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Abstract

Advances in heterogeneous treatment effects estimation enable firms to personalize marketing mix elements and target individuals at an unmatched level of granularity, but feasibility constraints limit such personalization. In practice, firms choose which unique treatments to offer and which individuals to assign to each treatment to maximize profits, and we denote the firm’s problem as the coarse personalization problem. We solve the coarse personalization problem using a two-step procedure that forms segmentation and targeting decisions in concert. First, the firm personalizes by estimating conditional average treatment effects. Second, the firm discretizes by utilizing treatment effects to choose which unique treatments to offer and who to assign to these treatments. The second step is the main contribution of our paper and is a novel application of optimal transport methods. We adapt Lloyd’s Algorithm to computationally solve the second step. With data from a large-scale field experiment for promotions management, we find that our methodology outperforms classical marketing techniques that segment on consumer characteristics or preferences. Using our procedure, the firm recoups over 99.5% of its expected incremental profits under fully granular personalization while offering only five unique treatments. We conclude by discussing how coarse personalization arises in other marketing areas.

Keywords: Personalization, Targeting, Optimal Transport, Optimization, Segmentation

*Zhang: [walterwzhang@chicagobooth.edu] Misra: [sanjog.misra@chicagobooth.edu]. We like to thank the data science and analytics team at the company that is the source of our data for their help and numerous insights. We are grateful for the discussions, comments, and suggestions of conference participants at Marketing Science 2021 and TADC 2021.


1 Introduction

Developments in heterogeneous treatment effects estimation enable firms to target customers at the individual level. The state of the art with incrementality-based targeting leverages machine learning to form fully granular segments of one: a customer with her own set of unique covariates can constitute a segment by herself[1].

Fully granular segmentation and targeting allow marketers to construct fully personalized targeting regimes where only customers who generate positive incremental profits for the firm are targeted [Dubé and Misra 2017, Kitagawa and Tetenov 2018, Hitsch and Misra 2018, Athey and Wager 2021]. In turn, consequent marketing decisions are profit maximizing because individuals are targeted when the marginal benefit outweighs the marginal cost of targeting.

However, fully granular segmentation and targeting procedures often face barriers in practice due to implementation costs and practical considerations. Possible barriers to fully personalized targeting include menu costs [Sheshinski and Weiss 1977], fairness considerations [Kahneman et al. 2019], antitrust concerns [OECD 2018], etc. In practice, firms typically decide on a small set of unique treatments to offer and which customers to assign to these treatments[2]. These treatments themselves are often elements of the marketing mix such as prices and promotions. In essence, firms need to create smaller sets of customers and choose treatments for each set with the aim of maximizing profits, and we call this problem the coarse personalization problem.

Traditional strategic marketing attempts to solves the coarse personalization problem by dividing it into three distinct pieces:

“[Marketers] must segment the market, select the appropriate target, and develop the offering’s value positioning. The formula ‘segmentation, targeting, positioning (STP)’ is the essence of strategic marketing” [Kotler and Keller 2014 page 35).

In the classic marketing literature, these three steps of “STP” are performed separately in a “discretize then personalize” framework. Discrete segments of the consumers are first constructed, targeting decisions are then implemented conditional on the segments, and positioning is established by personalizing prices or promotional levels for each targeted segment.

---

[1] In one-to-one marketing, firm’s marketing mix is tailored to each individual [Arora et al. 2008]. Personalization based on heterogeneous treatment effects provides a modern implementation of one-to-one marketing.

[2] The views on personalization have shifted over time. Nunes and Kambil [2001] draw the distinction between customization and personalization as well as provide survey evidence that customers would rather prefer customizing their content themselves instead of having the firm automatically personalizing. Gilmore and Pine [1997] observe that it is infeasible for many firms to offer mass customization because of implementation costs and managers should selectively choose which customization options to offer. However, by 2020 [Harvard Business Review Analytic Services 2018] notes that firms are rapidly trying to fully personalize their content, but continue to face implementation costs in doing so. Managers are selectively choosing which products to personalize, as firms now compete with one another in an arms race to provide the best personalized experiences for their customers.
Marketers form customer segments based on customer heterogeneity and over time the basis of customer segmentation on such heterogeneity has evolved. Initially, marketing researchers proposed segmenting on demographic and psychographic variables such as on household size and income (Smith 1956; Wind 1978; Gupta and Chintagunta 1994). More recently, segments are formed on estimated consumer preferences (Kamakura and Russell 1989; Bucklin and Gupta 1992; Bucklin et al. 1998) and either via continuous or discrete mixtures (Grover and Srinivasan 1987; Jain et al. 1990).

In this paper, we show that by implementing these steps separately is not profit maximizing in general. Segmenting using information from customer covariates or consumer preferences alone cannot always recover the optimal segments (Gupta and Chintagunta 1994). Profit maximization was predominately considered in the last step of “STP” because marketers did not have control over costs historically and were often focused on goals such as increasing engagement. The “STP” procedure contrasts with the modern fully granular approach, in which individuals are only targeted if they generate incremental profits and fully personalized segments of one are readily constructed.

We propose a solution to the coarse personalization problem that utilizes optimal transport. We revisit the traditional “STP” framework with modern machinery from the incrementality-based targeting literature. We specifically advocate for the “personalize then discretize” approach where we first estimate treatment effects and then form segments of consumers based on their estimated treatment effect. This approach inverts the standard “discretize then personalize” approach from the “STP” framework. We use optimal transport to map the distribution of conditional average treatment effects in the population to a set of discrete treatments. The transport cost is chosen such that profit maximization is achieved at the optimal solution. As a result, segmentation and targeting decisions are done in concert with the goal of profit maximization at our solution.

We provide a two-step strategy to solve the coarse personalization problem and we stress that the novelty of our solution comes from the second step. The first step personalizes by estimating heterogeneous treatment effects to enable the firm to construct profit maximizing fully granular targeting regimes. Then, the second step discretizes by accounting for the constraint that only a handful of unique treatments are available to the firm. The second step uses optimal transport to construct the best segments and their treatment levels to get as close as possible to fully granular profits. Thus, our solution attains the highest possible profits while incorporating the additional constraint on the number of treatments available.

More specifically, the second step is an application of semi-discrete optimal transport theory to solve the coarse personalization problem. After the first step, the firm knows how much profits it can make from fully granular personalization and that acts as a benchmark for the second step.
The optimal transport machinery allows us to form segments and their treatments simultaneously with the aim of getting as close to the profits under fully granular personalization as possible. We show that the optimal transport problem is a strictly convex optimization problem which guarantees a unique optimal solution. At the optimal solution, the average marginal effect of the treatment is equated to the marginal cost of the treatment for each assigned segment.

While we can technically solve the coarse personalization problem by brute force, the complexity of the problem is exponential in the number of people and also suffers from the curse of dimensionality. Instead, we propose a computational solution that adapts Lloyd’s Algorithm \cite{Lloyd1982} and leverages the convexity of the problem. Our adapted version of Lloyd’s Algorithm is scalable and provides a transparent visualization of the solution’s procedure. Other algorithms used to solve optimal transport problems are detailed in Peyré and Cuturi \cite{Peyre2019}.

We find that our solution significantly outperforms traditional “STP” methods in generating profits in our empirical application to promotions management for a food delivery platform. Further, only after five unique treatments, our solution using optimal transport recovers over 99.5% of the fully granular personalization’s expected incremental profits. These results illustrate that our “personalize then discretize” approach outperforms the traditional “discretize then personalize” approaches to solving the firm’s coarse personalization problem.

We also show the impact on consumer and producer surplus as the firm utilizes more unique treatments and recovers fully granular personalization. Bergemann and Bonatti \cite{Bergemann2011} theoretically find that as the firm is able to target more granularly, producer surplus increases along with the total surplus. Dubé and Misra \cite{Dub2017} find that consumer surplus changes non-monotonically as firms are able to target more granularly. Using our coarse personalization framework, we empirically examine the surplus implications as the firm increases its ability to granularly target. Coarser targeting reduces producer surplus due to the extra constraint on the firm’s problem, but it can increase consumer surplus for some individuals because they may be given a higher or lower level of treatment than what they would have gotten under the fully granular personalization case.

Lastly, we discuss how the coarse personalization problem naturally arises in other classic marketing problems. In salesforce contract design, managers need to determine which geographic blocks for salespeople to exert effort in, how much time to spend, and whether to call or visit in person. Advertising designers need to choose which set of advertisements and their characteristics to send out to customers. Pricing managers can choose to use nudges or price subsidies to influence consumer behavior. All of these marketing problems can be tackled with our coarse personalization framework.

Our paper contributes to the literature on promotions management. Personalization and customization using price promotions is a classical marketing problem and promotions are chosen...
to leverage customer heterogeneity (Rossi et al., 1996; Shaffer and Zhang, 1995). With the advent of online marketplaces, promotions are more readily personalized, customized, and distributed to customers (Ansari and Mela, 2003; Zhang and Krishnamurthi, 2004). The optimization approach to promotions management has been explored in the literature (Duvvuri et al., 2007; Zhang and Wedel, 2009), but often promotions are optimized after forming the customer segments as in the standard “STP” framework. Most recently, marketers have used tools from causal machine learning with online databases to target and personalize promotions based on their heterogeneous treatment effects (Hitsch and Misra, 2018; Yoganarasimhan et al., 2020; Ellickson et al., 2021). Our coarse personalization framework combines the optimization approach with the modern approach of using heterogeneous treatment effects.

Additionally, our paper provides a novel application of the optimal transport literature to the marketing literature. Optimal transport problems have been applied to discrete choice models under the mass transport framework (Chiong et al., 2016; Bonnet et al., 2017), matching markets (Galichon and Salanie, 2012), quantile regression (Carlier et al., 2016), bounding RDD estimates (Daljord et al., 2019), and its general applications to economics are surveyed in (Galichon, 2016). Computational methods of evaluating optimal transport problems are detailed in (Peyré and Cuturi, 2019) and a survey of recent mathematical developments in the field can be found in (Villani, 2009).

