In [164	<pre>import pandas as pu import numpy as np import gurobipy as gp</pre>
In [165	<pre>import seaborn as sn import matplotlib.pyplot as plt # from IPython.core.interactiveshell import InteractiveShell # InteractiveShell.ast_node_interactivity = "all" Importing ROI File roi_file = pd.read_csv("ROI_data.csv")</pre>
In [166 Out[166	101_1116
	 0 0.031 0.049 0.024 0.039 0.016 0.024 0.046 0.026 0.033 0.044 1 0.049 0.023 0.024 0.039 0.044 0.046 0.026 0.019 0.037 0.026 3) Formulate the marketing budget allocation problem as a linear program. Use gurobi to find the optimal budget allocation. Variables: We have defined our variables as allocation in each of the promotion channel Objective Function: Maximize the profit generated through allocation Constraints: Amount(TV + Print) <= Amont(FB, Email) Amount(Social Media) >= 2 * Amount(SEO,AdWords)
In [168	<pre>• Amount(Each Channel) < \$3 M obj = roi_1 # objective vector A = np.zeros((13,10)) # initialize constraint matrix ############# Defining Constraints channel_level_cons = np.identity(10) overall_budget_cons = np.ones((1,10)) A[11,[0,1]] = 1 A[11,[4,9]] = -1 A[12,4:9] = 1 A[12,2:4] = -2 A[0:10,] = channel_level_cons</pre>
	A[10] = overall_budget_cons ###################################
	<pre>ojModCon = ojModel.addMConstrs(A, ojModX, sense, b) # add the constraints to the model ojModel.setMObjective(None,obj,0,sense=gp.GRB.MAXIMIZE) # add the objective to the modelwe'll talk about the None and the 0 ojModel.Params.OutputFlag = 0 # tell gurobi to shut up!!</pre>
	<pre>#print("\nBudget Allocations are : ") plt.figure(figsize = (10,5)) roi_1_allocation = list(ojModX.x) sn.barplot(y = ojModX.x, x = channels) plt.title("Budget Allocation") plt.show()</pre> Budget Allocation 3.0 2.5
	4) Your boss is happy to see the promising results presented by the marketing department. However, your boss is also very concerned
In [169	because your boss recalls being somewhat disappointed after following such recommendations in the past. To be cautious about the decision, your team has decided to get another opinion about the ROI data and rerun the analysis. The second consulting firm returns the estimates of the ROI data in the table below (also in the CSV file mentioned above). You are asked to compare the two optimal allocations from these two ROI estimates.
	<pre>A = np.zeros((13,10)) # initialize constraint matrix ############ Defining Constraints channel_level_cons = np.identity(10) overall_budget_cons = np.ones((1,10)) A[11,[0,1]] = 1 A[11,[4,9]] = -1 A[12,4:9] = 1 A[12,2:4] = -2 A[0:10,] = channel_level_cons A[10] = overall_budget_cons ####################################</pre>
	<pre>#### Output Part of the constraint#### b = np.array([3,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,3,10,0,0]) sense = np.array(['<','<','<','<','<','<','<','<','<','<'</pre>
	<pre>ojModel.setMObjective(None, obj, 0, sense=gp.GRB.MAXIMIZE) # add the objective to the modelwe'll talk about the None and the 0 ojModel.Params.OutputFlag = 0 # tell gurobi to shut up!! ojModel.optimize() # solve the LP profit_2 = ojModel.objVal roi_2_allocation = list(ojModX.x) budget_dict_roi2 = dict(pd.Series(data = ojModX.x, index = channels)) #print("\nBudget Allocations are : ") #budget_dict_roi2</pre>
In [170	<pre>'Channel': list(channels)*2, 'ROI': ['ROI 1']*len(channels) +['ROI 2']*len(channels), 'Allocation': roi_1_allocation+roi_2_allocation }) plt.figure(figsize = (10,4)) sn.barplot(y = 'Allocation', x = 'Channel', hue = 'ROI', data = df) plt.title("Optimal Budget Allocation For Different ROI Values") plt.show()</pre>
	<pre>df = pd.DataFrame({ 'ROI': ['ROI 1', 'ROI 2'], 'PROFIT': [profit_1,profit_2] }) plt.figure(figsize = (10,4)) sn.barplot(y = 'PROFIT', x = 'ROI', data = df) plt.title("Profit Across Two ROI Estimates") plt.show()</pre> Optimal Budget Allocation For Different ROI Values 3.0 0.25
	2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 Print TV SEO AdWords Facebook LinkedIn Instagram Snapchat Twitter Email Channel Profit Across Two ROI Estimates
īn [171	## Using ROI-1 based attribution on ROI-2 profit_a = sum(roi_1* np.array(list(budget_dict_roi2.values())))
	<pre>print("When using ROI for first case and attribution for second, the change in obj function is {:.4f}".format(profit_a-ojModel.objVal)) ## Using ROI-2 based attribution on ROI-1 profit_b = sum(roi_2* np.array(list(budget_dict_roil.values()))) #print(np.round(profit_b-ojModel.objVal,2)) print("When using ROI for Second case and attribution for First, the change in obj function is {:.4f}".format(np.round(profit_b- ojModel.objVal,2))) When using ROI for first case and attribution for second, the change in obj function s -0.2040</pre>
	when using ROI for Second case and attribution for First, the change in obj function s -0.1900
	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based
	 5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of chunk above • Yes, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal
In [172	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of chunk above • Yes, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting point. By how much could each advertising medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation you found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix def optimization_function(roi_matrix, flag=0): obj = roi_matrix # objective vector A = np.zeros((13,10)) # initialize constraint matrix ############ Defining Constraints channel_level_cons = np.identity(10)
