

Project 5: AB Testing

0. Import Data

Import Data

```
# Load control, treatment, transactions df's
control <- read.csv('data/clean/control.csv')
treatment <- read.csv('data/clean/treatment.csv')
transactions <- read.csv('data/clean/transactions.csv')
```

Check/Wrangle Data

```
# Change transactions$invoice_date to datetime
# Load dependencies
library(lubridate)

##
## Attaching package: 'lubridate'

## The following object is masked from 'package:base':
##
##   date

# Change to datetime
transactions$invoice_date <- ymd(as.character(transactions$invoice_date))
# Check
str(transactions)

## 'data.frame':   4332333 obs. of  6 variables:
##  $ store_id      : int  10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 10018 ...
##  $ invoice_date: Date, format: "2015-01-21" "2015-01-21" ...
##  $ category     : Factor w/ 6 levels "Coffee","Espresso",...: 2 4 2 2 2 2 4 2 2 4 ...
##  $ product      : Factor w/ 12 levels "Cabernet Sauvignon",...: 11 4 8 8 8 10 4 8 11 4 ...
##  $ gross_margin: num   6.74 1.1 4.18 5.98 4.79 ...
##  $ sales        : num   14.97 2.75 8.37 11.96 9.57 ...

# Remove treatment units from control units
control <- subset(control, !(store_id %in% treatment$store_id))
```

1. Choose Target Variable

The goal is to increase gross margin per week, so the performance metric is weekly_gross_margin.

2. Choose Experimental Design

The data received includes descriptive data on both stores and transactions, so a matched pair design was used.

3. Choose Experimental and Control Variables

Experimental Variable

The combination of updated restaurant menu and television advertising is the experimental variable because it was adjusted to determine its effect on the target variable, weekly gross margin.

Control Variables

List potential control variables we have data for

1. sq_ft
2. average monthly sales

Wrangle data to obtain gross margins per store

```
# Determine gross_margin

# Load dependencies
library(dplyr)

##
## Attaching package: 'dplyr'
## The following objects are masked from 'package:lubridate':
##
##   intersect, setdiff, union
## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats':
##
##   filter, lag
## The following objects are masked from 'package:base':
##
##   intersect, setdiff, setequal, union

# gross margin per store
sum_transactions <- transactions %>%
  group_by(store_id) %>%
  summarise(sum_gross_margin=sum(gross_margin))

# Join treatment/control df's to sum_gross_margin
treatment <- left_join(treatment, sum_transactions, by='store_id')
control <- left_join(control, sum_transactions, by='store_id')
```

Check correlations between sum_gross_margin and potential control variables

```
# Check correlations
cor(control[c('sum_gross_margin', 'sq_ft', 'avg_month_sales')])

##               sum_gross_margin      sq_ft avg_month_sales
## sum_gross_margin      1.00000000 -0.02914714      0.99485333
## sq_ft                -0.02914714  1.00000000     -0.04006262
```

```
## avg_month_sales          0.99485333 -0.04006262      1.00000000
```

Of the potential control variables of interest, sq_ft and avg_month_sales, only avg_month_sales is correlated to the target variable, sum_gross_margin. As a result, avg_month_sales was selected as the only control variable.

4. Choose the Treatment and Control Units

Treatment Units

The treatment units are the 10 stores in the treatment dataframe

Control Units

Per project guidance, two control units from the control dataframe should be matched to each treatment unit from the treatment dataframe.

```
# Load dependencies
library(MatchIt)

# Include treatment column in treatment/control df's
treatment$treatment <- 1
control$treatment <- 0

# Divide Central and West Regions
central_units <- subset(rbind(control, treatment), region=='Central')
west_units <- subset(rbind(control, treatment), region=='West')

# Match the samples
# Central
matches_central <- matchit(treatment ~ avg_month_sales,
  data=central_units,
  method='nearest',
  ratio=2)

# West
matches_west <- matchit(treatment ~ avg_month_sales,
  data=west_units,
  method='nearest',
  ratio=2)

# Obtain matrix of matched units
matches_central <- matches_central$match.matrix
matches_west <- matches_west$match.matrix

# Create df of treatment and control store_id's
# Central
tu_central <- central_units[rownames(matches_central),]$store_id
cu1_central <- central_units[matches_central[,1],]$store_id
cu2_central <- central_units[matches_central[,2],]$store_id
match_matrix_central <- data.frame(tu_central, cu1_central, cu2_central)
names(match_matrix_central) <- c('Treatment Store', 'Control Store 1', 'Control Store 2')
# West
```

```

tu_west <- west_units[rownames(matches_west),]$store_id
cu1_west <- west_units[matches_west[,1],]$store_id
cu2_west <- west_units[matches_west[,2],]$store_id
match_matrix_west <- data.frame(tu_west, cu1_west, cu2_west)
names(match_matrix_west) <- c('Treatment Store', 'Control Store 1', 'Control Store 2')

# Combine match_matrix_central and match_matrix_west
match_matrix <- rbind(match_matrix_central, match_matrix_west)
# Display Treatment and Control Units
match_matrix

