

# MM6761: Take-home Assignment 3

Dai Yao (dai@{yaod.ai, mle.bi})

April 6, 2024

## 1 Puranam, Narayan and Kadiyali (MKSC 2017), and Liu and Toubia (MKSC 2018)

*For Puranam et al. (2017), how is the model estimated? Can we estimate the model without estimating Equation (2) first, and then use the outcome to estimate Equation (2)?*

**Answer:**

The parameters in the model can be split into three major categories: (1) those related to the classical topic models, including the hyperparameters  $\alpha_d$  and  $\beta_d$ , the document level topic proportions  $\theta_d$ , the vector of word level assignments of topics  $z_d$ , and the topic level parameter  $\phi_k$ ; (2)  $\lambda_k$  which capture the effects of observed characteristics of the document on  $\alpha_d$  (Equation 1 on page 729), and (3)  $\nu_{kd}$  which are the coefficients from the DiD specification (Equation 2 on page 729).

Since  $\lambda_k$  affect  $z$  (Equation 5 on page 730, Equation 7 on page 731), the parameters in (1) and (2) are hence estimated together, using a combination of Gibbs sampler (to estimate everything except  $\lambda_k$ ) and Stochastic Expectation Maximization (to estimate  $\lambda_k$ ). After obtaining an estimate of  $\theta_{kd}$ ,  $\nu_{kd}$  is estimated by a simple linear regression. Hence, we **can** estimate the model without  $\nu_{kd}$  first, and then we **can** use the outcomes in each iteration of the MCMC to estimate  $\nu_{kd}$ .

*For Liu and Toubia (2018), how is the model estimated? Can we estimate the model without estimating Equation (3) first, and then use the outcome to estimate Equation (3)?*

**Answer:**

The parameters in the model can be split into two major categories: (1) those related to the classical topic model for the queries and the web pages, including  $\phi_k$ ,  $\theta_p$  and  $z_p$ , and  $\theta_q$  and  $z_q$ , and (2)  $R$  which capture the semantic relationships between  $\theta_p$  and  $\theta_q$ .

They use a Gibbs sampler to estimate  $\phi_k$ ,  $\theta_p$ ,  $z_p$ , and  $z_q$  first since the posterior distributions of them are conjugate. They then use a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm to estimate  $\theta_q$  because the posterior distribution (Equation A.5 on page 947) is no longer conjugate. They finally use maximum likelihood estimator to estimate  $R$  since it only depends on  $\theta_p$  and  $\theta_q$ .

We **cannot** estimate the model without  $R$  first, because  $R$  affects both  $\theta_p$  (Equation A.4 on page 947) and  $\theta_q$  (Equation A.5 on page 947) in their estimation process. To draw some analogy,  $R$  are similar to  $\lambda$  in Puranam et al (2017) in terms of the linkage with the main model.

*For Liu and Toubia (2018), what's your opinion about Equation (3)? Why do you think it is innovative? Do you see any potential problems? If so, what are the problems?*

**Answer:**

Please see the detailed discussions of main problem of the model in the commentary paper for this paper, which is included in the reading list (Zhang, Yao, Zhang, 2021).

## 2 Chakraborty, Kim, and Sudhir (2022)

*Comparing Chakraborty et al. (2022) to the previous two papers, what are the main differences in terms of model development (2 to 3 main points)? By model development, you may focus on how machine learning based algorithms are used in the model development process, and how these algorithms are integrated with traditional marketing models into a unified framework.*

**Answer:**

- Both Puranam et al (2017) and Liu and Toubia (2018) **extend** the classical topic model (i.e., LDA) and incorporate new features. Chakraborty et al (2022) do not develop new machine learning algorithms. Instead, they **use** a deep learning hybrid convolutional-LSTM neural network to convert review texts to numeric attribute sentiment scores. The main body of the paper is a structural model about reviewers' rating behaviors which also account for missing attributes in reviewers' ratings.
- In Chakraborty et al (2022), the deep learning model and the structural model are clearly separated from each other, while in the previous two studies, they only have one model and the various components in each model are closely related to each other.
- In Chakraborty et al (2022), the Bayes rule is used to impute missing attribute score at the segment level. No missing data is accommodated in the previous two studies.

*What are the variables in  $X_{jk}^q$  and  $X_{ijk}^w$ , respectively? How  $A_{ijk}$  is computed if it is missing?*

**Answer:**

The coefficients for  $X_{jk}^q$  are  $\alpha_k$  (Equation 2 on page 609), hence, the covariates include those reported in Table 7 (page 615). The coefficients for  $X_{ijk}^w$  are  $\delta_k^g$ , hence, the covariates include those reported in Table 8 (page 617).

When  $A_{ijk}$  is missing, they use the Bayes rule to calculate the probability for  $A_{ijk}$  to realize each rating score  $s$  (Equation 5 on page 610). The idea is:

- Given  $X_{jk}^q$  and  $C_k^g$ , we can infer the probability for  $A_{ijk}$  to realize a specific score  $s$  (Equation 3 on page 609);
- Given  $X_{ijk}^w$  (in which  $A_{ijk}$  is a covariate (see Sentiment 1, 2, 4, 5 covariates in Table 8 on page 617), we can infer the probability for  $A_{ijk}$  to be missing.
- Given the two probabilities, we can apply the Bayes rule to impute the missing value (Equation 5 on page 610).