The next section of the paper formulates our model: the first step is described in Section 2.1 and the second step is fleshed out in Section 2.2. The empirical application of promotions management for a large food delivery firm is provided in Section 3. The surplus analysis is discussed in Section 4. We discuss how our framework can be adopted to address other classic marketing problems in Section 5. We conclude in Section 6.

2 Model

Our modeling approach has two steps to solve the coarse personalization problem. The first is to estimate treatment effects in a randomized control trial (RCT) setting using tools from the heterogeneous treatment effects and continuous treatments literatures. The second is to choose which treatments to offer and who to assign to each treatment using an optimal transport framework. The first step is described in Section 2.1 and the second step is fleshed out in Section 2.2. We emphasize that the second step is a novel application of optimal transport and the first step itself is presently used for fully granular incrementality-based targeting. Practical extensions of the model are provided in Appendix Section A.

For each individual $i$ with covariates $x_i$, we estimate continuous treatment effects for each dimension of treatment. The firm is then given a number of unique treatments $L$ that are non-
zero in only one dimension \( d \in \{1, \ldots, D\} \) and chooses (1) which treatments to offer and (2) the assignment of individuals \( i \) to each treatment \( l \in L \).

For individual \( i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \), we denote the individual characteristics as \( x_i \) and the firm’s outcome measure as \( Y_i \). Treatments are finite \( D \)-dimensional, and the treatment vector for individual \( i \) is denoted as,

\[
t_i = (t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D})
\]

where \( t_{i,d} \) is the treatment level in dimension \( d \). The feasible set of treatments available to the firm are non-zero only in one dimension and have the format \((0, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, 0)\) where \( t_{i,d} \neq 0 \). A vector of zeros for \( t_i \) represents the no treatment case.

The cost of treatment \( t_i \) is \( c_i(t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D}) \). We denote the cost of issuing feasible treatment \( t_i \) that is non-zero in dimension \( d \), or \( t_{i,d} \), as \(^3\)

\[
c_d(t_{i,d}) = c_i(T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0)
\]

and the cost of not targeting is normalized to be zero, \( c_d(0) = c_i(0, \ldots, 0) = 0 \). Then, the expected return that the firm gains from assigning treatment \( t_i \) to individual \( i \) is the expected outcome minus the cost of treatment,

\[
E[R_i|x_i, t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D}] = E[Y_i|x_i, t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D}] - c_i(x_i, t_{i,1}, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D}),
\]

or for feasible treatment \( t_i \) that is non-zero in dimension \( d \),

\[
E[R_i|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] = E[Y_i|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] - c_d(t_{i,d}).
\]

### 2.1 Treatment effects estimation

We consider a RCT setup where the randomization is over the treatments and across each treatment dimension. From our empirical application on promotions management in Section \(^3\) we have a RCT where different levels of dollar off and percentage off promotions are randomized over and only one type of promotion is assigned to each customer. We assume that each treatment is randomized between \([0, \bar{t}_d]\) where \( \bar{t}_d \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) represents the upper bound of the treatment assignment in dimension \( d \), and the treatment \( t_i \) has domain over \([0, \bar{t}_1] \times \cdots \times [0, \bar{t}_d] \times \cdots \times [0, \bar{t}_D] \).

Following the heterogeneous treatments literature, we can compute the conditional average treatment effect (CATE) for each of the treatments relative to the holdout or no treatment arm using the RCT. We further assume that the RCT was correctly implemented, so unconfoundedness and overlap are satisfied, and that the stable unit treatment value assumption (SUTVA) holds.

\(^3\)We use capital letters to denote random variables, \( T_{i,d} \), and lowercase letters to denote their realizations, \( t_{i,d} \).
Since our treatments in each dimension are continuous, we can compute the continuous CATE separately for each dimension given \( x_i \). We denote the \( d \)th dimension of treatment \( t_i \) as \( t_{i,d} \) and its continuous CATE as \( \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) \).

For each \( x_i \) and each dimension \( d \) of the continuous treatment, firms will select the treatment level that yields the highest expected profits. Since we prohibit treatments of different dimensions to be simultaneously administered, there are no interaction effects between treatment dimensions and we can thus solve firm’s problem separately in each dimension.

Without loss of generality, we consider a continuous treatment that is non-zero in dimension \( d \) or \( t_{i,d} \). The firm will target the customer \( i \) with treatment \( t_{i,d} > 0 \) if the treatment yields positive incremental expected returns over the no treatment case \( t_{i,d} = 0 \),

\[
E[R_i|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] > E[R_i|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] \\
E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, 0] - c_d(t_{i,d}) > E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, 0] \\
E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, 0] - E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, 0] > c_d(t_{i,d}) \\
\tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) > c_d(t_{i,d}),
\]

where \( \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) \triangleq E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, t_{i,d}, \ldots, 0] - E[Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, 0] \) is the incremental expected outcome from issuing treatment \( t_{i,d} \). Then, as in the incrementality-based targeting literature, the treatment will be administered if \( \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) > c_d(t_{i,d}) \), or if the continuous CATE is greater than the cost of treatment.

The firm chooses optimal treatment level \( t_{i,d}^* \) by solving the following program,

\[
t_{i,d}^* \in \arg\max_{t_{i,d} \in [0, \bar{t}_d]} \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) - c_d(t_{i,d}). \tag{1}
\]

which maximizes the firm’s expected returns over treatment \( t_{i,d} \).

To help alleviate the computational burden in the second step, we impose two assumptions. The first is a strict concavity assumption on the continuous CATE, \( \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) \). The second is a weak convexity assumption on the cost function, \( c_d(t_{i,d}) \).

**Assumption 1.** *(Strict Concavity of the Continuous Conditional Average Treatment Effects)*

The continuous conditional average treatment effect \( \tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) \) is strictly concave in \( t_{i,d} \). For \( t, t' \in [0, \bar{t}_d] \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \) and \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \),

\[
\tau_d(x_i, \alpha t + (1 - \alpha) t') > \alpha \tau_d(x_i, t) + (1 - \alpha) \tau_d(x_i, t').
\]

**Assumption 2.** *(Convexity of the Cost Function)*

The cost function \( c_d(t_{i,d}) \) is convex in \( t_{i,d} \). For \( t, t' \in [0, \bar{t}_d] \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \) and \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \),

\[
c_d(\alpha t + (1 - \alpha) t') \leq \alpha c_d(t) + (1 - \alpha) c_d(t').
\]

Assumption 1 imposes a strict concavity requirement on the estimated continuous CATEs.
It captures the notion of diminishing sensitivity of the treatment level or that changes in the treatment levels at higher treatment levels do not lead to increases the treatment effect as much.

Assumption 2 rules out economies of scale in the cost of issuing the treatment as the treatment level increases in each dimension of treatment.

Since a sum of a strictly concave function and a concave function is strictly concave, the firm’s program in Equation 1 has a unique solution $t^*_i d$ that is either an interior solution or on the boundary. After the firm solves $D$ programs for each individual $i$, the firm would have constructed optimal treatment levels $\{t^*_i d\}_{d=1}^D$ and the continuous CATE estimates $\{\{(\tau_d(x_i, t_i d))\}_{d=1}^D\}_{i=1}^N$.

The results from the first step provide the firm enough information to fully granularly personalize. To do so, the firm would assign each individual $i$ the treatment, $t^*_i d$, that yields the highest return across possible treatments $\{t^*_i d\}_{d=1}^D$. We will evaluate our coarse personalization results to the fully granular personalization benchmark. Given our RCT setting and assuming SUTVA holds, we can use off-the-shelf machine learning algorithms to estimate the continuous and heterogeneous treatment effects as documented in the recent literature (Athey and Imbens 2016; Wager and Athey 2018; Farrell et al. 2020, 2021).

### 2.2 Optimal transport

The caveat to the coarse personalization problem is that the firm can assign at most $L$ total unique treatments across the $D$ treatment dimensions, and we account for this constraint in our optimal transport solution. These $D$-dimensional feasible treatments can only be non-zero in one dimension $d$. Given this additional constraint on treatment feasibility, we further examine the firm’s profit maximization problem.

Let $L$ be the set of treatments that the firm decides to offer and $|L| = L$ by construction. We further assume $L < N$ in this scenario and that there are many more unique consumers than there are allowable unique treatments. Naturally, as $L \to N$ the firm recovers fully granular personalization and when $L = 1$ the same treatment is offered, or blanketed, to all individuals.

The firm then chooses the which treatments to offer as well as which consumers to assign to the treatment. Only unique treatments of the format $t_l = (0, \ldots, t_d, \ldots, 0)$ for $l \in L$ and for some dimension $d$ are feasible. From our first step in Section 2.1, the firm has already estimated the continuous CATEs, $\{(\tau_d(x_i, t_i d))\}_{d=1}^D$ for each $x_i$.

We now frame the firm’s coarse personalization problem as an optimal transport problem. We let $P$ be the distribution over $X = [0, \tilde{t}_1] \times \cdots [0, \tilde{t}_d] \times \cdots \times [0, \tilde{t}_D]$ and let $T = \{\tilde{t}_1, \tilde{t}_2, \ldots, \tilde{t}_L\}$ be a sample of $L$ points on $[0, \tilde{t}_1] \times \cdots [0, \tilde{t}_d] \times \cdots \times [0, \tilde{t}_D]$. We further let $Q^l g$ be the distribution over the sample of $L$ points that assigns probability mass $q_l$ on each $\tilde{t}_l$ and $\sum_{l=1}^L q_l = 1$. Then, we

---

4The firm will generally not choose less than $L$ unique treatments because it would weakly hinder the firm’s ability to target more granularly.
let \( \pi \in \mathcal{M}(P, Q^{\hat{t}, q}) \) be the allowable couplings between \( P \) and \( Q^{\hat{t}, q} \) where \( \mathcal{M}(P, Q^{\hat{t}, q}) \) is the set of probability distributions.