```

```

##      Treatment Store Control Store 1 Control Store 2
## 1          1664          8262          1964
## 2          1675          1857          7284
## 3          1696          7811          7334
## 4          1700          7484          6992
## 5          1712          8312          8162
## 6          2288          2409          3235
## 7          2293         12286         10518
## 8          2301          9639          9524
## 9          2322          8817          9438
## 10         2341         12019          2852

```

5. Clean and Prepare Data

Helper Functions

```

# Filters transaction data by date and calculates the weekly gross margin per store
# Inputs transaction data, start date, and end date
# Outputs a df with store_id, weekly_gross_margins, and id columns
wgm_by_dates <- function(df, date1, date2) {
  # Calculate weekly gross margins by date
  wgm_by_dates <- subset(df, invoice_date>=date1 & invoice_date<=date2) %>%
    group_by(invoice_week=cut(invoice_date, "week"), store_id) %>%
    summarise(gross_margin=sum(gross_margin)) %>%
    group_by(store_id) %>%
    summarise(weekly_gross_margin=mean(gross_margin))
  # Add rownames as column to make joins easier
  wgm_by_dates$index <- as.numeric(row.names(wgm_by_dates))
  return(wgm_by_dates)
}

```

Comparative Dates

```

# Filter data by test dates (2015-04-29 to 2015-07-21)
# and calculate weekly_gross_margin
wgm_comparative_dates <- wgm_by_dates(transactions, '2015-04-29', '2015-07-21')

# Create dataframe of weekly_gross_margins for treatment/control units

```

```

# TREATMENT
wgm_comparative_treatment <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_comparative_dates, by=c('Treatment Store'='store_id'))

# CONTROL
wgm_comparative_control1 <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_comparative_dates, by=c('Control Store 1'='store_id'))
wgm_comparative_control2 <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_comparative_dates, by=c('Control Store 2'='store_id'))
wgm_comparative_control <- rowMeans(data.frame(wgm_comparative_control1, wgm_comparative_control2))
# Create dataframe of treatment and control weekly_gross_margin
wgm_comparative <- data.frame(wgm_comparative_treatment, wgm_comparative_control)
names(wgm_comparative) <- c('Treatment', 'Control')

```

Test Dates

```

# Filter data by test dates (2016-04-29 to 2016-07-21)
# and calculate weekly_gross_margin
wgm_test_dates <- wgm_by_dates(transactions, '2016-04-29', '2016-07-21')

# Create dataframe of weekly_gross_margins for treatment/control units

# TREATMENT
wgm_test_treatment <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_test_dates, by=c('Treatment Store'='store_id'))$weekly_gross_margin

# CONTROL
wgm_test_control1 <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_test_dates, by=c('Control Store 1'='store_id'))$weekly_gross_margin
wgm_test_control2 <- left_join(match_matrix, wgm_test_dates, by=c('Control Store 2'='store_id'))$weekly_gross_margin
wgm_test_control <- rowMeans(data.frame(wgm_test_control1, wgm_test_control2))
# Create dataframe of treatment and control weekly_gross_margin
wgm_test <- data.frame(wgm_test_treatment, wgm_test_control)
names(wgm_test) <- c('Treatment', 'Control')

```

6. Calculate Lift

```

# Create df of increase in wgm by control, increase in wgm by treatment
lift_control <- wgm_test$Control/wgm_comparative$Control
lift_treatment <- wgm_test$Treatment/wgm_comparative$Treatment
lift <- data.frame(lift_control, lift_treatment)

# Calculate increase in weekly_gross_margin of treatment relative to control
lift_overall <- mean(lift$lift_treatment)/mean(lift$lift_control)
lift_west <- mean(lift$lift_treatment[1:5])/mean(lift$lift_control[1:5])
lift_central <- mean(lift$lift_treatment[6:10])/mean(lift$lift_control[6:10])
lift_overall

```

```
## [1] 1.42306
```

```
lift_west
```

```
## [1] 1.405746
```

```
lift_central
```

```
## [1] 1.44099
```

The calculated overall lift is approximately 46%, while the calculated lift for west region stores is approximately 43% and the calculated lift for central region stores is approximately 49%.

