

ForTune: Running Offline Scenarios to Estimate Impact on Business Metrics

Georges Dupret, Konstantin Sozinov, Carmen Barcena Gonzalez, Ziggy Zacks, Amber Yuan Benjamin Carterette, Manuel Mai, Shubham Bansal, Gwo Liang (Leo) Lien, Andrey Gatash Roberto Sanchis Ojeda, Mounia Lalmas

ABSTRACT

Making ideal decisions as a product leader in a web-facing company is extremely difficult. In addition to navigating the ambiguity of customer satisfaction and achieving business goals, one must also pave a path forward for ones' products and services to remain relevant, desirable, and profitable. Data and experimentation to test product hypotheses are key to informing product decisions. Online controlled experiments by A/B testing may provide the best data to support such decisions with high confidence, but can be time-consuming and expensive, especially when one wants to understand impact to key business metrics such as retention or long-term value. Offline experimentation allows one to rapidly iterate and test, but often cannot provide the same level of confidence, and cannot easily shine a light on impact on business metrics.

We introduce a novel, lightweight, and flexible approach to investigating hypotheses, called *scenario analysis*, that aims to support product leaders' decisions using data about users and estimates of business metrics. Its strengths are that it can provide guidance on trade-offs that are incurred by growing or shifting consumption, estimate trends in long-term outcomes like retention and other important business metrics, and can generate hypotheses about relationships between metrics at scale.

We implemented scenario analysis in a tool we call ForTune. We conduct experiments with this tool on a publicly available dataset. We also report the results of experiments carried out by Spotify, the world's largest audio streaming service, using ForTune in production. In both cases the tool predicted reasonably well the results of the controlled experiment provided that features were chosen carefully. We illustrate how the method was used to make strategic decisions regarding the impact of boosting one type of content over another at Spotify.

ACM Reference Format:

Georges Dupret, Konstantin Sozinov, Carmen Barcena Gonzalez, Ziggy Zacks, Amber Yuan, Benjamin Carterette, Manuel Mai, Shubham Bansal, Gwo Liang (Leo) Lien, Andrey Gatash, and Roberto Sanchis Ojeda, Mounia Lalmas. 2024. ForTune: Running Offline Scenarios to Estimate Impact on Business Metrics. In *Proceedings of (KDD'24)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 9 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

KDD'24, August 25–29, 2024, Barcelona, Spain

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM. . . \$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Product leaders in web-facing companies continually face difficult decisions. Their decisions impact customer satisfaction in unpredictable ways, and in addition to navigating the ambiguity of customer satisfaction and achieving business goals, one must also pave a path forward for products and services to remain relevant, desirable, and profitable. However, it is not immediately obvious how a decision today might contribute to tomorrow's success.

To make the best informed decisions, companies run many online experiments – with some running over 200 concurrent experiments [14]. However, there are some significant limitations to running these experiments. From an infrastructural perspective, exposing users to several experiments simultaneously complicates evaluation, as noise and interaction effects can enter the system. Additionally, controlled experiments can only test a limited number of hypotheses, forcing teams to choose wisely on configurations. Furthermore, not all hypotheses can be tested online, either because it is just not possible, or because of technical constraints. For example, the traffic is already allocated to other, incompatible experiments. From an outcomes and analysis perspective, online experiments might not necessarily provide a holistic picture of how the new product or service affects the users. Long-term outcomes such as user satisfaction and retention or financial metrics such as revenue and gross profits are categories of metrics that are difficult to measure in real-time, even more so when one is working within the confines of a short experiment. For all these reasons, it would be valuable to have an offline method that not only tests hypotheses, but also overcomes some of the limitations of online experimentation. Specifically, an offline method that allows testing many configurations, and is also able to project the impact of long-term key metrics.

There are not many methods available to carry out such predictions that are both flexible and lightweight. One possibility is to develop a predictive model, but this requires a deep knowledge of the system to be tested and is typically complex and expensive, both in terms of computation and human effort. In contrast, the method we present here is simple, flexible, and easy to implement.

To introduce the approach, imagine we expect a 1% increase in podcast consumption in an online audio app, such as Spotify, following an algorithmic or interface modification. Should we release this new version? Does an increase in podcast consumption lead to increased profit? What would be the impact on user retention? Would we observe a substitution effect and experience a decrease in music consumption? The only way to obtain a definitive answer is to run a controlled experiment; but this is time consuming, especially when evaluating on a long term metric, and it is expensive, both in terms of traffic and engineering time. In this work, we propose a simple method to predict the impact of such a controlled experiment prior

to deploying the changes and without the need to develop and train a predictive model.

