\}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\cap_{k \neq j} \{\epsilon_{mnk} - \epsilon_{mnj} < X_{mj}\beta_m - X_{mk}\beta_m\}). \end{aligned}$$

In our simulation, we primarily explore the case of one product. Then we have the choice of choosing the product and not choosing the product (option 1 vs option 0):

$$\begin{cases} U_{mn1} = \beta_0 + X_m\beta + \epsilon_{mn} \\ U_{mn0} = 0 \\ \epsilon_{mn} \sim \text{Logis}(0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Here U_{mn1} is the utility of this product for customer n in market m . β describes how characteristics influence the expected utility, and is also a vector of length K , and it independently comes from a multivariate normal distribution. $\beta_0 + X_m\beta$ is the systematic utility of this product in market m , and ϵ_{mn} is the random utility for customer n in market m . Here U_{mn0} is the utility of not choosing the product, and we set it to be 0. Here X_m is a vector of K product characteristics.

Then P_{mn1} have a type 1 extreme distribution as

$$P_{mn1} = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + X_m\beta)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + X_m\beta)}. \quad (7)$$

For large enough N , the sample probability of product 1 being chosen in market m converges to this extreme distribution value. [6] construct a data generating process for each of the characteristics X_m . We simulate them independently and identically from multivariate log-normal distribution:

$$X_m \sim \text{logNormal}(0, \Sigma_m), \text{diag}(\Sigma_m) \sim \text{Unif}(0.5, 1.5; K).$$

Next we add confounding variables. Given K_c confounding variables here, and that they are

weakly correlated with true variables, we are actually constructing

$$(X_m, X_m^c) \sim \text{logNormal}(0, \Sigma), \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_m & C_1 \\ C_1^T & \Sigma_m^c \end{bmatrix},$$

where X_m^c is the matrix of confounding variables, C_1 is the covariance matrix of X_m and X_m^c , and we control their correlation to be weak. Σ_m^c is the covariance matrix of X_m . To control the correlation among true variables and confounding variables, we construct the big covariance matrix Σ as

$$[\Sigma]_{i,j} = \rho^{\frac{|i-j|}{3}}. \quad (8)$$

Here ρ is a pre-set correlation parameter, $0 < \rho < 1$. Combining X_m and X_m^c gives us the total characteristics of the product in market m : $X_m^t = (X_m, X_m^c)$:

Then we add categorical variables into the datasets. Specifically, we create binary variables by setting a cutoff value T and let

$$\tilde{X}_{mk} = \begin{cases} 1, & X_{mk} > T \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The sample share of the product in market m is defined as

$$S_m = \frac{1}{N_m} \sum_{n=1}^{N_m} \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{mn1} > 0\}}. \quad (9)$$

Here N_m is the number of customers in market m . To make the case simpler, we assume the number of customers in each market is the same. If we set N_m large enough, S_m follows the extreme value distribution and converges to the real share. Following our empirical analysis in Section 4, instead of using sample shares as a response, we model the log of the quantity(unit) sold in each market:

$$\log(Q_m) = \log\left(\sum_{n=1}^{N_m} \mathbb{1}_{\{U_{mn1} > 0\}}\right),$$

where $\log(Q_m) = (\log(Q_1), \log(Q_2), \dots, \log(Q_M))'$ is the vector of the log of units of this product sold in each market. $X_m = (X_1^t, X_2^t, \dots, X_M^t)'$ is this product's characteristics in each market.

3.2.2 Empirical results: Model comparison

To estimate and perform model comparison, we partition the data into two parts: training $DGP^{(1)}$ and testing $DGP^{(2)}$. And we control $DGP^{(1)}$ and $DGP^{(2)}$ to be the same size. For $DGP^{(1)}$, we use this part of the data to estimate the best tuning parameters for SVM, GLMBoosting, and random forests. We find the best $\hat{\lambda}$ and best $\hat{\alpha}$ for the alpha norm via a five-fold cross-validation, where α is chosen from $\{0.1, 0.5, 0.9\}$. We also use five-fold cross-validation to choose the best $\hat{\lambda}$ for lasso, ridge, and the elastic net. We plug in the tuning parameters to construct all models $\{f_i\}$.