In our setup, \( \hat{t}_l \) are the treatments that the firm needs to choose and assign. \( \mathcal{X} \) represents the space that treatments can be chosen over and \( \pi \) represents the treatment assignment of individuals of \( x_i \) to treatment \( \hat{t}_l \).

The Monge-Kantorovich problem for our setup is

\[
W(\hat{t}, q) \triangleq \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{M}(P, Q^{\hat{t}, q})} E_{\pi}[C(X, T)] = \min_{\pi \in \mathcal{M}(P, Q^{\hat{t}, q})} \sum_{l=1}^{L} q_l E_{\pi}[C(X, T)|T = \hat{t}_l]
\]

where \( C(X, T) \) is some cost function that we will further specify. The coarse personalization problem is then

\[
\min_{\hat{t} \in \mathbb{R}^D, q \in \mathbb{R}^L} W(\hat{t}, q)
\]

s.t. \( q \geq 0 \) \hspace{1cm} \text{(non-negative weights)}

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{L} q_l = 1 \hspace{1cm} \text{(adding up)}
\]

\[
\hat{t}_l \text{ takes form } (0, \ldots, \hat{t}_d, \ldots, 0) . \hspace{1cm} \text{(feasible treatment)}
\]

In our framework, the inner Monge-Kantorovich problem is a semidiscrete optimal transport problem that searches for optimal coupling from \( \mathcal{X} \) to \( \mathcal{T} \) and the outer minimization problem chooses the \( L \) unique \( D \)-dimensional treatments \( \tilde{t}_l = (\tilde{t}_{l,1}, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{l,d}, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{l,D}) \) and the size of their respective assignments \( q_l \).

To map the optimal transport problem to the firm’s profit maximization problem, we let \( C(X, T) \) represent the squared loss of profits from assigning individual \( i \) a treatment that is not her best possible treatment under fully granularly personalization. We first define

\[
\mathcal{R}_i(x_i, \tilde{t}_l) \triangleq E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, T_{i,1} = \tilde{t}_{i,1}, 0, \ldots, 0] + \cdots + E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = \tilde{t}_{i,d}, \ldots, 0] + \cdots + E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, T_{i,D} = \tilde{t}_{i,D}]
\]

and then define

\[
\bar{\mathcal{R}}_i \triangleq \max \{ E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, \hat{t}_{i,1}, \ldots, 0], \ldots, E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, \hat{t}_{i,d}, \ldots, 0], \ldots, E_{\pi}[R_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, \hat{t}_{i,D}] \}.
\]

\( \mathcal{R}_i(x_i, \tilde{t}_l) \) represents the expected return from giving treatment \( \tilde{t}_l \) to to an individual with \( x_i \). When \( \tilde{t}_l \) is feasible, only one dimension of the treatment will be non-zero. Thus, only one of the
right-hand side terms in Equation 4 will be non-zero. \( \bar{R_i} \) represents the highest expected return possible for an individual with \( x_i \) if the firm could perfectly granularly target that individual. We then specify the cost function as

\[
E_\pi [C(X, Y)|t = \tilde{t}_i] = \left( \mathcal{R}(x_i, \tilde{t}_i) - \bar{R}_i \right)^2
\]

in the Monge-Kantorovich problem. The cost function in Equation 6 represents the sum of the lost profits from assigning individual \( i \) treatment \( \tilde{t}_i \) compared to fully granularly personalizing for individual \( i \). The firm receives weakly lower profits from coarse personalization compared to fully granular personalization by the optimality of the latter in solving the firm’s program in Equation 5.

Examining the optimal transport problem in Equation 3, we see that the firm faces a convex program.

**Proposition 3.** \( E_\pi [C(X, T)] \) is strictly convex in \( \tilde{t}_i \).

**Proof.** From Assumptions 1 and 2 we saw that the firm’s program in Equation 4 was strictly concave. Since \( E[Y|x_i, 0, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0] \) is a constant with regards to \( \tilde{t} \) and \( q \), \( E[R_i|x_i, \tilde{t}_{i,b}, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,d}, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,D}] \) is then strictly concave and so is \( \mathcal{R}(x_i, \tilde{t}_i) \) by construction. Since \( \bar{R}_i \) is a constant with regards to \( \tilde{t} \) and \( q \), \( (\bar{R}_i - \mathcal{R}(x_i, \tilde{t}_i)) \) is strictly convex.

We let \( \phi(\cdot) \) be a convex and strictly increasing function for all \( t, t' \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) and let \( \alpha \in [0, 1] \). Then, for some strictly convex function \( f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \),

\[
\phi(f(\alpha t + (1 - \alpha)t')) < \phi(\alpha f(t) + (1 - \alpha)f(t')) \leq \alpha \phi(f(t)) + (1 - \alpha)\phi(f(t'))
\]

where we used that \( \phi(\cdot) \) is strictly increasing in the first inequality and then used that \( \phi(\cdot) \) is convex in the second inequality. Choosing \( \phi(x) = x^2 \), we see that \( (\mathcal{R}(x_i, \tilde{t}_i) - \bar{R}_i)^2 = (\bar{R}_i - \mathcal{R}(x_i, \tilde{t}_i))^2 \) is strictly convex. Lastly, \( \sum_{i=1}^{L} q_i E_\pi [C(X, T)|T = \tilde{t}_i] \) is a convex combination of strictly convex functions with convex weights \( q \). Thus, \( E_\pi [C(X, T)] \) is strictly convex in \( \tilde{t}_i \).

Our coarse personalization problem collapses to a convex optimization problem by Proposition 3. Since we are solving a convex program over a closed interval, our cost function is bounded from below. Theorem 2.2 from Galichon (2016) informs us that the solution to the Monge-Kantorovich problem in Equation 5 exists. Further, Rademacher’s Theorem tells us that the set of non-differentiable points of the convex function will be Lebesgue measure zero, and thus can be ignored under a continuous \( P \). In our framework, the non-differentiable points are those that split mass between two unique treatments. Rademacher’s Theorem thus informs us
that we have a pure assignment of individuals to unique treatments and achieve a Monge mapping as a part of our solution.

**Discussion**

The optimal transport problem jointly chooses both the groups of individuals to be be assigned to each unique treatment as well as the level of treatment to offer for each group to maximize profits. At the optimal transport problem’s solution, the assigned treatment level is chosen such that average marginal effect of the treatment is equal to the average marginal cost across each assigned group. In comparison, with fully granular personalization, the marginal effect of treatment is equated to the marginal cost of treatment at the individual level.

More specifically, we let \((\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)\) be the solution to the optimal transport problem. Since treatments are feasible, \(\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*\) is a \(d\)-dimensional treatment that can only be non-zero in one dimension. Then from Equation 3, the objective function at the optimum is

\[
W(\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*, \mathbf{q}^*) = \sum_{l=1}^{L} q_l^* E_\pi [C(X, T)|T = \hat{i}_l^*]
\]

and optimality to \(\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*\) implies that

\[
\frac{\partial W(\hat{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{q})}{\partial \hat{i}_l} \bigg|_{(\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)} = 0 = \frac{\partial (\mathcal{R}_l(x_i, \hat{\mathbf{i}}_l))}{\partial \hat{i}_l} \bigg|_{(\hat{\mathbf{i}}^*, \mathbf{q}^*)}.
\]

Without loss of generality, we let treatment \(\hat{\mathbf{i}}_l\) be non-zero in dimension \(d\). Then, \(\mathcal{R}_l(x_i, \hat{\mathbf{i}}_l) = E_\pi [R_l|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = \hat{i}_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0]\) and we attain

\[
0 = \frac{\partial (E_\pi [R_l|x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = \hat{i}_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0])}{\partial \hat{i}_{l,d}} = \frac{\partial (E_\pi [Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, \hat{i}_{i,d}, \ldots, 0])}{\partial \hat{i}_{l,d}} - \frac{\partial c_d(\hat{i}_{i,d})}{\partial \hat{i}_{l,d}}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial (E_\pi [Y_i|x_i, 0, \ldots, \hat{i}_{i,d}, \ldots, 0])}{\partial \hat{i}_{l,d}} = \frac{\partial c_d(\hat{i}_{i,d})}{\partial \hat{i}_{l,d}}.
\]

The first order condition implies that the optimal treatment should be chosen such that for all individuals assigned to a unique treatment, the average marginal effect of treatment is equal to the marginal cost of issuing the treatment. In the fully granular personalization case, at the individual level, the marginal effect of treatment is set to its marginal cost. For example, if treatments were prices, this would be equating the marginal revenue to marginal cost across each assigned group. Thus, the coarse personalization solution is a natural generalization of the individual-
level equivalence of marginal effects to marginal cost to an average-level equivalence within the
assigned treatment groups.

In comparison, for the binary and one-dimensional treatment case, as in [Hitsch and Misra
(2018)], the firm would target anyone who has a treatment effect greater than the targeting cost.
For the one-dimensional continuous treatment case, as in [Dubé and Misra (2017)], the optimal
treatment is set such that marginal effect of treatment is equated to marginal cost of treatment.
In our coarse personalization framework, we have the parallel for a multi-dimensional continu-
ous treatment effect. Thus, our first order condition result illustrates the generalization of our
intuition from a continuous treatment effect in one dimension to continuous treatment effects in
D dimensions.

2.3 Computational solution

To solve our coarse personalization problem, we adapt a version of Lloyd’s Algorithm (Algorithm
1), from Lloyd (1982). Other methods to solve semidiscrete optimal transport problems can be
found in [Peyré and Cuturi (2019)]. Our formulation of the optimal transport problem falls under
the class of mixed-integer linear programs.