The core idea is to collect past consumption data and re-weight the observations to match the changes we expect. In our example, after deploying the app change we would expect more users with a comparatively larger podcast consumption, so if such users exhibit a higher retention rate, so would the test branch of the experiment.

We verified this idea successfully on a publicly available dataset (a large controlled experiment from an advertising company, Criteo, that provides online display advertisements). We also verify the predictions with several controlled experiments using proprietary data from Spotify. ForTune is both expressive and flexible, which has led to adoption across many different levels at Spotify to inform strategic decision making.

Section 2 presents the method. In Section 2.1 we use an example to motivate it. We then extend the method to more general scenarios in Section 2.2 and summarize it in Section 2.3. We then discuss caveat and limitations in Section 2.4 and we review related works in Section 3. Finally, we present experiments in 4: those we carried on the Criteo dataset in Section 4.1, and on Spotify proprietary data in Section 4.2.

2 THE FORTUNE ALGORITHM

We describe our proposed approach, which we call *ForTune*. We start by describing a toy example to build intuition. Later we generalize the solution to more complex problems.

2.1 The Intuition behind the Algorithm

Suppose you own a shoe store and design a campaign to double the number of male customers. How will this impact average sale price? A simple estimate is easy to come by: just re-weight the past male customers twice as much as the female customers (or resample accordingly) and compute the weighted average of sale prices. An example is provided in Table 1.

gender	age	shoe size	marital status	price	weight
F	97	34	married	180	1
F	85	53	single	150	1
M	80	47	single	390	2
M	45	49	married	180	2
M	54	50	single	300	2
M	79	54	single	340	2
F	69	39	married	250	1

Table 1: Hypothetical shoe store. Before the campaign, the average shoe sale is the average of the price column, i.e. \$256. After the campaign we expect twice as many male customers as before. We do not actually know the exact characteristics of these new customers, so a safe bet is to assume that they will be similar to the current male customers. Therefore, we replicate all male rows in the table. The estimated average sale price after the campaign is estimated as the average of the price column weighted by the weight column, i.e. \$273.

This estimated average sale price will be accurate as long as the original male customers are representative of the new customers.

As a warning, imagine the campaign targets male under 50 years old. Only one current customer is representative of that cohort and our prediction of the campaign impact will rely exclusively on him. It is clear that such a prediction will not be very reliable. More generally, we need to ensure that our estimator is based on enough samples to control the variance.

On the other hand, if we know more than just the gender of the new customers, we should refine our predictions. For example, if we targeted single male customers, a quick look at Table 1 reveals that they spend more, and hence the average price should be higher after the campaign if we target explicitly that cohort. A similar conclusion would be reached if we targeted older male customers, say customers with 65 years of age on average.

In the next section we formalize these ideas and propose a way to derive a set of weights that incorporate the assumption about the impact of the campaign, and at the same time makes as few assumptions as possible about the customers characteristics.

2.2 Building More Complex Scenarios

In the previous section, we discussed the simple case where there is only one constraint on the population: gender mix. Often the constraints apply to a continuous variable (like age) instead of a binary one. We can also encounter situations where multiple variables need to be constrained to model the scenario.

Let X be a $N \times D$ feature matrix, and y an N dimensional vector representing the metric of interest. In Table 1, the features are gender, age, shoe size and marital status. The vector y is the vector of prices, i.e. the business metric we want to predict. The dimensions are $N = 7$ and $D = 4$.

The objective is to identify a N dimensional vector ω of weights that incorporate the change we expect. In the shoe store example that would mean that the proportion of male customers is doubled, i.e. denoting by X_n the n^{th} observation in X and $I_M(X_n)$ the indicator function for males:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n I_M(X_n) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N I_M(X_n) \quad (1)$$

This constraint means that the weights ω must be such that the new proportion of males in X must be twice the original proportion, i.e twice $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N I_M(X_n)$. We can see that the solution to this constraint is not unique and many different vectors ω satisfy it.

