

DOTE 6635: Artificial Intelligence for Business Research

Prediction Problems in Business Research

Renyu (Philip) Zhang

1

Why Do We Care About Predictions?

- Everyone cares about the prediction of **macro economic/political/natural outcomes**.
 - Population, elections, GDP, poverty, tax policy, market research, when will humans run out of fossil fuel, etc.
- Sometimes good predictions could directly lead to **good decisions/policies**.
 - Weather forecast, demand forecast, stock/asset return, recommendation system, user/patient LT(V), cancer screening, insurances, bail out, etc.

American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings 2015, 105(5): 491–495
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aerp.20151023>

$$\frac{d\pi(X_0, Y)}{dX_0} = \underbrace{\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial X_0}}_{\text{prediction}} \underbrace{(Y)}_{\text{causation}} + \underbrace{\frac{\partial \pi}{\partial Y}}_{\text{causation}} \underbrace{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial X_0}}_{\text{causation}}.$$


Prediction Policy Problems

By JON KLEINBERG, JENS LUDWIG, SENDHIL MULLAINATHAN, AND ZIAD OBERMEYER

- Causal inference is all about **predicting the counterfactual outcomes**.
 - Causal ML, DML, honest tree, matrix completion, etc.

Empirical policy research often focuses on causal inference. Since policy choices seem to depend on understanding the counterfactual—what happens with and without a policy—this tight link of causality and policy seems natural. While this link holds in many cases, we argue that there are also many policy applications where causal inference is not central, or even necessary. causation and prediction; (ii) explain how machine learning adds value over traditional regression approaches in solving prediction problems; (iii) provide an empirical example from health policy to illustrate how improved predictions can generate large social impact; (iv) illustrate how “umbrella” problems are common and important in many important policy domains; and (v) argue that solving these

2

Recommendation (Business)



http://pubsonline.informs.org/journal/mnsc/

MANAGEMENT SCIENCE
Vol. 65, No. 7, July 2019, pp. 3131–3149
ISSN 0025-1909 (print), ISSN 1526-5501 (online)

MIS Quarterly ■ RESEARCH NOTE

Learning Preferences with Side Information

Vivek F. Farias,^a Andrew A. Li^b

^a Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142; ^b Operations Research Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142

Contact: vivekf@mit.edu, <http://orcid.org/0009-0002-5856-9246> (VFF); aali@mit.edu, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9552-6421> (AAL)

Received: October 8, 2016
Reviewed: June 1, 2017; July 19, 2017
Accepted: August 14, 2017
Published Online in Articles in Advance: May 8, 2019
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3092>
Copyright © 2019 INFORMS

Abstract. Product and content personalization is now ubiquitous in e-commerce. There are typically not enough available transactional data for the task. As such, companies today seek to use a variety of information on the interactions between a product and a customer to drive personalized decisions. We formalize this capability as one of recovering a large-scale matrix with side information in the form of additional dimensions or confounding dimensions. Viewing the matrix we seek to recover and the side information we have as slices of a tensor, we consider the problem of *slice recovery*, which is to recover specific slices of “simple” tensors from noisy observations of the entire tensor. We propose a definition of simplicity that on the one hand elegantly generalizes a standard generative model for our motivating problem and on the other hand subsumes low-rank tensors for a variety of existing definitions of tensor rank. We provide an efficient algorithm for slice recovery that is practical for massive data sets and provides a significant performance improvement over state-of-the-art incumbent approaches to tensor recovery. Furthermore, we establish near-optimal recovery guarantees that, in an important regime, represent an order improvement over the best available results for this problem. Experiments on data from a music streaming service demonstrate the performance and scalability of our algorithm.

History: Accepted by Noah Gans, stochastic models and simulation.
Supplemental Material: The e-companion is available at <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3092>.