In [172.	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of chunk above • Yes, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting point. By how much could each advertising medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation you found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix def optimization_function(roi_matrix, flag=0): obj = roi_matrix # objective vector A = np.zeros((13,10)) # initialize constraint matrix ###################################
In [172	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of chunk above • Yes, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting point. By how much could each advertising medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation you found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix def optimization function (roi_matrix, flag=0): obj = roi_matrix # objective vector A = np.zeros((13,10)) # initialize constraint matrix def optimization_function (roi_matrix) ###################################
In [172	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation) Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of chunk above • We, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting point. By how much could each advertising medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation your found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix def optimization function(roi_matrix, flage(1)): obj = roi_matrix % objective vector A = np.zeros((13,10)) & initialize constraint matrix ###################################
	5) Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the optimal objective) for one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? • We can infer from the above graphs that the two allocations are not same. • Answered in the output of tunk above • We, the third constraint is usual because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the most profitable channel. Having the budget allocation constrained at \$3M, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio • To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting portfolio who much could each advertising medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation you found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix. def optimization_functionizoi_matrix, riagnot; obj = roi_matrix # objective vector A = nurcorooi((3,10)) * initialize conservaint meerix fifialization_functionizoi_matrix. channel_level_cone = np.identity(10) ownor1 budget_cone = np.identity(10) ownor1 budget_cone = np.identity(10) ownor1 budget_cone = np.identity(10) null_(n,1) = channel_level_cone ### AIII_(4,3) = 1 AIII_(4,3) = 0 AIII_(4,3
In [173	S. S. Are the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? One that uses the first ROI data and the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss' experience, is useful? * We can infer from the above gagle that the two allocations, are not some. * Aspresed in the outboat of chunk above * Yes, the third constraint is useful because if the highest ROI channel is not restricted, the optimizer will put all the money in the many inforbiate chunnel Hawing the budget albucion constraint at STM, we can have a diversity in our marketing portfolio 6) To explore this further perform some analysis of how your optimal allocation would change based on changes in the ROI data. Use the first ROI data as your starting point. By how much could each advertising mediums ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optimal allocation your found in step (3)? Below code will help us find the sensitivity to allocation for input ROI matrix def portification sunction(roi matrix, stage-0); abig = roi_mothrix = fortion(roi matrix, stage-0); abig = roi_moth
In [173.	Since the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct) how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective be relative to the optimal solution of the property of the property of the role of the property of the role of the property of the role
In [173	Signature to use the second allocation (the allocation that assume the second ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assume the second ROI data was correct, how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the second ROI data is correct, if you after the first POI objective (the one that uses the first ROI data and the second ROI data is correct, if you after the first ROI data and the second ROI data is the second
In [174	Solve the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation that absound the discribed bearoon ROI data was correct) by much lower would the objective bearoon ROI data was correct) by much lower would the state of the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is a second ROI data and the second ROI data and the second ROI data and the second ROI data and roing a correct ROI data and roi