For $DGP^{(2)}$, we obtain $\hat{y}_i = \text{predict}(f_i, DGP^{(2)})$ for each method, and we estimate their corresponding out-of-sample RMSE.

As our panel data in Section 4 only have two continuous predictors, we include two continuous predictors in the true-predictor set. We try two different true-predictor cases. In the first instance, we include two continuous predictors and two binary predictors as true predictors. We estimate the RMSE of all models in different situations and calculate their RMSE ratios with the alpha norm as the benchmark. Table 2 displays the results. Similarly, in the second case, we use two continuous and 20 binary predictors as true predictors, and present the results in Table 3. To further explain our data-generating process, for the rest of the redundant predictors, we control their correlation with the true predictors via ρ in equation 8. In the low-correlation case, we let $\rho = 0.1$, whereas in the high-correlation case, we make $\rho = 0.6$. The confounding predictors are 50% numerical and 50% categorical. We want to show our ℓ_α method outperforms other linear methods in a high-correlation and high-dimensional case, by altering correlation ρ , market size M , and the number of predictors in total K .

From the results in Table 2 and Table 3, we see that most of the entries are larger than 1, and ratios tend to be greater in the high-correlation case, or in the high-dimensional case, where K is equal to or greater than M . In most cases, our ℓ_α method outperforms the other methods except the random forest. The alpha norm can provide proper model selection and marginal effect estimates, however, whereas the random forest is difficult to interpret and lacks flexibility when we want to define subgroups.

4 Store-Level Market Demand Data

4.1 Sales Prediction

The marketing example is about grocery store sales for salted snacks. Our dataset uses scanner-panel data on grocery stores from IRI Marketing Research. A unit of observation is product j , uniquely defined by a UPC (Universal Product Code), in store m in week t . The number of observations is 15,339, which includes 100 unique products.

Let q_{jmt} be the number of bags of salty snack j sold in store m in week t . If $q_{jmt} = 0$, the possible situation can be zero sale, being out of stock or missing observation. The price p_{jmt} is defined as the quantity-weighted average of prices for product j in store m in week t . Therefore, if $q_{jmt} = 0$, the weight is also set to zero. The general regression model is of the form

$$Y_{jmt} = f(X_{\text{price},jmt}, X_{\text{product},jmt}, X_{\text{promotion},jmt}, X_{\text{week},t}) + \epsilon_{jmt}.$$

Table 4 provides detailed summary information on our predictors. In our model, we do not use the variable `iri_key`, which is a unique label for each store, because it is severely unbalanced in the data. The weeks are transformed into a combination of year and week. Specifically, we use six years and 52 weeks to present the 300 weeks in our dataset to deal with the unbalanced data issue.

For model validation, again we randomly separate the dataset into two parts: training DGP⁽¹⁾ and testing DGP⁽²⁾. Then we use DGP⁽¹⁾ to estimate the best tuning parameters and construct the model and apply the models to DGP⁽²⁾ to evaluate the out-of-sample RMSE.

In total our dataset contains 15 predictors with three continuous variables: quantity (number of units sold), price, and equivalized volume (or all commodity volume), which represent the store revenue from all products sold. Quantity ranges from 1 to 1,505 with mean 16.36 and standard deviation 40.37. Price ranges from 0.2 to 9.99 with mean 2.11 and standard deviation 1.003. Equivalized volume ranges from 0.0469 to 3 with mean 0.5139 and standard deviation 0.266.

Table 5 provides out-of-sample RMSE ratios for the ℓ_α estimator as the benchmark and R^2 of all models. Out-of-sample R^2_{OOS} is simply calculated as

$$R^2_{\text{OOS}} = 1 - \frac{\sum(\hat{y}_i - y_i)^2}{\sum(y_i - \bar{y})^2}, \quad (10)$$

where \hat{y}_i and y_i are the predicted and observed values, respectively. The ℓ_α regularization beats all other linear methods, with a smaller RMSE and larger R^2 . The final solution selects 158 predictors.