Since our coarse personalization problem is strictly convex in the treatment values by Propo-
sition 3, our adapted Lloyd’s Algorithm should rapidly converge with only a few iterations. We
prefer Algorithm 1 over other solvers because it is simple to implement, scalable, and provides
a transparent visualization of the optimization procedure. Figure 1 demonstrates the algorithm’s
optimization procedure for two-dimensional treatments.

Given continuous CATE estimates $\{\tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d})\}_{d=1}^D, \{t^*_i\}_{d=1}^D \forall i \in D$ from the first step,
the firm can solve the optimal transport problem by using Algorithm 1. As Figure 1 demonstrates,
in each iteration, the algorithm cycles through updating the treatment assignment and updating
the treatment values. The feasible treatment constraint is enforced by choosing the dimension
of the treatment that yields the highest expected return to the firm for each cell. The algorithm
terminates when the changes to the treatment values are less than a pre-specified tolerance value.

The final profit for the firm is the sum of the profits from terminal step’s Voronoi Cells’ as-
signments. From our argument using Rademacher’s Theorem, there cannot be a point on the
border of the Voronoi Cells that splits mass between two cells because our assignment solution
is a Monge mapping.

Grid search comparison

A common alternative approach to solving the optimal transport problem is using a brute-force
grid search. The firm can discretize over the treatment domain $X$ which collapses the semidiscrete
Algorithm 1 Adapted Lloyd’s Algorithm

Step 0: Guess initial values $\tilde{t}_1^0, \ldots, \tilde{t}_L^0$

Step $k$:

- Compute the Voronoi Cells
  \[ v_i^k = \{ x \in X : |C(X, \tilde{t}_i^k)| \leq |C(X, \tilde{t}_j)|, \forall j \neq i \} \]

- Compute values of the Barycenter of the cells
  \[ \bar{t}_i^k = (\bar{t}_{i,1}^k, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,L}^k) = \frac{1}{P(v_i^k)} \int_{v_i^k} x dP(x) \]

- Compute profits for each of the feasible treatments generated from $\bar{t}_i^k$, which are of form \{(0, ..., $\tilde{t}_{i,d}^k$, ... 0)\}_d=1^D, and have expected profits
  \[ E[R_{i,d}|x_i, t_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, t_{i,d} = \tilde{t}_{i,d}, \ldots, t_{i,D} = 0] = \tau_d(x_i, \tilde{t}_{i,d}) - c_d(\tilde{t}_{i,d}) \]

- Update the $\tilde{t}$ values by forcing the feasibility constraint to hold, which means we choose the feasible treatment that yields highest profits across $d \in D$
  \[ \tilde{t}_i^{k+1} = \begin{cases} (\bar{t}_{i,1}^k, \ldots, 0) & \text{if } E[R_{i,1}|x_i, \bar{t}_{i,1}, \ldots, 0] > E[R_{i,d'}|x_i, 0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,d'}, \ldots, 0], \forall d' \neq 1 \\ \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \\ (0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,d'}^k, \ldots, 0) & \text{if } E[R_{i,d}|x_i, 0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,d}, \ldots, 0] > E[R_{i,d'}|x_i, 0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,d'}, \ldots, 0], \forall d' \neq d \\ \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \\ (0, \ldots, \bar{t}_{i,L}^k) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

Terminate the algorithm when $\tilde{t}_i^{k+1}$ is close enough to $\tilde{t}_i^k$

Then, over the finite grid of possible assignments and treatment levels, the firm can combinatorially search for optimal values. With the grid search, we can also relax Assumptions 1 and 2. However, the combinatorial space exponentially grows in the number of individuals and it further suffers from a version of the curse of dimensionality. For $N$ individuals, $L$ treatments, and $D$ dimensions with $G$ discrete points in each dimension, the combinatorial space for the grid search problem is $G^D LN$.

The grid search algorithm’s run time is $O((GD)^{G/2}LN)$. In contrast, the run time of $I$ iterations of our adapted Lloyd’s Algorithm is $O(IDLN)$ and will be substantially faster. Thus, for a large number of high dimensional treatments, the standard grid search approach is computation-

---

The use of discretization to approximate a continuous domain underlies the mass transport approach to solving continuous-continuous optimal transport problems in Chiong et al. (2016).

For example, if the firm chooses to assign three different promotions ($L = 3$) across dollar off and percentage off promotion types ($D = 2$) that take on ten possible values ($G = 10$) for fifteen people ($N = 15$), there are 16 over billion combinations to search over.
ally infeasible and using the adapted Lloyd’s Algorithm or any convex optimizer that leverages Assumptions 1 and 2 is highly suggested.

2.4 Discussion

Given the constraint that only $L$ unique treatments can be offered, the optimal transport problem in the second step solves for which unique treatments to offer and who to assign to each treatment with the goal of maximizing profits. In essence, the distribution of CATEs that we estimated in the first step is mapped to a discrete distribution of assigned treatments. We know that after the first step, the fully granular personalization solution is profit maximizing for the firm because it optimally chooses profit maximizing the treatment at the individual level. The second step accounts for the extra constraint and uses optimal transport to choose which treatments to offer and their assignments to get as close as the fully granular profits as possible. Our coarse personalization solution generates the maximum expected profits possible given the limitation on the number of unique treatments available to the firm.

In terms of the traditional “STP” framework (Kotler and Keller 2014), we have solved both the segmentation and targeting steps in a single procedure. The former are the assignments to each treatment and the latter are the unique treatment values. Since we are discretizing the fully granular personalization results into a handful of assigned treatments in the second step, our “personalize then discretize” approach inverts the “discretize then personalize” approach used in classical “STP”. Because the optimal transport problem aims to minimize profits lost from coarse personalization, its segmentation and targeting results should yield higher profits than those generated by first segmenting on covariates or preferences alone and then targeting. By forming segmenting and targeting decisions in concert, the firm is able to optimize to the correct metric. We further recover fully granular profits when we let the number of treatments equal to the number of individuals ($L = N$). The final choice of the number of unique treatments $L$ to offer is left to the firm to tailor to its setting.

More generally, we espouse the optimal transport approach because it allows us to interpret the coarse personalization problem in an economic manner, suggests a simple procedure in Algorithm 1 to solve it, and links it to a broader transport theory literature. We can translate the optimization problem in Equation 3 as a regret minimization problem – with a handful of treatments available, the firm solves the problem to minimize lost potential profits. Naturally, marketing researchers can use black-box optimizers to solve the optimization program instead using our optimal transport framework. However, in doing so, it loses the benefits from the optimal transport approach. Section 2.2's discussion shows that we can economically interpret optimal transport solution as choosing treatments and their assignments such that the average
marginal benefit of treatment is equal to the marginal cost of treatment across assigned groups. Our adaptation of Lloyd’s Algorithm in Algorithm 1 provides a computationally simple yet scalable solution to solve the optimization problem and whose link would not be made clear without viewing the problem from an optimal transport lens. Because our algorithm takes in the optimal treatments for each individual, it is especially efficient in higher dimensions as it searches over treatments at are close to the individual optimal values. Compared to a black-box optimizer approach, our algorithm embeds a “warm start” in the optimization process. Lastly, recasting our coarse personalization problem as an semi-discrete optimal transport problem allows us to connect our marketing problem to transportation theory and exploring other links may prove fruitful for future research.

3 Empirical application

In this section, we apply our methodology to a large-scale field experiment run by a food delivery platform. Treatments are two dimensional and are dollar amount off and percentage off promotions. We show that under the coarse personalization framework, the company can achieve profits close to fully granular personalization while utilizing only a handful of unique promotions or treatments. Further, we see that the coarse personalization solution using optimal transport from Section 2 significantly outperforms classic marketing segmentation procedures in generating expected profits for the firm.

3.1 Setting

We have a large-scale RCT data set for a large food delivery platform across three core-based statistical areas (CBSAs) in the United States. There are over 1.2 million unique customers in the data with around 100 pre-treatment recency, frequency, and monetary (RFM) covariates. Across these their customers, the following treatments were randomized assigned: dollar amount off ($2, $3, $4, $5), percentage off (5%, 10%, 15%, 20%), and no treatment. The assigned promotion can only be used on the next order by the customer, the promotions are issued by email, and the no treatment group will act as a baseline that receives $0 off or 0% off. We assume that the customers use the targeted promotions on their next purchase occasion, there are no gaming of the coupons, and we ignore dynamic effects from stockpiling in response to coupon availability. In the framework of the Section 2 we have a two-dimensional treatment that consists of dollar off and percentage off promotions. Without loss of generality, we set the dollar off promotion to be the first dimension of treatment and the percentage off promotion as the second dimension of treatment.
We first examine if the randomization in the experiment was correctly implemented by the firm. We estimate a logistic regression for the propensity score of being given any treatment using the Lasso, and we plot the distribution of the predicted propensity score in Figure 2 separately for treated and not treated individuals. We find that there is a sizable difference in the propensity scores across the two types of individuals which suggests the data might not be balanced. We then examine each treatment arm separately and estimate a logistic regression for the propensity score of each treatment arm to the no treatment arm using the Lasso and plot the predicted propensity score for only the treated individuals for each treatment arm in Figure 3. We find that there is virtually no difference in propensity scores for the treated individuals in each treatment arm. These results suggest that the randomization was correctly done across treatment arms, but may be incorrectly performed for the no treatment sample. The company has not indicated that the randomization was incorrectly implemented, but we will adjust our CATE estimations with the propensity score to account for possible mistakes or stratifications during the firm’s randomization procedure.