Keywords: personalization • e-commerce • online retail • recommender systems • collaborative filtering • matrix recovery • tensor recovery • side information • multi-interaction data

ON THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VIEW-BASED AND PURCHASE-BASED RECOMMENDER SYSTEMS¹

Jing Peng and Chen Liang
Department of Operations and Information Management, School of Business, University of Connecticut Storrs, CT, U.S.A. (jingpeng@uconn.edu) (chenliang@uconn.edu)

E-commerce platforms often use collaborative filtering (CF) algorithms to recommend products to consumers. What recommendations consumers receive and how they respond to the recommendations largely depend on the design of CF algorithms. However, the extant empirical research on recommender systems has primarily focused on how the presence of recommendations affects product demand, without considering the underlying algorithm design. Leveraging a field experiment on a major e-commerce platform, we examine the differential impact of two widely used CF designs: view-also-view (VAV) and purchase-also-purchase (PAP). We found several striking differences between the impact of these two designs on individual products. First, VAV is about seven times more effective in generating additional product views than PAP but only about twice as effective in generating sales due to a lower conversion rate. Second, VAV is more effective in increasing views for more expensive products, whereas PAP is more effective in increasing sales for less expensive products. PAP is less effective in increasing the views but more effective in increasing the sales of products with higher purchase incidence rates (PIRs). Finally, when aggregated over all products with the same levels of price or PIRs, VAV dominates PAP in generating views and the difference is more striking for products with higher prices or lower PIRs. Interestingly, PAP is more effective than VAV in increasing the sales of products with low prices or moderate PIRs, though VAV generates more sales than PAP overall. Our findings suggest that platforms may benefit from employing different CF designs for different types of products.

Keywords: Collaborative filtering, substitute, complement, price, purchase incidence rate, cross-sell, up-sell

5

5

Recommendation (CS)

Deconfounding Duration Bias in Watch-time Prediction for Video Recommendation

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Authors: Ruohan Zhan, Changhua Pei, Qiang Su, Jianfeng Wen, Xueliang Wang, Guanyu Mu, Dong Zheng, Peng Jiang, Kun Gai Authors Info & Claims

KDD '22: Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining • August 2022 • Pages 4472–4481 • <https://doi.org/10.1145/3534678.3539092>

Published: 14 August 2022 Publication History Check for updates

17 1,454

Deep Neural Networks for YouTube Recommendations

Paul Covington, Jay Adams, Emre Sargin
Google Mountain View, CA {pcovington,jka,msargin}@google.com

ABSTRACT
YouTube represents one of the largest scale and most sophisticated video recommendation systems in existence. In this paper, we describe the system at a high level and focus on the dramatic performance improvements brought by deep learning. The paper is split according to the classic two-stage information retrieval dichotomy: first, we detail a deep candidate generation model and then describe a separate deep ranking model. We also provide practical lessons and insights derived from designing, iterating and maintaining a massive recommendation system with enormous user-facing impact.

Keywords recommender system; deep learning; scalability

1. INTRODUCTION
YouTube is the world's largest platform for creating, sharing and discovering video content. YouTube recommendations are responsible for helping more than a billion users discover personalized content from an ever-growing corpus of videos. In this paper we will focus on the immense impact deep learning has recently had on the YouTube video recommendations system. Figure 1 illustrates the recom-

Table 3: Live experiments on Kuaisou App. We use VR as a baseline and show the relative performance of WLR and Res-D2Q with #Groups = 30. The square brackets represent the 95% confidence intervals for online metrics. Statistically-significant improvement (whose value is not in the confidence interval) is marked with bold font in the table.

| Method | Main Metric. | Constraint Metrics. | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| | Watch Time | Like | Follow | Share | |
| WLR v.s. VR (baseline) | +0.184% | +1.012% | +0.214% | +0.95% | -0.137% |
| WLR [-0.16%, 0.16%] | [-0.50%, 0.51%] | [-0.4%, 0.4%] | [-1.31%, 1.40%] | [-0.75%, 0.73%] | |
| Res-D2Q v.s. VR (baseline) | +0.746% | +0.251% | -0.167% | -0.861% | +0.271% |
| Res-D2Q [-0.15%, 0.15%] | [-0.41%, 0.41%] | [-0.6%, 0.6%] | [-1.21%, 1.21%] | [-0.85%, 0.86%] | |

Figure 1: Recommendations displayed on YouTube mobile app home.