To better understand the process of regularization, we plot the trend of changes in RMSE, and the number of predictors of the ℓ_α and ridge regression when we change lambda in Figure 5. (Notice we do not draw this plot with lasso from `glmnet`; instead, we use the alpha norm with $\alpha = 1$.)

The top predictors of those regularized methods can be found from the penalization path in Figure 5. The top predictors we can extract from the path include price, equivalized volume, promotion, brands (e.g., Lays and Ruffles), flavors (e.g., original, classical, regular, and sour cream and onion), the cooking method (e.g.,kettle-cooked), and fat content (e.g., reduced fat). Among these top predictors, many strands of literature have discussed the effect of price, promotion, brand, and equivalized volume. Our method, however, provides an even closer look at the incremental effect of a particular brand, flavor, cooking method, and fat content, which can help grocery stores develop detailed strategies to improve their inventory. For example, a larger proportion of Lays snacks stock leads to higher sales.

4.2 Promotion Lift Estimates

Section 4.1 shows promotion is always selected as a top predictor. Now we estimate the lift of a promotion. The products in our dataset are tagged with a promotion label if their price deduction is greater than 5%. We want to see the incremental effect on sales generated by promotion (see [6]).

First, we split the data into a training set $DGP^{(1)}$ and testing set $DGP^{(2)}$. $DGP^{(1)}$ contains all the records with no promotion, and $DGP^{(2)}$ contains all the records with promotion. We find that we have 11,348 non-promotion records, which account for 74% of our data. We use $DGP^{(1)}$ to train all models and provide predictions for $DGP^{(2)}$. Then we calculate the lift factor:

$$\text{Lift factor} = \frac{\text{Actual sales}}{\text{Baseline sales}} = \frac{y}{\hat{y}}.$$

We use the predictions from the non-promotion model as the baseline sales and compare them to the actual sales. The incremental effect on the lift factor is defined by

$$\Delta Q = \text{Lift factor} \cdot \text{Baseline sales} - \text{Baseline sales} = (\text{Lift factor} - 1) \cdot \text{Baseline sales}.$$

When we predict the sales using a log-linear model of the form:

$$\log(Q) = \alpha - \eta \log(P) + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i X_i,$$

$$\log(Q') = \alpha - \eta \log((1 - \gamma)P) + \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i X_i + \beta_{\text{prom}} \text{Prom}.$$

Here, Q is the quantity of products in the absence of promotion, and X_i is all the predictors. P is the price of the product, Q' is the quantity of products when promotion is considered, and Prom is the dummy indicator for promotion. β_{prom} is the corresponding coefficient and γ is the discount applied to price in the promotion, and in our model, $\gamma > 0.05$.

The lift factor is calculated from the comparison of the two models as

$$\log(\text{Lift}) = \log(Q') - \log(Q) = -\eta \log(1 - \gamma) + \beta_{\text{prom}} \text{Prom},$$

$$\text{Lift factor} = \frac{Q'}{Q} = \exp(-\eta \log(1 - \gamma) + \beta_{\text{prom}} \text{Prom}).$$

The average of realized lift factors can predict the future lift from a promotional event. Figure 6 plots the distribution of $\log(\text{lift})$ calculated under different models. The distributions generated from different models are similar, and the mean of each distribution is positive as expected.

Figure 6 shows that a large number of models have negative estimates for $\log(\text{Lift})$, though the average effect of promotion is positive and statistically significant. We want to investigate what may play a significant role in deciding the magnitude and sign of the promotional effect. Finally, models of $\log(\text{lift})$ are helpful in determining promotional strategies concerning an individual product.

Our lift estimates based on the ℓ_α estimation are less biased than linear regression methods. We use resampling bootstrap to get the distribution of β_{Prom} from OLS estimate, and we hope it will approximate to the true distribution since OLS gives unbiased estimates. For each resampling model, we randomly select half of the observations and use them to fit the OLS. We plot the distribution of β_{Prom} in Figure 7. The plot of $\log(\text{lift})$ estimated by the alpha norm is very close to the mean of OLS bootstrapping. And it is expected to be less biased than rf and svm. All methods give positive average lifts, with positive and negative increments in the estimate. The large variance in the estimation suggests the negative lifts come from variance rather than bias, see [6]. Further

improvements in lift estimates occur if we use the variables selected in lasso or the alpha norm.