The firm’s goal is to maximize profits from prescribing dollar off or percentage off promotions to its customer base. The outcome variable of interest is the total profits generated from the customer 28 days after the promotion was sent. The firm’s profit from consumer \(i\) after 28 days is defined as

\[
\text{Profit after 28 days}_i = \text{Spending after 28 days}_i - \text{Promotion cost}_i
\]

where the promotion cost depends on the promotion issued to the consumer. Figure 4 plots the profits by treatment value for dollar off and percentage off promotions. We see that in both dimensions profits earned by the firm generally increase with a higher promotion values and they roughly have a concave shape.

In terms of the notation in Section 2 profits are \(R_i\), spending levels are \(Y_i\), and promotion costs are \(c_d(t_{i,d})\) where \(t_{i,d}\) is treatment issued to consumer \(i\) that is non-zero in dimension \(d\). We only observe profits after 28 days for each consumer and can back out the spending level after 28 days by imposing structure on the firm’s costs. The firm’s expected returns or expected profits for individual \(i\) assigned treatment \(t_{i,d}\) that is non-zero in dimension \(d\) is

\[
E[R_i| x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] = E[Y_i| x_i, T_{i,1} = 0, \ldots, T_{i,d} = t_{i,d}, \ldots, T_{i,D} = 0] - c_d(t_{i,d}).
\]

We define the cost of the dollar amount off promotion to the firm to be the dollar amount itself. For the percentage off promotion, the firm expects the promotion cost for consumer \(i\) to be the percentage off times the average promotion spending on an order by the consumer over the last 365 days before treatment. These cost assumptions are similar to what the firm incurs in practice.
We then construct the firm’s expected cost for offering consumer $i$ a percentage promotion to be

$$\text{percentage off cost to firm}_i = \text{percentage off promotion} \times \text{average past promo spend}_i.$$

The cost of the promotion is then

$$c_d(t_{i,1}) = t_{i,1}$$
$$c_d(t_{i,2}) = t_{i,2} \times \text{average past promo spend}_i$$

for dollar off promotion $t_{i,1}$ and for percentage off promotion $t_{i,2}$ respectively. For customers who have never received a promotion before the field experiment, their past promotion spend for an order was median imputed. Lastly, the treatment vector $(t_{i,1}, t_{i,2}) = (0, 0)$ is the no promotion or holdout case and the firm incurs no cost by not issuing a promotion.

We also assume that the continuous CATEs, $\tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d})$, are strictly concave in the treatment value, $t_{i,d}$, to satisfy Assumption 1. Since the firm issues promotions or coupons without a prior announcement, the consumers may treat these as gains (Blattberg et al., 2010). We can then motivate the strict concavity assumption using prospect theory as customers have diminishing sensitivity over gains (Kahneman and Tversky, 2018). By our construction of the costs of promotion, they are weakly convex in $t_{i,1}$ and $t_{i,2}$ which fulfills Assumption 2.

We interpret the continuous CATEs, $\tau_d(x_i, t_{i,d})$, as a behavioral sensitivity to dollar off or percentage off treatments (Briesch, 1997). We find that even when the two yield the same expected value to the customers, the continuous treatment effect is different. In other words, customers have differing sensitivity when presented two promotions that yield the same expected monetary value. Otherwise, if consumers had the same sensitivity to the expected value of dollar off and percentage off promotions, then we would be able to collapse the two-dimensional treatment to just a one-dimensional expected value of the promotion for each customer.

### 3.2 Estimation procedure

To estimate the continuous CATEs, $\hat{\tau}_d(x_i, t_{i,d})$, we first implement the Causal Forest of Wager and Athey (2018) in each of the two treatment dimensions. Since we may not have a perfectly randomized experiment, we use the generalized regression forests implementation of the Causal Forest (Athey et al., 2019) that uses propensity score estimates to adjust for possible stratification between the treatments and holdout sample.

We also estimate the continuous CATEs directly using Deep Neural Networks (Farrell et al., 2020, 2021). We find similar results which suggest that deviations from perfect randomization do not heavily influence our results. To account for imperfect randomization in this approach, we can implement to DR-Learner procedure from Kennedy (2020) while using DNNs for the propensity score and regression function estimators.
To force strict concavity of the continuous CATEs for each individual and in each dimension, we then impose a logarithmic functional form on continuous CATEs that is parameterized by $\alpha_{i,d}$ and $\beta_{i,d}$,

$$\hat{\tau}_d(x_i, t_{i,d}) = \alpha_{i,d} + \beta_{i,d} \log(1 + t_{i,d}) + \epsilon_{i,d},$$

and a shape restriction that $\beta_{i,d} > 0$. We let $\epsilon_{i,d}$ represent a vector of the approximation error. The individual continuous CATEs are parameterized by the estimates $\{(\hat{\alpha}_{i,d}, \hat{\beta}_{i,d})^2_{d=1}N_{i=1}\}$, and we use these to solve for the optimal treatment levels $\{t_{i,1}^*, t_{i,2}^*\}_{i=1}^N$ by using Equation 1. Given the optimal treatment levels and the parameterized continuous CATE estimates for each individual and dimension of treatment, we run Algorithm 1 with a choice of the number of treatments $L$ to attain the unique treatment values and their assignments.

We compare our coarse personalization estimates to traditional marketing segmentation procedures. To segment on covariates, we first reduce the covariate size to 59 covariates by retaining variables that are relevant either for predicting subsequent purchase incidence or purchase amount. Then, for this reduced set of covariates we implement $k$-means to segment the data. To segment on consumer preferences, we can form segments on the treatment sensitivity of individuals and we implement $k$-means on the $\{\hat{\beta}_{i,1}, \hat{\beta}_{i,2}\}_{i=1}^N$ estimates from our parameterization of the CATEs. Lastly, we can cluster on the optimal treatment levels across individuals themselves and we implement $k$-means on $\{t_{i,1}^*, t_{i,2}^*\}_{i=1}^N$. After the segments are made, we find the optimal treatment level for each segment by choosing the level and dimension of treatment that maximizes profits.

We bootstrap the entire procedure to produce standard errors for our estimates. In our estimation results, we focus on the implementation uncertainty of the second step, the optimal transport step, which is of main practical interest to the firm. In practice, firms treat the first step CATE estimates as given and focuses on the implementation uncertainty of the different methods in generating profits. As a result, the comparisons of interest are how well the coarse personalization solution compares to other segmentation methods as well as how close can coarse personalization get to the fully granular personalization profits. In other words, the firm cares about how well the different methods for segmentation and targeting perform and how much profits is the firm leaving on the table by not fully granularly personalizing.

---

1To fully account for both model uncertainty in the first step and the implementation uncertainty in the second step, we can use the confidence intervals that the Causal Forest provides for its CATE estimates. We can sample from the CATE confidence intervals and then implement the optimal transport step for each sample.
3.3 Results

We provide results using a dataset of over 1.2 million customers and use a hundred bootstrap iterations to quantify uncertainty in our estimates. The first step’s CATE estimates were estimated using the entire set of 126 covariates and on the entire data set of 1,213,390 individuals. The continuous CATE parameterization produced an average $R^2$ of 0.925 and 0.770 respectively for the dollar off and percentage off dimensions. We then dropped 10,011 people whose $\hat{\beta}_{i,d}$ where were $10^{-6}$ or smaller since their continuous CATE estimates were not well approximated by the logarithmic functional form. The second step was run on the remaining 1,203,379 individuals and bootstrap procedure was implemented for the second step to quantify implementation uncertainty.

Figure 5 provide the continuous CATE estimates evaluated at the randomized level of treatment in each dimension and across individuals. We see that the treatment effects generally increase as the promotion value increases in each dimension and that the treatment effect of the percentage off promotion has more variance than the dollar off promotion. On average, customers are more receptive to the dollar off promotions than to the percentage off promotion since the CATE levels are higher for the former.

For ten unique treatments ($L = 10$), Figure 6 plots the treatment values and assignments and Table 1 provides the treatment values. In Figure 6, the circular points represent the optimal treatment values $\{t_{i,1}^*, t_{i,2}^*\}_{i=1}^N$ and the colors represent their assignments to the unique treatments. The diamond points represent the location of the optimal treatment level. Table 1 shows that most of the customers are assigned to the second, tenth, and seventh treatments and these are all dollar off promotions. We see that many of the offered treatments are tightly packed between the one to two dollar off promotion in Figure 6 which suggests that most individuals who are most receptive to a dollar off promotion in this range.

There is significant bunching of individuals at the upper bound in Figure 6 for the percentage off treatment which suggests we are leaving profits on the table by enforcing this upper bound. While we can expand the upper bound of allowed treatments using our parameterization of the continuous CATE estimates, we retain the upper bound at $5$ and $20\%$ in the optimal transport problem because this was the largest promotion in each dimension that the RCT had randomized over. In future field experiments, the firm may consider randomizing over a larger set of treatments.

Table 2 shows the percentage of expected incremental profits recouped by coarse personalization compared to the fully granular personalization case.

\*Expected incremental profits are defined as additional expected profits over the expected baseline profits of not targeting anyone.
plots the expected incremental profits across bootstrap iterations for coarse personalization.

We find that after three unique treatments, we recoup around 99% of the fully granular personalization’s expected profits and after five unique treatments, we recoup over 99.5% of the fully granular personalization’s expected profits. These results suggest that the firm is able to match almost all of the fully granular personalization’s expected profits by using only a handful of unique treatments with our coarse personalization procedure.

**Comparison to classical segmentation**

Figure 7 and Table 2 also show the expected incremental profits arising from separately forming segments based on covariates, preferences, and optimal treatment levels and then finding the optimal treatment for each segment. We find that our coarse personalization methodology (“personalize then discretize”) significantly outperforms the other standard segmentation methods (“discretize then personalize”) that are used in the standard “STP” approach. With our framework, coarse personalization generates the maximum expected profits possible given the limitation on the number of unique treatments available to the firm.