7. Calculate Statistical Significance

```
# Paired T-Test because the test conducted was matched pair
# Overall lift
t.test(lift$lift_treatment, lift$lift_control, paired=TRUE)

##
## Paired t-test
##
## data: lift$lift_treatment and lift$lift_control
## t = 6.4463, df = 9, p-value = 0.0001187
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.2693906 0.5606837
## sample estimates:
## mean of the differences
##                0.4150372

# Central lift
t.test(lift$lift_treatment[1:5], lift$lift_control[1:5], paired=TRUE)

##
## Paired t-test
##
## data: lift$lift_treatment[1:5] and lift$lift_control[1:5]
## t = 3.6189, df = 4, p-value = 0.02238
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.09428807 0.71574559
## sample estimates:
## mean of the differences
##                0.4050168

# West lift
t.test(lift$lift_treatment[6:10], lift$lift_control[6:10], paired=TRUE)

##
## Paired t-test
##
## data: lift$lift_treatment[6:10] and lift$lift_control[6:10]
## t = 5.452, df = 4, p-value = 0.005499
## alternative hypothesis: true difference in means is not equal to 0
## 95 percent confidence interval:
##  0.2085946 0.6415205
## sample estimates:
## mean of the differences
##                0.4250575
```

With a p-value of 0.0001156, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, that there is no difference in weekly gross margins between the control and treatment groups, in favor of the alternative hypothesis, that there is a difference in weekly gross margins between the control and treatment groups. The t-test estimated

lift is approximately 44% for all stores, 42% for west region stores and 46% for central region stores.

8. Summary

Planning the Analysis

Round Roasters, a coffee restaurant in the US, conducted a market test to determine the impacts of introducing a new menu and television marketing campaign. Because Round Roasters was interested in profitability and buying coffee follows a weekly cycle for customers, data was aggregated weekly and weekly gross margin was used as the target metric. Because Round Roasters collected data on their stores and transactions, a matched pair analysis was used. This matched pair analysis was conducted using the test period (April 29, 2016 to July 21, 2016) and the comparative period (April 29, 2015 to July 21, 2015).

Matching Treatment and Control Units

Determining Control Units

Two potential control variables were chosen for their logical validity and data availability: 1. square footage 2. average monthly sales

Per the correlation matrix below, average monthly sales correlates with gross margin, with a correlation coefficient of 0.995, while square footage does not correlate with gross margin, with a correlation coefficient of -0.029. Thus, average monthly sales was the only control variable used in the analysis.

##	sum_gross_margin	sq_ft	avg_month_sales
## sum_gross_margin	1.00000000	-0.02914714	0.99485333
## sq_ft	-0.02914714	1.00000000	-0.04006262
## avg_month_sales	0.99485333	-0.04006262	1.00000000

Matching Treatment and Control Units

The following control units were matched to their respective treatment units, controlling for weekly sales and region of each store.

##	Treatment	Store	Control	Store 1	Control	Store 2
## 1		1664		8262		1964
## 2		1675		1857		7284
## 3		1696		7811		7334
## 4		1700		7484		6992
## 5		1712		8312		8162
## 6		2288		2409		3235
## 7		2293		12286		10518
## 8		2301		9639		9524
## 9		2322		8817		9438
## 10		2341		12019		2852

Analysis

A paired t-test was conducted between the increase in weekly gross sales between the test period (April 29, 2016 to July 21, 2016) and the comparative period (April 29, 2015 to July 21, 2015) for the treatment units and average of the control units. With a p-value of 0.0001156, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null

hypothesis, that there is no difference in weekly gross margin between the control and treatment groups, in favor of the alternative hypothesis, that there is a difference in weekly gross margin between the control and treatment groups. Per the bar graph of lift for each treatment-control unit pair below, the increase in incremental lift between treatment and control units is 44% for all stores. Because the increase in incremental lift for the new menu is statistically significant in both central region stores, at 46%, and west region stores, at 42%, it should be implemented in both central and west region stores.