5 Discussion

ℓ_α regularization provides a useful tool for predictor selection in marketing and economics. Scanner-panel data usually have thousands of binary dummy variables, and many of the predictors do not predict sales; hence, variable selection is needed. Our ℓ_α regularization can jump to a sparse solution. Post-lasso variables can increase the fit of the model in high-dimensional sparse cases. For the applications we use here, ℓ_α regularization finds a better solution to in-sample overfitting and is more adaptive than lasso, as the degree of the norm can be chosen from 0 to 1, thus applying to both sparse and extreme sparse models.

Our empirical analysis shows ℓ_α regularization does improve predictions versus traditional linear regression and machine-learning black-box techniques. Predicted sales and selected variables can be used for inventory planning and can predict the outcome of potential marketing strategies. Also, the alpha norm can be particularly useful when the practitioners want to study the significant predictors for a particular subpopulation. Our alpha norm can efficiently shrink the predictor size and pick significant predictors according to the features of the response.

In contrast to machine-learning approaches, the ℓ_α regularization benefits from interpretability of the marginal effects. The impact of a particular product or flavor can be assessed. ℓ_α regularization is more efficient in estimating the model than nonlinear methods while providing relatively similar performance. A further extension could be to apply our methodology to demand and supply-demand estimation as in [20], when targeting a specific incremental effect, such as the lift of promotion. Similar approaches can be applied to estimate lift of in-store displays, which usually have multiple levels.

References

- [1] Allenby, G. M., Shively, T. S., Yang, S., and Garratt, M. J. (2004). A choice model for packaged goods: Dealing with discrete quantities and quantity discounts. *Marketing Science*, 23(1):95–108.
- [2] Andrews, R. L., Currim, I. S., and Leeflang, P. S. (2011). A comparison of sales response predictions from demand models applied to store-level versus panel data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 29(2):319–326.
- [3] Angrist, J. D. (2001). Estimation of limited dependent variable models with dummy endogenous regressors: simple strategies for empirical practice. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 19(1):2–28.
- [4] Attouch, H., Bolte, J., and Svaiter, B. F. (2013). Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forward–backward splitting, and regularized gauss–seidel methods. *Mathematical Programming*, 137(1-2):91–129.
- [5] Bajari, P., Nekipelov, D., Ryan, S., and Yang, M. (2015a). Machine learning methods for demand estimation. *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, 105(5):481–485.
- [6] Bajari, P., Nekipelov, D., Ryan, S. P., and Yang, M. (2015b). Demand estimation with machine learning and model combination. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [7] Bredies, K., Lorenz, D. A., and Reiterer, S. (2015). Minimization of non-smooth, non-convex functionals by iterative thresholding. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 165(1):78–112.
- [8] Briesch, R. A., Chintagunta, P. K., and Matzkin, R. L. (2010). Nonparametric discrete choice models with unobserved heterogeneity. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 28(2):291–307.
- [9] Fong, N. M., Simester, D. I., and Anderson, E. T. (2010). Private label vs. national brand price sensitivity: Evaluating non-experimental identification strategies. Technical report, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [10] Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2010). Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 33(1):1–22.