If the campaign is also targeting older males, then an additional constraint must be enforced. The following constraint enforces that the average male age after the campaign is 65 years old:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n I_M(X_n) X_{n,\text{age}} = 65 \quad (2)$$

Similarly, we could choose a looser version of this constraint and only require the average male age to be larger than 65 years old:

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n I_M(X_n) X_{n,\text{age}} \geq 65 \quad (3)$$

There are still many vectors of weights that satisfy constraints in Eq. 1 and Eq. 2 or 3. Solutions that give large weights to a small number of observations are undesirable because they would rely excessively on a subset of the data and would typically be associated

with a high variance. Instead, it seems reasonable to look for a solution that gives as much importance to each observation as possible, while remaining compatible with the constraints. This suggests satisfying the constraints while maximizing the entropy of the weights. The optimization problem becomes:

$$\arg \max_{\omega} \mathcal{H}(\omega) \quad (4a)$$

subject to

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n I_M(X_n) = \frac{2}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N I_M(X_n), \quad (4b)$$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \omega_n I_M(X_n) X_{n,\text{age}} = 65, \quad (4c)$$

$$\omega_n \geq 0 \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\}, \quad (4d)$$

$$\sum_n \omega_n = 1 \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\} \quad (4e)$$

We added two natural constraints: the weights are positive (Eq. 4d) and they sum to one (Eq. 4e).

Note that if no constraints are imposed beyond the natural one, the solution to this problem is to give equal weights to each observation, i.e. $\omega = \frac{1}{N}$. This is in agreement with the fact that prior to the campaign, the target metrics is estimated as the sample average.

2.3 The Algorithm

We formalize the algorithm we built an intuition for in the previous sections. The ForTune Algorithm consists in the following convex optimization problem:¹

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \max_{\omega} \quad & \mathcal{H}(\omega) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & g_i(x) \leq 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \\ & h_i(x) = 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, p, \\ & \omega_n \geq 0 \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\}, \\ & \sum_n \omega_n = 1 \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the h_i are $p \geq 0$ affine functions and $g_i \leq 0$ are $m \geq 0$ convex inequalities. The last two constraints are the natural constraints. The functions g_i and h_i define the scenario associated with the problem. The problem of finding the right set of weights can be solved using an appropriate convex solver. The solution is unique.


Once the weights ω are known, the metric of interest t is estimated as

$$\hat{t} = \sum_n \omega_n t_n \quad (6)$$

This algorithm provides a point estimate of the prediction under the scenario hypotheses. A distribution of point estimates and hence a measure of uncertainty can be obtained by dividing the dataset in B distinct random subsets and estimating the point estimate independently for each of the subsets. Another possibility is bootstrapping [6], where the dataset is repeatedly sampled with

¹We require the problem to be convex for convenience. We could generalize it to any type of constraints but we have not encountered in practice a case where this is useful.

Figure 1: Box plots of the Resampling Weights for the Criteo dataset. The weights have been multiplied by the number of observations so a weight of 1 means that the observations has the same importance in the control and treatment branches. A weight of 5 means that the corresponding observations is five times more influent in the test branch than prior to resampling. We set the constraints on features f_1, f_4, f_7 and f_{10} to be multiples of the corresponding averages. The multiples are reported on the y axis. The further from the original means (where the multiple is 1.0), the larger the weights' spread.



replacement to create B overlapping subsets. The experiments in Section 4 will motivate the need to estimate uncertainty.

2.4 Limitations

Not all constraints are possible nor lead to realistic outcomes. It is useful to remember that the predictions are obtained after giving comparatively more importance to users who help satisfy the constraints. If no user can help, then the constraint is unrealizable. Returning to the example above, if the constraint had been that the average male age be 100 years old instead of 65 (see Eq. (2)), no combination of weights would solve the associated convex problem. Less obvious set of constraints might be unrealizable, but in practice they are easy to detect because the quadratic solver will fail to return a solution.

A more subtle case occurs when the conditions are realizable, but the solution applies large weights to a limited number of observations, leading to a high variability. In the former example this would happen if few users were aged 65 or older. In that case, the solver will give large weights to these few observations, effectively leading to an estimate that is based on only a few data points. This problem can be diagnosed by examining the weights distribution. If

the distribution is reasonably close to uniform, then the constraints can be met easily enough. Otherwise, the prediction is probably unreliable. In Fig. 1 we show the effect of applying constraints that are farther and farther away from the feature original averages. More details are provided in the Experiment Section 4 where we discuss the Criteo dataset, but it should be clear that the further away from the constraints from the control data averages, the more outlier weights there are.

It is also important to keep in mind that the method is useful to predict averages, but not absolute values. For example, in the shoe shop example of Section 2.1, we predicted the average sell price, not the sales revenue. The reason is that the campaign likely increased the number of customers by an amount that we ignore. Not accounting for the changes in the user base might lead to apparent paradoxes. If the campaign targeted women instead of men who in this particular example buy cheaper shoes, the average price would have decreased even though the total sales would still be larger due to the new customers brought by the campaign.