Segmenting on covariates does not appear to help the firm in maximizing profits because the segments based on consumer characteristics do not necessarily correspond to the optimal segments for maximizing profits. Segmenting on consumer preferences and optimal treatment levels does better than segmenting on covariates. Since optimal treatment levels are constructed from the consumer preferences and the cost function faced by the firm, the two procedures embed similar information and thus should perform similarly. Segmenting on preferences is noisier than segmenting on optimal treatment levels because the latter is more directly related to the profit maximization problem and accounts for treatment costs. The difference in profits between segmenting on optimal treatment levels and our coarse personalization procedure arises because coarse personalization uses the correct distance metric of expected profits for segmentation. This specific difference is exemplified in Figure 6. For each individual, the nearest treatment on Figure 6 is not necessarily assigned because the distance metric used for segmentation is in expected profits space (Equation 6) and is not Euclidean distance in the optimal treatment values. As a result, the constructed segments from coarse personalization will outperform those constructed from using the optimal treatment level when firm’s goal is to maximize expected profits.

**Comparison to A/B testing**

Optimizing the treatment level itself in our empirical example has a substantial effect and Table 2 demonstrates that with only one unique treatment (1.70 dollars off) blanketed to the whole population, we are able to recover 96% of the fully granular benchmark. In comparison, if the firm
ran standard A/B testing and chose the best treatment arm from the RCT to blanket target, the firm would offer the two dollar off promotion and attain expected profits of $789,868 dollars which is 93.8% of the fully granular benchmark. The firm’s most recently blanketed promotion, a 10% off coupon, would yield only $330,278 in profits which is 39.21% of the fully granular benchmark. Thus, optimizing the blanket treatment itself does a sizable amount of work of getting close to the fully granular personalization profits in our scenario.

**Rounded treatment levels**

Since decimal level treatment values may not be applicable for different settings, we further examine the coarse personalization problem with rounded treatments. By a priori discretizing the space of possible treatments, we can no longer guarantee that the solution to the Monge-Kantorovich Problem in Equation 2 is unique. As a result, we empirically examine two different rounding procedures. The first is ex-ante rounding, where we only allow Algorithm 1 to consider when integer treatments when updating. The second is ex-post rounding, where we round the treatment levels after running Algorithm 1. In the latter case, because two unique treatments might be rounded to the same value, the effective number of unique treatments may be reduced by the rounding procedure.

Table 3 demonstrates the percentage of expected incremental profits with by coarse personalization with the two integer rounding procedures. Fully granular personalization with integer treatments only allows for 26 unique treatments in this setting. Comparing Table 2 to Table 3 we see that we leave some profits on the table with both rounding procedures. The fully granular personalization profits with integer treatments lies between that of offering one and two unrounded treatments. From Table 3 we see that with ex-ante rounding we can recover almost all of the fully granular rounded treatment profits after ten unique integer treatments. With ex-post rounding, we see that the effective number of treatments is often smaller than the number of unique treatments before rounding. Further, the best performing set of ex-post rounded treatments is similar to the set of ex-ante rounded treatments. The differences across profits with the same effective number of treatments arises because the ex-post rounding itself is ad hoc and not necessarily profit maximizing. In contrast, rounding ax-ante in each step of Algorithm 1 ensures that constructed segments and their treatment levels are geared towards profit maximization. These results suggest that even though with rounded treatments we may not get an unique optimal solution, Algorithm 1 still does well with ex-ante rounding to form segments that are assigned integer treatments in solving the coarse personalization problem.

To flesh out the performance of Algorithm 1 with ex-ante rounding, we can examine Figure 8 which provides the profit comparisons for the coarse personalization solution with different
ex-ante rounded treatments at the 0.25, 0.5, and 1 (integer rounding) levels. The algorithm still performs well with the ex-ante rounding since we see that profits overall increase with more granular targeting. While we almost fully recover the unrounded coarse personalization results by rounding at the 0.25 level, in practice that level of rounding is often too granular for the firm. Rounding at 0.5 or at integer values leads statistically significant lower profits than rounding at 0.25, but the firm is still able to almost recover all of the fully granular profits while still only offering only five unique treatments in either case. The optimal rounding level of the treatments will ultimately depend on the firm’s application and how much it is willing to leave profit on the table for more rounded treatments.

4 Surplus analysis

We can use our coarse personalization framework to examine the effects of better personalization and targeting on consumer surplus and producer surplus. While it is clear that producer surplus will monotonically increase as the firm can better personalize, its effect is not clear on consumer surplus. Some consumer receive higher or lower consumer surplus by being assigned a treatment that is above or below their assigned treatment under fully granular personalization. Due to the uncertain effect on consumer surplus, the total surplus produced for an individual may be higher or lower than that of under the fully granular personalization scenario.

To close our model for a surplus calculation, we need to impose assumptions on the individual valuation of the treatments $v_i(t_{i,d})$. We assume that the consumer values the dollar off coupon at face value ($v_i(t_{i,1}) = t_{i,1}$) and values the percentage off coupon at the percentage off rate times the average past promotion spend for an order ($v_i(t_{i,2}) = t_{i,2} \times \text{average past promo spend}_i$). These valuations match the cost of issuing the promotion for the firm and we can treat the promotion as a transfer from the consumer to the consumer that stimulates further demand from the consumer. Armed with the firm’s program (Equation 1) and the assumption on consumer valuations, we can compute the total surplus (Equation 8) and estimate the change in surplus for each individual under different levels of coarse personalization compared to the fully granular personalization benchmark. We defer the complete surplus calculation procedure to Appendix Section B.

From Figure 9 and Table 4, we observe that there is a non-monotonic relationship of consumer surplus to the number of unique treatments available. The lines in Figure 9 represent the bootstrap means and the bands represent one bootstrap standard deviation for the change in welfare surplus from the fully granular benchmark. The consumer surplus is highest when there is one unique treatment ($L = 1$) and decreases non-monotonically as the firm can use more treatments. Further, the consumer surplus drops significantly after four unique treatments and then drops sizably again after eight unique treatments. The non-monotonic changes in consumer surplus arise from
the trade-off between the firm assigning treatments to individuals that are different from their individual optimal treatment level and that the firm chooses the assignment of individuals so the individual often cannot benefit too much from the assignment at the expense of the firm.

Table 5 provides the surplus decomposition of the change total surplus into the change in producer surplus and consumer surplus for when the firm issues ten unique treatments ($L = 10$). Each row in the table represents the respective unique treatment in Table 4. We see that compared to the fully granular personalization benchmark, producer surplus is always reduced under coarse personalization. Further, we see that the changes in consumer surplus contributes most to the changes in total surplus from Table 4.

From Tables 1 and 5, we see that most of the customers are assigned to three unique treatments. In turn, three unique treatments captures a sizable portion of the expected profit gain from coarse personalization. As a result, when the firm is able to assign four unique treatments, it is able assign all the individuals who did not fit the three unique treatments and the firm lost profits on into the fourth treatment. Since these are the consumers who are likely benefiting from the constraint in the three unique treatment case, this result explains the significant drop in consumer surplus in Figure 9 from going from three to four unique treatments.

Our empirical findings corroborate the non-monotonic relationship of personalization and consumer surplus in Dubé and Misra (2017). We further see that from Figure 9 and Table 4, the gain in consumer surplus for being assigned a suboptimal treatment generally dwarfs the loss of producer surplus. As a result, we see that total surplus increases with coarser targeting. These findings lie opposite to the the theoretical equilibrium results in Bergemann and Bonatti (2011), which finds that total surplus increases as advertisers are better able to personalize and meet the needs of the consumers. Even though our surplus calculation uses an simplified model of the consumer valuation of promotions, we still see that the results from better personalization can be non-monotonic and will depend on the consumers’ valuations. Future research should utilize panel data for a more rigorous surplus calculation to flesh out the non-monotonic relationship between personalization and consumer surplus as well as examine the long-term effect of personalized promotions on societal surplus.

Lastly, our surplus formulation offers a convenient rule to choose the number of unique treatments to offer from a societal perspective. From Figure 9 we see that offering three unique treatments maximizes the total societal surplus while allowing the firm to recover 99% of fully granular profits. Since the change in total surplus is positive, more deadweight loss is generated in the fully granular case than when coarse personalizing by offering only three unique treatments. Thus, in preempting possible fairness or antitrust concerns, the firm may be inclined to offer only three unique treatments and leave 1% of the fully granular profits left on the table.
5 Discussion

Outside of the our empirical application where we revisited the traditional “STP” procedure for promotions management, we can also adapt our coarse personalization procedure to a variety of different marketing applications. We provide a handful of classical marketing scenarios where our framework can be adapted. In some of the examples, the assumption that the treatment vector is non-zero in one treatment dimension can be relaxed and interactions across treatments can be allowed. However, in practice, this requires much more data to be used in the first step in order to estimate the interactions.

In the context of salesforce compensation, managers need to decide which geographic blocks of individuals to assign to which salespeople, how long much time the salespeople should spend on visit, and whether the visits should be in person or just a phone call (Misra, 2019). The dimensions of treatment in this example are the time spent and the type of visit. Further, often only a certain number of geographic blocks are assigned to each salesperson (Zoltners and Sinha, 1983). Managers can also use the coarse personalization procedure to design the optimal geographic blocks and visits types for the salespeople in order to maximize expected sales.

In the “contract externality” framework of Daljord et al. (2016), salesforce managers choose a homogeneous contract commission rate and the assignment of heterogeneously effective salespeople to that contract. “Contract externalities” arise because the choice of which salespeople to assign the contract to will affect the optimal contract commission rate. The firm’s manager then chooses the treatment level, the homogeneous commission rate, and the composition of the salespeople who are assigned to each treatment. Daljord et al. (2016) focus on a one-dimensional contract rate while our framework allows for a finite dimensional number of contract components.