- [11] Hartmann, W., Nair, H. S., and Narayanan, S. (2011). Identifying causal marketing mix effects using a regression discontinuity design. *Marketing Science*, 30(6):1079–1097.
- [12] Marjanovic, G. and Solo, V. (2012). On l_q optimization and matrix completion. *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, 60(11):5714–5724.
- [13] Marjanovic, G. and Solo, V. (2013). On exact l_q denoising. In *In Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2013 IEEE International Conference*, pages 6068–6072. IEEE, New York.
- [14] Marjanovic, G. and Solo, V. (2014). l_q sparsity penalized linear regression with cyclic descent. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 62(6):1464–1475.
- [15] Mazumder, R., Friedman, J. H., and Hastie, T. (2011). Sparsenet: Coordinate descent with nonconvex penalties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(495):1125–1138.
- [16] Mullainathan, S. and Spiess, J. (2017). Machine learning: an applied econometric approach. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 31(2):87–106.
- [17] Polson, N. G., Scott, J. G., and Willard, B. T. (2015). Proximal algorithms in statistics and machine learning. *Statistical Science*, 30(4):559–581.
- [18] Polson, N. G. and Sun, L. (2017). Bayesian l_0 regularized least squares. Technical report, University of Chicago.
- [19] Varian, H. R. (1982). The nonparametric approach to demand analysis. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 50(4):945–973.
- [20] Viard, V. B., Gron, A., and Polson, N. G. (2015). Bayesian estimation of nonlinear equilibrium models with random coefficients. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 31(4):435–456.
- [21] Zeng, J., Peng, Z., Lin, S., and Xu, Z. (2014). A cyclic coordinate descent algorithm for l_q regularization. Technical report, Xi’an Jiaotong University.

Appendix

A ℓ_α Regularization Algorithm

Specifically, in [14], the algorithm starts with an initial estimate of β , for example, $\hat{\beta}^{ols}$ or 0, which is denoted as β^1 . Then the initial residual is calculated as $r^1 := y - X\beta^1$. Let k be the iteration counter and let i be the coefficient coordinate to be updated in the k -th iterate. Because $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we simply have $i = p$ when $0 \equiv k \pmod{p}$, and $i = k \pmod{p}$ otherwise. A complete iterate includes the calculation of adjusted gradient z_i^k , a proximal map, and the update of β_i^k .

a) Calculate the adjusted gradient $z_i^k := z(\beta_{-i}^k)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ by

$$z_i^k = x_i^T r^k + \beta_i^k. \quad (11)$$

This expression of z_i^k follows easily from the definition of z^k and r^k . Here, $\|x_i\|_2 = 1, \forall i$.

b) Using z_i^k and the ℓ_α optimization, calculate the map

$$\mathcal{T}(z_i^k, \beta_i^k) := \begin{cases} \tau(z_i^k), & \text{if } |z_i^k| \neq h_{\lambda, \alpha} \\ \text{sgn}(z_i^k)b_{\lambda, \alpha}, & \text{if } |z_i^k| = h_{\lambda, \alpha}, \text{ and } \beta_i^k \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

when $|z_i^k| = h_{\lambda, \alpha}$, $\tau(z_i^k) = \{0, \text{sgn}(z_i^k)b_{\lambda, \alpha}\}$ is implied.

c) Update β^k by

$$\beta^{k+1} = \beta_{-i}^k + \mathcal{T}(z_i^k, \beta_i^k)e_i. \quad (12)$$

Then $J(\beta^{k+1}) \leq J(\beta^k)$ by the definition of $\mathcal{T}(\cdot)$ and (3).

d) Update the residual:

$$\begin{aligned}r^{k+1} &= y - X\beta^{k+1} \\ &= y - X\left(\beta_{-i}^k + \beta_i^{k+1}e_i\right) \\ &= \left(y - X\beta_{-i}^k - \beta_i^k x_i\right) - \beta_i^{k+1}X e_i + \beta_i^k x_i \\ &= r^k - \left(\beta_i^{k+1} - \beta_i^k\right) x_i.\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

e) Update the iteration counter k by $k = k + 1$.

f) Update i by $i = p$ when $0 \equiv k \pmod{p}$, and $i = k \pmod{p}$ otherwise.