Like in observational studies [9], an unbiased estimate of the effect requires the identification of the confounding covariates. This typically relies on domain knowledge although automated methods have been developed that can help identify the causal graph [25]. At Spotify we built knowledge by comparing ForTune predictions and the results of past controlled experiments. If the predictions are off, we investigated the reasons and identified missing variables. An example is given in Section 4.2.

3 RELATED WORKS

This work began through an investigation into Sensitivity Analysis, which is usually defined as the study of the relation between model output uncertainty and each input variable. In practice it is not limited to this. Iooss & Lemaître [12] enumerates a list of applications, among which one aligns with ForTune: “map the output behavior in function of the inputs by focusing on a specific domain of inputs if necessary.”

Sensitivity Analysis can be divided into local and global methods [24]. In Local Sensitivity Analysis, the attention is on the impact of small input perturbations around a nominal value of the features (typically the mean) on the model output. When the model is sufficiently simple, Taylor series expansions can be used to approximate the model and an analytical differential sensitivity index can be derived [30]. Global sensitivity examines the global response (averages over variations of all the features) of the model output by exploring a finite region of the input domain. While the first global sensitivity analyses technique relied on the assumption of feature independence, newer approaches relax this constraint [15, 30].

ForTune can be understood as a Sensitivity Analysis method because it examines the dependency of the output to variations of the input. There are nevertheless some fundamental differences in methodological terms and in terms of applicability. First Sensitivity Analysis requires a model of the relation between inputs and outputs. Models can be constructed to incorporate external knowledge (think of Bayesian models that make explicit the relations between features) which is an advantage when such knowledge exists. On the other hand, ForTune only relies on resampling / re-weighting the data and accounts for features correlation implicitly. We have

already observed that it also depends on accurately selecting the features, but this is true of designing analytical models too.

While ForTune and Sensitivity Analysis share a similar goal, other works share a similar method; weighting observations to query the data is a very common approach in statistics. Some of the oldest application include stratified sampling [3] and the Horvitz–Thompson estimator [11]. An example is polling for elections [29], which involves collecting data from a small sample of citizens to predict the behavior of the larger population. To achieve accuracy, cohorts or the groups within the sample are weighted, adjusting the poll data to ensure that it represents the broader population. Factors for cohorts weighting include demographics like race, age, gender, education, and geographical location. These factors play a significant role in voting behavior, and the demographics of the sample group ideally should match the demographics of the voting population. The success of Stratified Sampling as well as ForTune depends heavily on selecting the right set of features to match the original data to the target population.

Inverse Probability Weighting (IWS) and ForTune share the same objective of estimating quantities related to a target population other than the one from which the data was collected. The main difference lies in the knowledge about the target population: IWS supposes that a sample of the target dataset is provided, while ForTune relies on a limited set of global constraints to characterize it. Propensity Score Matching (PSM) [20] is another matching technique for estimating the effect of an intervention by accounting for the covariates that predict receiving the treatment. We use this method in Section 4.1.3 where we compare its predictions with ForTune predictions. The process of matching is improved upon using Entropy maximization in [7, 16].

Both IWS and PSM are approaches to *counterfactual analysis*. Counterfactual analysis has become an important area of research for investigating hypotheses, used particularly for offline evaluation and learning of multi-armed bandits and Reinforcement Learning (RL) exploration policies [23]. A large set of methods for counterfactual analysis is *Off-Policy Evaluation*, which is used to estimate outcomes from deploying a target policy to a population from which data has previously been collected. Off-Policy Evaluation (OPE) involves using existing data collected based on a logging policy (typically randomization), then re-weighting that data with propensities given by the target policy to estimate what would happen to quantities of interest if the target policy were to be deployed. A great deal of research has gone into off-policy estimates for different problems (for example, slate recommendation [26], sequential search [19]), reducing the variance of OPE [5], leveraging historic data [1], minimally-invasive randomized interventions [13], long-term off-policy estimation [22], interdependent reward models [18], and more.

Approaches to long-term causal inference (LCI) are also relevant to our aims. The usual approach to LCI is the use of short-term metrics as surrogates for long-term effects [2]. Much of the research on LCI is concerned with identifying good surrogates [17, 28, 31] or handling confounding factors [27].

Of these methods, only Sensitivity Analysis requires an analytic model of the data. Both IWS and PSM require access to a sample of the target dataset. OPE is designed to evaluate new policies. ForTune on the other hand requires no analytical model and only

some global statistics about the target dataset. It is simple, requires only historical data, does not require interventions, does not require assumptions about surrogacy, does not require models of effects, and can be applied to virtually any data, attributes, and metrics.