6

6

Other Predictions

The Review of Financial Studies

Empirical Asset Pricing via Machine Learning*

Shihao Gu
Booth School of Business, University of Chicago

Bryan Kelly
Yale University, AQR Capital Management, and NBER

Dacheng Xiu
Booth School of Business, University of Chicago

We perform a comparative analysis of machine learning methods for the canonical problem of empirical asset pricing: measuring asset risk premiums. We demonstrate large economic gains to investors using machine learning forecasts, in some cases doubling the performance of leading regression-based strategies from the literature. We identify the best-performing methods (trees and neural networks) and trace their predictive gains to allowing nonlinear predictor interactions missed by other methods. All methods agree on the same set of dominant predictive signals, a set that includes variations on momentum, liquidity, and volatility. (JEL C52, C55, C58, G0, G1, G17)

Received 9 February 2023
Accepted 12 October 2023
Published online: 20 November 2023
[Check for updates](#)

Kai Cao^{1*}, Yingda Xia^{1,2}, Jiawen Yao^{3,4,5}, Xu Han^{3,6}, Lukas Lambert^{1,6}, Tingting Zhang^{1,6}, Wei Tang^{1,6}, Gang Jin⁷, Hui Jiang^{8,9}, Xu Fang¹, Isabella Negroni¹, Xuezhen Li¹, Wei Wang¹, Yuqian Fan¹⁰, Fangzi¹, Mingming Chen¹¹, Yiqun Zhou¹², Tuan Kornacki¹³, Michael Voeckler¹⁴, Yimai Lu¹, Yingli Chen¹, Xin Chen¹, Zaiyi Liu¹, Jian Zhou¹, Chuanmiao Xie¹, Rong Zhang¹, Hong Li¹, Gregory D. Hager¹⁵, Alain L. Yulle¹⁶, Le Lu¹⁷, Chengwei Shao¹⁸, Yu Shuo¹⁹, Qi Zhang¹⁹, Tingbo Liang¹⁹, Ling Zhang¹⁹, & Jianping Luo¹⁹

Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC), the most deadly solid malignancy, is typically detected late and at an inoperable stage. Early or incidental detection is associated with prolonged survival, but screening asymptomatic individuals for PDAC using a single test remains unfeasible due to the low prevalence of the disease and its aggressiveness. Non-contrast computed tomography (CT), routinely performed for clinical indications, offers the potential for large-scale screening; however, identification of PDAC using non-contrast CT has long been considered impossible. Here, we develop a deep learning approach, pancreatic cancer detection with artificial intelligence (PANDA), that can detect and classify pancreatic lesions using non-contrast CT. PANDA was trained and evaluated on a dataset of 3,208 patients from a single center. PANDA achieves an area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) of 0.956–0.956 for lesion detection in a multicenter validation involving 6,239 patients across 10 centers, outperforms the mean radiologist performance by 34.1% in sensitivity and 34.8% in specificity, and has a sensitivity of 92.2% and specificity of 96.9% for lesion detection in a real-world multi-scenario validation consisting of 20,330 consecutive patients. Notably, PANDA utilized with non-contrast CT shows non-inferiority to radiology reports (using contrast-enhanced CT) in the differentiation of common pancreatic lesion subtypes. PANDA could potentially serve as a new tool for large-scale pancreatic cancer screening.