Table 1: Comparison of Different Linear Methods

P	Measure	$\ell_{0.1}$	$\ell_{0.5}$	$\ell_{0.9}$	lasso	ols	elastic net
low correlation							
50	RMSE	0.99	0.99	0.99	1	1.03	1.01
	Bias β_1	0.46	0.39	0.68	1	-0.12	1.14
	Var β_1	1.29	1.18	1.04	1	0.95	1.14
	Bias β_6	0.23	0.20	0.32	1	-0.07	1.28
	Var β_6	0.35	0.40	0.30	1	10.68	1.33
100	RMSE	0.99	0.99	0.99	1	1.08	1.01
	Bias β_1	0.39	0.34	0.78	1	0.01	1.07
	Var β_1	1.05	1.08	1.02	1	0.78	0.93
	Bias β_6	-0.23	-0.19	-0.01	1	-1.80	1.63
	Var β_6	0.64	0.41	0.08	1	35.09	2.82
500	RMSE	0.98	0.98	0.99	1	2.42	1.01
	Bias β_1	0.36	0.28	0.67	1	0.12	1.04
	Var β_1	1.32	1.06	0.95	1	5.67	1.08
	Bias β_6	-0.69	0.00	-0.11	1	11.44	4.91
	Var β_6	3.49	0.00	0.10	1	6.28E+02	10.85
high correlation							
50	RMSE	0.99	0.99	1.00	1	1.03	1.00
	Bias β_1	1.13	0.64	0.71	1	0.04	0.92
	Var β_1	0.98	1.36	1.09	1	0.91	1.02
	Bias β_6	0.00	0.00	0.08	1	0.65	3.76
	Var β_6	0.00	0.00	0.04	1	17.66	4.18
100	RMSE	0.99	0.99	1.00	1	1.08	1.00
	Bias β_1	0.97	0.81	0.79	1	-0.08	0.84
	Var β_1	0.85	1.37	1.07	1	0.76	0.94
	Bias β_6	0.00	0.00	0.06	1	1.79	3.87
	Var β_6	0.00	0.00	0.02	1	17.67	5.05
500	RMSE	0.99	0.99	0.99	1	2.41	1.01
	Bias β_1	0.74	0.25	0.61	1	-6.56E-03	1.10
	Var β_1	0.89	1.37	1.06	1	5.54	1.07
	Bias β_6	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	-10.80	6.96
	Var β_6	0.00	0.00	0.00	1	2.94E+02	12.52

Note: $N^{\text{train}} = 600, N^{\text{test}} = 600$ and the total number of runs is 100. $\text{Cor}(X_i, X_j) = \rho^{|i-j|/3}$ where $\rho = 0.1, 0.6$. The regularization parameter λ is chosen 5-fold cross-validation. We use lasso as a benchmark and divide all the result values by their counterparts given by lasso. RMSE is the out-of-sample performance in the test sample (averaged by 100 runs). Bias and variance are the in-sample performance in the training sample.

Table 2: Model Comparison for Discrete-Choice Models I

M	K	lm	lasso	ridge	elastic net	ℓ_α	glmboosting	rf	svm
low correlation									
100	50	4.68	0.95	1.12	1.05	1	1.11	1.04	1.18
	100	NA	0.98	1.26	0.98	1	1.02	1.10	1.28
	500	NA	0.98	1.13	0.98	1	1.28	0.78	1.19
500	50	1.11	0.97	0.99	0.95	1	0.99	0.38	0.82
	100	1.07	0.95	0.90	0.92	1	0.99	0.32	0.67
	500	NA	0.95	1.09	0.90	1	1.05	0.77	1.59
1000	50	1.07	0.99	1.07	0.99	1	1.01	0.65	0.90
	100	1.08	1.00	1.01	0.95	1	1.01	0.63	0.95
	500	7.447	0.95	1.06	0.89	1	1.01	0.51	1.25
high correlation									
100	50	118.3	1.00	1.14	1.02	1	1.18	1.11	1.23
	100	NA	0.94	1.09	1.01	1	1.03	0.48	1.05
	500	NA	0.98	1.13	0.98	1	1.28	0.78	1.19
500	50	1.07	1.00	1.05	1.01	1	0.99	1.02	1.18
	100	1.28	0.99	1.07	1.05	1	1.05	0.31	0.94
	500	NA	1.00	1.79	1.03	1	1.13	0.34	2.4
1000	50	1.03	1.00	1.04	1.01	1	1.00	0.55	0.77
	100	1.26	1.14	1.24	1.1	1	1.08	1.33	1.47
	500	41.07	1.00	1.39	1.04	1	1.04	0.50	1.63

Note: In this case, we have two continuous and two binary predictors as true predictors for 100 customers in each market. We report the ratio of RMSE of other models compared to the alpha norm when applied to same datasets. We use five-fold cross-validation to choose tuning parameters, and we want to see how the alpha norm outperforms other models in different sample sizes for M and K .

