## Integrated Analysis Report

### How Individual Findings Connect

Each analysis provides a complementary view of Superstore’s operational landscape. Member A examined high-level sales performance and macro trends, identifying that while Q4 sales spike significantly, profit is not guaranteed—especially when deep discounting is applied. Member B focused on customer segmentation, isolating the behaviors and transactional patterns of Superstore’s most valuable customers and those at risk of churning. Member T looked under the hood at SKU-level profitability, finding that many high-revenue products (such as Tables or certain Phones) generate poor or even negative margins due to structural pricing and sourcing issues.

These perspectives converge on three critical connection points:

* Discounts are the common denominator: All three analyses confirm that discounts above 20% do not generate proportional sales lift, frequently result in negative margins, and—in the case of At-Risk customers—serve as a final push toward churn. This is not just a pricing issue; it is a strategic misalignment between revenue tactics and long-term customer value.
* Churn is predictable—and preventable: Member B’s RFPM segmentation showed that a specific group of high-value customers with a history of profitable purchases is now disengaged after making low-value, discounted purchases. Member T’s analysis links these transactions to Problem SKUs like Binders that are structurally unprofitable. Member A adds that these incidents often occur during peak seasonal discount windows, revealing that retention failures are concentrated and time-bound—suggesting that targeted, data-driven interventions can work.
* High performers are under-leveraged: Copiers, Accessories, and Phones consistently outperform on profit per unit, but are not the focal point of seasonal campaigns or customer incentives. Meanwhile, Table sales are heavily promoted despite their steep losses. This misalignment between what sells and what profits is leading to both lost opportunity and wasted spend. Member T’s strategic quadrant framework clarifies which products belong in investment, fix, or exit buckets. Member A’s seasonal trend data provides the campaign timing. Member B’s behavioral insights provide the customer segments to target.

### Cross-Functional Implications

These findings underscore the need for tighter alignment across operational units. Marketing must coordinate with Merchandising to ensure promotions feature high-margin products, not loss-leaders. Sales Operations and IT need to implement price guardrails and discount-blocking logic for Problem SKUs. Analytics must supply shared models of churn risk, product profitability, and regional opportunity to ensure that campaign planning, inventory decisions, and retention efforts are informed by the same ground truth.

This is not just a technical fix—it requires an organizational shift from volume-based growth to value-based optimization. Each role in the organization must orient toward sustainable profitability and long-term customer retention rather than short-term sales bumps.

### Conflicting Findings and Resolutions

Some apparent contradictions emerged but were resolved through synthesis:

* Member A reports strong Furniture sales in Q4, while Member T identifies Tables and Bookcases as major loss drivers. This reflects the classic revenue vs. margin distinction. The resolution is to separate profitable Furniture SKUs (like Chairs) from unprofitable ones and direct Q4 promotional investment accordingly.
* Member A finds only a weak negative correlation between discounts and sales, while Members B and T present clear evidence of discounts leading to churn and margin collapse. This discrepancy is due to the limitations of aggregate correlation: deep discounting harms a subset of SKUs and customer groups rather than the entire dataset. A global Pearson coefficient masks these targeted harms. The resolution is to shift from broad discounting to SKU- and segment-specific elasticity modeling.