7

JOURNAL ARTICLE

Human Decisions and Machine Predictions*

Jon Kleinberg, Himabindu Lakkaraju, Jure Leskovec, Jens Ludwig, Sendhil Mullainathan

The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Volume 133, Issue 1, February 2018, Pages 237–293, <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx032>

Published: 26 August 2017

PDF Split View Cite Permissions Share ▾

Abstract

Can machine learning improve human decision making? Bail decisions provide a good test case. Millions of times each year, judges make jail-or-release decisions that hinge on a prediction of what a defendant would do if released. The concreteness of the prediction task combined with the volume of data available makes this a promising machine-learning application. Yet comparing the algorithm to judges proves complicated. First, the available data are generated by prior judge decisions. We only observe crime outcomes for released defendants, not for those judges detained. This makes it hard to evaluate counterfactual decision rules based on algorithmic predictions. Second, judges may have a broader set of preferences than the variable the algorithm predicts; for instance, judges may care specifically about violent crimes or about racial inequities. We deal with these problems using different econometric strategies, such as quasi-random assignment of cases to judges. Even accounting for these concerns, our results suggest potentially large welfare gains: one policy simulation shows crime reductions up to 24.7% with no change in jailing rates, or jailing rate reductions up to 41.9% with no increase in crime rates. Moreover, all categories of crime, including violent crimes, show reductions; these gains can be achieved while simultaneously reducing racial disparities. These results suggest that while machine learning can be valuable, realizing this value requires integrating these tools into an economic framework: being clear about the link between predictions and decisions; specifying the scope of payoff functions; and constructing unbiased decision counterfactuals.

JEL: C10 - General, C55 - Large Data Sets: Modeling and Analysis, K40 - General
Issue Section: Article

Predict then Decide

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Train Using 5-fold Cross Validation | 44.375 | 44.375 | 44.375 | 44.375 | 44.376 |
|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

FIGURE I
Partition of New York City Data (2008–13) into Data Sets Used for Prediction and Evaluation

8

When Do Predictions Make No Sense?

- You are not predicting sufficiently important macro economic/political/natural outcomes.

- Your prediction is neither accurate nor causal for decision-making.

$$\frac{d\pi(X_0, Y)}{dX_0} = \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial X_0} \underbrace{(Y)}_{\text{prediction}} + \frac{\partial \pi}{\partial Y} \underbrace{\frac{\partial Y}{\partial X_0}}_{\text{causation}}.$$

Your prediction of Y is not accurate. 

Your causal identification is not clean. 

- Your predictions of the counterfactual outcomes are ungrounded because of the violation of unconfoundedness (a.k.a. CIA) and/or common support (a.k.a. overlapping condition) assumptions.

9

9

Prediction vs. Estimation

Perspective

Integrating explanation and prediction in computational social science

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03659-0>

Received: 23 February 2021

Accepted: 20 May 2021

Published online: 30 June 2021

 Check for updates

Jake M. Hofman^{1,17}, Duncan J. Watts^{2,3,4,17}, Susan Athey⁵, Filiz Garip⁶, Thomas L. Griffiths¹⁸, Jon Kleinberg¹⁹, Helen Margetts^{10,20}, Sendhil Mullainathan²¹, Matthew J. Salganik⁶, Simine Vazire¹⁴, Alessandro Vesplignani¹⁵ & Tal Yarkoni¹⁶

Computational social science is more than just large repositories of digital data and the computational methods needed to construct and analyse them. It also represents a convergence of different fields with different ways of thinking about and doing science. The goal of this Perspective is to provide some clarity around how these approaches differ from one another and to propose how they might be productively integrated. Towards this end we make two contributions. The first is a schema for thinking about research activities along two dimensions—the extent to which work is explanatory, focusing on identifying and estimating causal effects, and the degree of consideration given to testing predictions of outcomes—and how these two priorities can complement, rather than compete with, one another. Our second contribution is to advocate that computational social scientists devote more attention to combining prediction and explanation, which we call integrative modelling, and to outline some practical suggestions for realizing this goal.

10

10

A Broader Perspective

| | w.o. Intervention | w. Intervention |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Specific Features or Effects | Descriptive analysis or constructing new measurements | Causal inference or applied micro |
| Outcome Prediction | Predictive modeling or forecasting | Structural estimation, counterfactual simulation and world model |

Note: Adapted from Table 1 in "Integrating explanation and prediction in computational social science."
 Reference: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-021-03659-0>

11

11