Table 3: Model Comparison for Discrete-Choice Models II

M	K	lm	lasso	ridge	elastic net	ℓ_α	glmboosting	rf	svm
low correlation									
100	50	1.22	1.19	0.68	1.18	1	0.88	0.49	0.67
	100	NA	0.95	1.03	0.97	1	0.97	0.55	1.01
	500	NA	1.01	1.31	0.98	1	0.94	1.74	2.41
500	50	1.20	1.03	1.19	1.05	1	1.05	0.60	1.12
	100	1.18	0.97	0.99	0.92	1	1.02	0.56	0.74
	500	NA	1.03	1.28	1.06	1	1.27	0.60	1.31
1000	50	1.03	0.99	1.03	1.00	1	0.99	1.24	1.10
	100	1.15	1.02	1.12	1.03	1	1.03	0.50	0.99
	500	17.03	0.96	1.34	0.97	1	1.18	0.84	1.42
high correlation									
100	50	10.41	1.05	1.37	1.12	1	1.19	0.69	1.22
	100	NA	1.32	2.17	1.29	1	1.24	2.2	2.08
	500	NA	0.88	0.93	0.88	1	0.91	0.49	1.04
500	50	1.19	1.01	1.12	1.00	1	1.00	0.55	0.93
	100	1.27	0.98	1.05	0.98	1	1.00	0.49	0.99
	500	NA	1.09	1.52	1.07	1	1.16	0.50	1.54
1000	50	1.01	1.04	1.06	1.03	1	1.00	0.92	0.96
	100	1.17	1.00	1.02	0.99	1	1.06	0.43	0.80
	500	16.18	0.99	1.33	1.00	1	1.05	0.55	1.71

Note: In this case, we have two continuous and 20 binary predictors as true predictors for 100 customers in each market. We report the ratio of RMSE of other models compared to the alpha norm when applied to same datasets. We use five-fold cross-validation to choose tuning parameters, and we want to see how the alpha norm outperforms other models in different sample sizes for M and K .

Table 4: List of Marketing Predictors


Variable	Description
Y_{jmt}	log of quantity/units of product j sold in store m at week t , i.e, $\log(q_{jmt})$
$X_{\text{price},jmt}$	log of price of products at time t in store m
$X_{\text{product},jmt}$	vector of attributes of the product j in store m at time t, such as brand, volume, flavor, cut type, cooking method, package size, fat, salt levels
$X_{\text{promotion},jmt}$	vector of promotional variables of product j in store m at time t, such as promotions, display, and features
$X_{\text{week},t}$	label of which week the record represents
X_{store}	reference information of store, such as equalized volume and iri_key

Table 5: Out-of-Sample RMSE Ratio and R^2 of Different Models

Method	lm	glmboosting	rf	svm	lasso	ridge	elastic net	ℓ_α
RMSE ratio	1.027	1.000	0.970	0.995	1.002	1.010	1.001	1
R^2	0.325	0.360	0.398	0.367	0.358	0.347	0.359	0.360


Note: Here we show the out-of-sample RMSE ratio and R^2 of all models compared to the alpha norm when applied to DGP⁽²⁾. We can see in this case that the alpha norm performs the best among the linear models. The alpha norm, lasso, and ridge use the same λ here. The best ℓ_α model selects 158 predictors (intercept included) in total, and $\alpha = 0.9, \lambda = 1$. The RMSE of the alpha norm is 0.979 in this analysis.