We can also apply our methodology to advertising design. For example, Bertrand et al. (2010) find that for small loans, altering advertising features, such as the advertisement’s photo and content, have a significant effect on increasing loan demand that is comparable in effect to changing the loan’s interest rate. If their firm decides to choose a handful of advertisements to coarsely personalize and send out, then the findings from Bertrand et al. (2010) provide the first step’s results in our procedure. We would then account for how many different advertisements the firm is willing to send out and determine the optimal advertisements to send out using our second step.

Our framework can also be used to guide pricing decisions. Chandar et al. (2019) find that across 40 million Uber rides, riders have heterogeneous preferences over private tipping behavior. If firm managers aim to maximize tip and overall spending from customers but cannot fully personalize due to fairness concerns, they can assign different geographic blocks of riders going
to the same location the same baseline price and default suggested tip rate. By coarsely personalizing, the managers can simultaneously both increase profits over the no personalization scenario and address fairness concerns – two people in the same area searching for a ride to the nearest airport will face the same price.

Lastly, coarse personalization can be interpreted as a more regularized version of the fully granularly personalized case. Heterogeneous treatment effect estimates are known to be noisy \cite{Hitsch:2018,Wager:2018}, and by coarsely assigning blocks or segments of customer that are given the same treatment, firms are able to explicitly choose the level of regularization to incorporate when using the heterogeneous treatment effects. At one extreme, full regularization implies everyone receives the same treatment and at the other, fully granular personalization is implemented and everyone gets her own fully personalized treatment. The coarse personalization framework enables a firm’s manager navigate between two extremes while ensuring the profit maximizing groups and treatments are formed at each level of regularization.

6 Conclusion

Advances in heterogeneous treatment effect estimators have allowed for granular incrementality-based targeting and personalization in a myriad of social science applications. While these methods enable individual-level personalization and fully granular segmentation, firms or institutions in practice often only offer a handful of unique treatments due to menu costs, fairness constraints, antitrust considerations, etc. We denote this practical problem as the coarse personalization problem in which firms need to choose both the unique treatments to offer and the assignment of individuals to the selected treatments. We provide a link of what is available theoretically to what is done in practice with our solution to the coarse personalization problem.

In this paper, we utilize methods from optimal transport to solve the coarse personalization problem. We propose a two-step approach where the first step estimates the conditional average treatment effects and the second step solves the constrained assignment problem. The first step itself is already used in the literature and provides the fully granular personalization solution. The second step is a novel application of the optimal transport and maps the distribution of conditional average treatment effects to a set of discrete treatments. Our solution revisits the “STP” approach in traditional marketing with modern machinery and we advocate for an “personalize then discretize” rather than “discretize then personalize” approach.

There are practical implications of the methodological results from this paper. We provide an empirical application of promotions management for a large food delivery platform. We find that after assigning five unique treatments, the company is able to recoup over 99.5% of its expected profits from fully granular personalization. Our approach outperforms traditional marketing pro-
cedures that segments only on covariates or preferences. Further, our proposed algorithmic solution is both scalable and easy to implement. These results have direct managerial implications as we offer a practical way for firms and marketers to optimally coarsely personalize their offerings. Future research can examine the effects of competition on firms implementing our coarse personalization procedure.

Our methodology can be generally used for constrained assignment problems in other fields. Using drug trial data, we can find the best drug and dosage level combinations for pharmaceutical companies to provide. Drug companies can then coarsely personalize medicine for their clientele. The optimal transport solution itself can be adapted to solve for optimal teacher assignments with peer effects or for optimally allocating workers to projects and collaborative tasks.

We view our paper as a bridge linking optimal transport theory to practical problems in social science. Optimal transport methods have been utilized in economics for many applications and they are surveyed in (Galichon, 2016). In computer science, optimal transport has been used for a variety of problems ranging from training high-dimensional GANs to computer vision (Peyré and Cuturi, 2019). This paper utilizes optimal transport as a novel way to solve a practical problem and future research in applying optimal transport to other problems in social science is already underway.
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Figures

Start with $\tilde{t}_k$

**Expansion:**
- Compute Voronoi Cells
- Compute Barycenters $\{(t'_1, t'_2)\}_{l=1}^L$

**Reduction:**
- Force feasibility constraint

**Update:**
- Update to $\tilde{t}_{k+1}$
- Recompute Voronoi Cells

Terminate when $\tilde{t}_{k+1}$ is close enough to $\tilde{t}_k$

Figure 1: Adapted Lloyd’s Algorithm ($D = 2$)

Note: Propensity scores are obtained using the Lasso with ten-fold cross validation.

Figure 2: Estimated propensity score (any treated vs. not treated)
Note: Propensity scores are obtained using the Lasso with ten-fold cross validation.

Figure 3: Estimated propensity score across treated arms

Note: The bars represent one standard deviation.

Figure 4: Profits by treatment
Note: The diamond points represent the offered treatments, the round points represent individuals, and the colors represent the assignment of individuals to treatments.

Figure 6: Treatment assignments ($L = 10$ treatments)
Note: The lines are the bootstrap means and the bands represent one bootstrap standard deviation. The band around the fully granular profits line reflects the sampling variation across the 100 bootstrap iterations.

Figure 7: Profit comparisons

Note: The lines are the bootstrap means and the bands represent one bootstrap standard deviation. The band around the fully granular profits line reflects the sampling variation across the 100 bootstrap iterations.

Figure 8: Profit comparisons for coarse personalization with ex-ante rounded treatments
Note: The lines are the bootstrap means and the bands represent one bootstrap standard deviation.

Figure 9: Surplus decomposition across treatments

Tables

Table 1: Treatment assignments ($L = 10$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment ($l$)</th>
<th>Dimension ($d$)</th>
<th>Value ($t_{i,d}$)</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>7,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>556,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>7,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>54,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>12,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>15,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>214,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>30,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>9,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dollar</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>295,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Expected incremental profits by segmentation method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of treatments ($L$)</th>
<th>Covariates</th>
<th>Preferences</th>
<th>Optimal treatment levels</th>
<th>Coarse personalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>808,920</td>
<td>808,920</td>
<td>808,920</td>
<td>808,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>808,940</td>
<td>814,377</td>
<td>812,609</td>
<td>829,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>808,969</td>
<td>815,851</td>
<td>824,710</td>
<td>834,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>809,021</td>
<td>826,215</td>
<td>826,581</td>
<td>836,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>809,114</td>
<td>827,432</td>
<td>828,205</td>
<td>838,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>809,156</td>
<td>828,159</td>
<td>828,766</td>
<td>839,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>809,190</td>
<td>828,568</td>
<td>828,970</td>
<td>839,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>809,226</td>
<td>828,817</td>
<td>829,159</td>
<td>840,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>809,247</td>
<td>828,929</td>
<td>829,243</td>
<td>840,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>809,277</td>
<td>829,429</td>
<td>829,315</td>
<td>840,985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Profit by segmentation method and number of treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Profits ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm’s promo (10% off)</td>
<td>330,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B testing ($2)</td>
<td>789,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully granular (2206)</td>
<td>842,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Benchmark profit comparisons

Note: The firm’s recent promotion was a 10% off blanket promotion. The A/B tested promotion is a blanket $2 off promotion. When $L = 1$, the optimal blanketed promotion is a $1.70 off promotion. Fully granular personalization would use 2,206 unique promotions when rounding to three significant figures.
Table 3: Expected incremental profits by the number of treatments (rounded integer treatments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of treatments (L)</th>
<th>Ex-ante Rounding</th>
<th>Ex-post Rounding</th>
<th>Effective treatments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profits ($)</td>
<td>Percent to granular (%)</td>
<td>Profits ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>789,868</td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>789,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>809,849</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>809,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>812,964</td>
<td>99.33</td>
<td>809,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>814,335</td>
<td>99.49</td>
<td>812,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>816,677</td>
<td>99.78</td>
<td>812,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>817,753</td>
<td>99.91</td>
<td>815,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>818,116</td>
<td>99.96</td>
<td>817,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>818,265</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>817,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>818,394</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>817,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>818,471</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>815,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fully granular (26) | 818,481 | – | 818,481 | – | – |

Note: $\Delta TS_i$,$\Delta CS_i$ and $\Delta PS_i$ respectively represent the total change in total surplus, consumer surplus, and producer surplus to the fully granular personalization benchmark across individuals. $\Delta TS_i > 0$ represents the percentage of individuals who have a positive change in total surplus to the fully granular benchmark and the other two columns ($\Delta CS_i > 0$ and $\Delta PS_i > 0$) are likewise defined.

Table 4: Surplus decomposition across treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of treatments (L)</th>
<th>$\Delta TS$</th>
<th>$\Delta TS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
<th>$\Delta CS$</th>
<th>$\Delta CS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
<th>$\Delta PS$</th>
<th>$\Delta PS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,613</td>
<td>64.16</td>
<td>44,029</td>
<td>64.54</td>
<td>-33,416</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14,348</td>
<td>62.38</td>
<td>27,387</td>
<td>62.38</td>
<td>-13,040</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,248</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td>29,483</td>
<td>50.29</td>
<td>-8,234</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-123</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>5,546</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>-5,668</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>-3,889</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>51.16</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>51.17</td>
<td>-2,917</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,622</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>49.32</td>
<td>-2,380</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>49.18</td>
<td>-1,927</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>-1,577</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>49.98</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td>49.98</td>
<td>-1,340</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Surplus decomposition across individuals ($L = 10$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment ($l$)</th>
<th>Average $\Delta TS_i$</th>
<th>$\Delta TS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
<th>Average $\Delta CS_i$</th>
<th>$\Delta CS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
<th>Average $\Delta PS_i$</th>
<th>$\Delta PS_i &gt; 0$ (%)</th>
<th>$N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-57.70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-15.65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-42.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>138.73</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>299.50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-160.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>556,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>136.14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>152.81</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-16.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>164.97</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-142.64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-59.35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-7.84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-51.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-170.45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78.62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-249.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>176.26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>332.54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-156.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8.92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>312.48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-321.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-253.45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-122.20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-131.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>133.11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>300.28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-167.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>295,479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\Delta TS_i$, $\Delta CS_i$, and $\Delta PS_i$ respectively represent the change in total surplus, consumer surplus, and producer surplus to the fully granular personalization benchmark for individual $i$. $\Delta TS_i > 0$ represents the percentage of individuals assigned that treatment who have a positive change in total surplus to the fully granular benchmark and the other two columns ($\Delta CS_i > 0$ and $\Delta PS_i > 0$) are likewise defined.
Appendix

A Extensions of the model

We discuss two practical extensions to our main model from Section 2.