In [174 Out [174	SACE the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the second ROI data was correct), how much lower would the objective be the first allocation? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you were to describe the second ROI data was correct, how much lower would the objective be relative to the optimal objective? Do you think the third constraint above, based on your boss separeirace, is useful? **Wears had remain above gegate at the new above as a rot care. **Assenced the board of custa zone. **Assenced the board of custa zone. **Board and the second of custa zone. **Board and
In [174 Out [174	Share the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation (the allocation that assumed the relative to the optional objective (the nor leaf uses the first ROI data and the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation)? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation? Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you used the first allocation and allocation and allocation and allocation are considered. **One of the first data is a surface of the second ROI data is data as a surface of the your optional allocation would have part after the yighes ROI data is the the first medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optional allocation you demand the great is the first medium's ROI increase or decrease and still result in the same optional allocation you don't not go (3). **Bell control and the great is a surface of the second result in the same optional allocation you don't not go (3). **Bell control and the great is a surface of the second result in the same optional allocation you don't not go (3). **Bell control and the great is a surface of the second result in the same optional allocation and the great is a surface of the second result in the same optional allocation which is a surface of the second result in the same optional allocation and the great is a surface of the second result in t
In [174	5 STAR the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROI data is correct, if you were to use the second allocation than allocation that assumed the relative to the quismal objective (the nor that were think for the data with the second ROI data is correct, if you were the relative to the quismal objective (the nor that were think ROI data and the first allocation?) Assuming the second ROI data is correct, if you were the control of the primal objective Poy out think the third contraint above, based on your looks experience, is useful? - Assert the second ROI assess and the second ROI data is correct, if you were the relative problem of the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI data is correct, if you were the second ROI assess and the research to one of shade the second ROI assess and the research one of second ROI assess and the research one of second ROI assess and the research of the second ROI assess and the second ROI assessment of the second ROI assessment and the second ROI assessment and the second ROI assessment
In [174 In [174	Silver the allocations the same? Assuming the first RCII data is cornest, if you was a use the section distriction that districts that southers that you was the section distriction that districts that you was a section of the section of the plant of th
In [174 In [174 In [174	Short the allocations the same? Assuming the first ROL data is connect, if second ROL data is connect, if second ROL data is connect, if second ROL data was carried, below the second ROL data was carried, below to the policy of the second ROL data was carried, below to the policy of the second ROL data was carried, below to the second ROL data was carried to the policy of the second ROL data was carried to the policy of the second ROL data was carried to the second ROL data was carried as a second specific more of the second ROL data was carried to the second ROL data w
In [174 In [174 In [175	3 Ave the allocations the same? Assuming the first RDI data is context, if the data is context, if the data was context from the context with the objective between the context of the data was context. They must be designed to the objective between the context and the objective between the context of the data was context. They must be designed the dispersion of the objective between the context and the object of the obj
In [174 Out [174 Out [174	Silve the allocations the same? Assuming the first RDI data is connect, if the content to the option of the same connect from much lower would the objective be related to the option of the content to the conte
In [174 Out [174 Out [174	Since the eliminations the same? Assuming the Pert RDI data is corrent, if second RDI data was converted from which lower would be dispetitive be second RDI data was converted from which lower would be dispetitive be the first allocations. Assuming the end of the dispetitive between the first allocations and second second RDI data is converted to the property of t
In [174 Out [174 In [177	grant the allocations the anneal Assuming the first ADI data is covered by a second field data was convected by workshown where would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they would be objective by the first allocation from what they was the contract of the same of the first allocation from what they was the contract of the same of
In [172 In [173 In [174 In [177	Spiker the electricities the squared according to the six state for a control of the state of the control of the state of