Figure 1: $\tau_\lambda(z)$ Function




Note: We show $\tau_\lambda(z)$ when $\lambda = 10$ and $\alpha = 0, 0.2, 0.5, 0.9, 0.99$. $\tau_\lambda(z) = \{0, \text{sgn}(b_{\lambda,\alpha})\}$ at the point $z = h_{\lambda,\alpha}$. $\tau_\lambda(z)$ function maps the gradient z to 0 when it's smaller than the threshold $h_{\lambda,\alpha}$. It jumps immediately from 0 to $b_{\lambda,\alpha}$ when z arrives $h_{\lambda,\alpha}$, which results in discontinuity of coefficient regularization path.

Figure 2: $\tau_\lambda(z)$ vs. λ and $\log(h_{\lambda,\alpha})$ vs. $\log(\lambda)$




Note: The top panel is $\tau_\lambda(z): \lambda = 1, \alpha = 0.5$. (red dashed lines are $z = \pm \lambda$); The middle panel is $\tau_\lambda(z): \lambda = 10, \alpha = 0.5$; The bottom panel is threshold of τ function versus λ . When λ is small, $h_{\lambda,\alpha} > \lambda$ and when λ is large, $h_{\lambda,\alpha} < \lambda$. The larger α is, the quicker $\log(h_{\lambda,\alpha})$ changes with $\log(\lambda)$. Thus estimates given by ℓ_α ($\alpha < 1$) are sparser than those given by lasso when we choose a small λ . On the other hand, they are more robust for too large λ 's.

Figure 3: Simulation Example: Linear Regression Model




Note: The true number of non-zero coefficients is 5. The dataset dimension p are 50, 100, 500 from top to bottom. The left column is $\hat{\beta}_1$ when $\beta_1 = 5$; The right column is the number of non-zero $\hat{\beta}_i$. In the left column, as λ increases, the estimate $\hat{\beta}_1$ is penalized from 5 to 0. The path of lasso ($\alpha = 1$) looks smoother and shrinks most quickly. The behavior of $\ell_{0.9}$ regularization is similar to lasso. The larger α is, the quicker $\hat{\beta}_1$ shrinks. In the right column, the path of $\ell_{0.1}$ drops most quickly when $\log(\lambda)$ is less than 0.

Figure 4: Regularization Paths for Nonzero Coefficients




Note: In this figure, we plot the regularization paths of $(\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2, \dots, \hat{\beta}_5)$, where $N = 600, p = 500$ and $\alpha = 0.1$. Discontinuous points in the regularization path of a specific $\hat{\beta}_j$ can be explained by other $\hat{\beta}_i$'s dropping to 0, a special feature of ℓ_α regularization caused by the discontinuity of the τ function at $h_{\lambda, \alpha}$. Because x_1, x_2, \dots, x_5 are positively correlated, the drop of one $\hat{\beta}_i$ increases the estimated value of others.

Figure 5: Out-of-Sample RMSE and Number of Predictors under Different Models




(a) RMSE



(b) Number of predictors selected


Note: Figure (a) shows how out-of-sample RMSE changes when λ increases. Figure (b) shows the number of selected predictors selected. We can see that when the λ is growing, the penalty terms in these methods are also growing, which encourages a sparser model with fewer predictors. The alpha norm removes predictors faster than lasso when λ is small and removed predictors are often useless, but slows down the speed when λ is larger and removed predictors are more significant.

Figure 6: Distribution of Log(Lift)



Note: We plot the distribution of estimated log lift of each model here. We can see the shapes of different models are quite similar. Though the means are obviously positive, the distributions all have a small proportion of negative values, which indicates that in some cases, the promotion may not have an incremental effect on sales.

Figure 7: Accuracy of Log(Lift) estimate



Note: We generate this plot using 1,000 resampling bootstraps of the OLS model as in Section 4.1. We can see the distribution of $\beta_{\text{promotion}}$ in the OLS model is close to Gaussian with an average of 0.4. The mean of estimated lift given by ℓ_{α} model is close to 0.4, which is expected to be much less biased than svm and rf.. The vertical lines are the mean of estimated log lift in Section 4.2, and except for the SVM and random forests, they appear to be close to the expectation given by the OLS model.