A.1 Selective assignment

One extension of the core model is that the firm can a priori choose a subset of unique treatments to assign. For example, the firm may insist that they retain a no treatment case or a 10% off promotion in the promotions management setting from Section 3. To accommodate this, we let \(\mathcal{L}_0\) be the set of a priori treatment assignments with \(|\mathcal{L}_0| = L_0 < L\). We would then need to choose to assign the other \(L' = L - L_0\) treatment assignments with our framework. Without loss of generality, we let the first \(L_0\) terms in the treatment vector \(\tilde{t}\) be the a priori assigned treatments and let the last \(L'\) terms in \(\tilde{t}\) to be denoted as \(\tilde{t}'\). We reformulate the optimal transport problem such that the firm chooses unique treatments \(\tilde{t}'\) as well as assigned treatment group size \(q\) for all unique treatments.

\[
\min_{\tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{L'}, q \in \mathbb{R}^L} W(\tilde{t}, q)
\]

s.t. \(q \geq 0\)  
\(\sum_{l=1}^{L} q_l = 1\)  
\(\tilde{t}_l\) takes form \((0, \ldots, \tilde{t}_d, \ldots, 0)\)  
(positive weights)  
(adding up)  
(7)  
(feasible treatment)

The objective function in Equation 7 is still strictly convex in \(\tilde{t}\) and the solution will be a Monge mapping. We can implement Algorithm 1 while holding the first \(L_0\) terms in \(\tilde{t}\) fixed to computationally solve the optimal transport problem.

A.2 Fairness considerations

To directly address possible fairness considerations in treatment assignment, we can include a bound of the difference in the magnitude of assigned treatments in the optimal transport problem. In addition to the number of treatments \(L\), the firm also decides on the largest difference of the assigned treatments levels in each dimension. We can directly impose this additional constraint in the optimal transport problem and enforce the constraint in the last step of each iteration in
Algorithm 1. Fairness considerations directly act as constraint for profit maximization as suggested by Kahneman et al. (2019). Intuitively, we anticipate that the additional constraint will further limit the possible treatment values and will increase the level of coarseness of the final targeting assignment. As a result, the firm’s expect profits should further decline.

**B Surplus calculation details**

Bergemann and Bonatti (2011) find that as firms can better granularly personalize, they attain higher levels of producer surplus and societal total surplus generally increases in equilibrium. With our coarse personalization framework, we are able to empirically examine the theoretical results from Bergemann and Bonatti (2011). Since the firm can only choose \( L \) unique treatments to assign, individuals can be assigned a treatment that is either above or below their optimal level or even in a different treatment dimension. Compared to the granular case, the consumer surplus can increase or decrease if they receive a higher or lower than optimal treatment level under our coarse personalization procedure. In contrast, the producer surplus will always diminish when the firm more coarsely targets by the optimality principle of fully granular personalization. Due to the ambiguous effect on consumer surplus, the total surplus generated for each individual \( i \) can either increase or decrease compared to the fully granular case.

Intuitively, we expect that some individuals benefit from coarse personalization because they may receive a treatment that is better for them than what they would get in the fully granular personalization case. The distortion in the firm’s ability to perfectly granularly personalize creates this benefit to individuals. In determining the optimal assignments and the optimal treatments to offer, the firm trades off the gains in consumer surplus from the distortion and the profits they gain from the treatments and their assignments. However, an individual consumer cannot benefit too much lest the firm would reassign her to another treatment where the gain in consumer surplus is lower or even negative. These non-monotonic changes to the individual-level consumer surplus as the targeting ability of the firm increases directly parallels to the non-monotonicity in the consumer surplus as firms are able to use more features of the data to personalize prices in Dubé and Misra (2017). Total surplus can increase or decrease with coarse personalization depending on the changes in consumer surplus relative to the producer surplus. If the consumer surplus gain from coarse personalization dwarfs the loss in producer surplus, then total surplus may increase with coarse personalization.

We formulate a simple surplus analysis to empirically examine the results from Bergemann and Bonatti (2011) and Dubé and Misra (2017) in our framework. Without loss of generality, at the fully granular personalization benchmark, individual \( i \) is offered treatment value \( t^*_{i,d} \) that is non-zero in dimension \( d \). The expected outcome from giving individual \( i \) this optimal treat-
ment is \( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, t_{i,d'} \ldots] \) and the firm makes expected profits \( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, t_{i,d'} \ldots] - c_d(t_{i,d'}^*) \).

If individual \( i \) is instead assigned treatment value \( \tilde{t}_{i,d'} \) that is non-zero in dimension \( d' \) under coarse personalization, the expected outcome from giving individual \( i \) this optimal treatment is \( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,d'} \ldots] \) and the firm makes expected profits \( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,d'} \ldots] - c_d'(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) \). Lastly, we assume the individual values the two treatments respectively at monetary values \( v_i(t_{i,d}'), v_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) \) for some individual-level valuation function \( v_i(\cdot) \).

At the individual level, the change in consumer surplus from coarse personalization to the fully granular case is

\[
\Delta CS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) = v_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) - v_i(t_{i,d}^*)
\]

and the change in producer surplus is

\[
\Delta PS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) = \bigg( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,d'} \ldots] - c_d'(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) \bigg) - \bigg( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, t_{i,d'}^* \ldots] - c_d(t_{i,d'}^*) \bigg).
\]

Then, the change in total surplus from coarse personalization to the fully granular case for individual \( i \) is

\[
\Delta TS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) = \Delta CS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) + \Delta PS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'})
\]

\[
= v_i(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) - v_i(t_{i,d}^*) + \bigg( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, \tilde{t}_{i,d'} \ldots] - c_d'(\tilde{t}_{i,d'}) \bigg) - \bigg( E[Y_i|x_i, \ldots, t_{i,d'}^* \ldots] - c_d(t_{i,d'}^*) \bigg).
\]

Since the distortion in the firm’s optimal targeting strategy leads some individuals being given a better promotion than the fully granular case, specific individuals can generate higher total surplus (Equation 8) under coarse personalization. However, because the firm decides the level of treatments offered as well as their assignments, individuals that receive overly beneficial treatments will be reassigned to another treatment where they receive a less beneficial treatment if the firm is able to do so. The reassignment occurs because the firm focuses solely on maximizing profits or producer surplus. Depending on the sizes of the consumer valuations and the generated profits, coarse personalization can either increase societal deadweight loss or total surplus.

**Example**

To further build intuition for the decomposition of the change in total surplus in Equation 8, consider the case where there is only one dimension of treatment and the treatment \( t_{i,1} \) represents a dollar amount off coupon that the consumer can redeem on her next purchase. Assume that the individual values the coupon at face value so \( v_i(t_{i,1}^*) = t_{i,1}^* \) and \( v_i(\tilde{t}_{i,1}) = \tilde{t}_{i,1} \) and that the cost to
the firm to issue to coupon is also the face value of the coupon so \( c_1(t^*_{i,1}) = t^*_{i,1} \) and \( c_1(\tilde{t}_{i,1}) = \tilde{t}_{i,1} \)\(^{10}\). Then, the change of the total surplus from assigning coupon \( \tilde{t}_{i,1} \) to individual \( i \) compared to the fully granular case with \( t^*_{i,1} \) is

\[
\Delta TS_i(\tilde{t}_{i,1}) = \tilde{t}_{i,1} - t^*_{i,1} + \left( E[Y_i|x_i, \tilde{t}_{i,1}] - \tilde{t}_{i,1} \right) - \left( E[Y_i|x_i, t^*_{i,1}] - t^*_{i,1} \right) \\
= E[Y_i|x_i, \tilde{t}_{i,1}] - E[Y_i|x_i, t^*_{i,1}] \\
= \tau_1(x_i, \tilde{t}_{i,1}) - \tau_1(x_i, t^*_{i,1}),
\]

where added and subtracted \( E[Y_i|x_i, 0] \), or the expected outcome under no treatment, to get to the last line. Thus, the change in total surplus for individual \( i \) from coarse personalization over the fully granular case is just the difference in the continuous CATE evaluated at \( \tilde{t}_{i,1} \) and \( t^*_{i,1} \). If \( \tau_1(x_i, t) \) is increasing in \( t \), then the total surplus for individual \( i \) will increase if \( \tilde{t}_{i,1} > t_{i,1} \) or her assigned treatment level is higher than the individual’s fully granular optimal treatment level. Similarly, if \( \tau_1(x_i, t) \) is decreasing in \( t \), then the total surplus for individual \( i \) will increase if \( \tilde{t}_{i,1} < t_{i,1} \) or the individual’s assigned treatment level is lower than the individual’s fully granular optimal treatment level. Thus, we see that for certain individuals the change total surplus can either increase or decrease under coarse personalization.

\(^{10}\)For a coupon that is for five dollars off, the individual would value the coupon at five dollars and the firm would incur a five dollar cost of issuing the coupon to the consumer.