4 EXPERIMENTS

We use the results of various controlled experiments to test ForTune. The aim is to estimate the value of the metrics of interest on the treatment branch using the data from the control branch. The treatment can be thought of as analogous to a campaign as described in Section 2; it is an intervention designed to shift customer/user behavior. In Section 4.1, in the interest of reproducibility, we use a publicly available dataset from Criteo. Important information about the Criteo dataset was obfuscated to protect the confidentiality of users, which prevents us from analyzing the results in all the details we wish. We therefore also use proprietary data from Spotify in Section 4.2.

We also introduce a baseline, with which we compare ForTune. Suppose the treatment branch dataset was known to us, but for the same metrics we intend to predict using ForTune. In this hypothetical case, we should achieve better or equal accuracy than when using ForTune because we dispose of more information about the treatment. In Section 4.1.3 we use Propensity Score Matching to conduct such predictions and we compare the results with the ForTune predictions.

4.1 Predicting the Probability of Visits on the Criteo Dataset

The CRITEO-UPLIFT1 dataset [4] was created using data from several incrementality tests, which are randomized trials where some of the population is prevented from being targeted by advertising. The dataset includes 25 million rows, each representing a user with twelve features, a treatment indicator, and two binary labels (visits and conversions). Positive labels indicate whether the user visited or converted on the advertiser’s website within a two-week test period. The overall treatment ratio is 84.6%, reflecting the practice of advertisers of maintaining a small control population to minimize potential revenue loss. For privacy, the data has been selectively subsampled and anonymized to maintain the competitiveness of the benchmark without revealing the original incrementality level or user context. The dataset is freely accessible on the Criteo datasets web page.²

The twelve features are named f_0 to f_{11} and we are not provided with a description or a definition of how they are computed. We only know they are predictive of the two labels. In the following experiment we chose the visits as the metric of interest rather than conversion because they are less rare (4.7% compared to 0.3%). This saves us from the need to deal with extremely skewed data.

In the upper and bottom panes of Fig. 2 we report the histograms of the probability of visits on the control and treatment branches. We sampled $B = 199$ times with replacement³ 10,000 samples from the original dataset and computed the probability of visits for each of these samples. This bootstrapping procedure gives us

²<https://ailab.criteo.com/ressources>

³Given that the Criteo dataset contains close to 14 million observations, sampling with or without replacement is not likely to make a significant difference.

an estimate of the variability of the metric that is useful when evaluating prediction accuracy.

4.1.1 The Scenario. To estimate the probability of visits on the treatment branch based on the control data, ForTune also needs a scenario. This is not straightforward because Criteo did not provide enough details on how the dataset was generated, and building a scenario typically requires domain knowledge. To overcome this problem, we instead identify a scenario that is likely to produce the control branch data. In other words, we ask this question: if we have an ideal or somewhat ideal scenario, how good does ForTune predict the metrics of interest in the treatment branch?

To keep the experiment simple and realistic, we only impose constraints on the averages of a subset of features. We identify the set of features for which the means in the control and treatment branches are significantly different and we constrain the weighted averages of this subset of features to match the corresponding averages in the treatment branch. The results are reported next.

4.1.2 ForTune Predictions. We apply ForTune to predict the probability of visit in the treatment branch. To establish the constraints we compute the control set averages and the treatment set averages of the twelve features. Only features f_1 , f_4 , f_7 and f_{10} have averages that are notably different so we design constraints only for these.⁴ Setting these as constraints in Eq. (5) leads to a convex optimization problem in Eq. (7) where the sum is over the observations in the control set. Once the weights ω are evaluated, we use them to estimate the probability of visit v_{test} on the treatment set as $\hat{v}_{\text{test}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \omega_n v_n$ where $v_n \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates if the user of observation n made or not a visit (matching the visit column of the Criteo dataset).

$$\begin{aligned} & \arg \max_{\omega} \quad \mathcal{H}(\omega) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \omega_n f_{1n} = 17.00, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \omega_n f_{4n} = 3.59, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \omega_n f_{7n} = -5.43, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \omega_n f_{10n} = 23.34, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \omega_n \geq 0 \quad \quad \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\}, \\ & \quad \quad \quad \sum_n \omega_n = 1 \quad \quad \quad n \in \{1 \dots N\} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In practice it is useful to resample like we did above to estimate the probability of visit variability instead of computing one point estimate based on the full control dataset. As described above, we sample $B = 199$ times 10,000 observations with replacement from the control set. We then run the procedure above on each of the 199 data samples. The result is plotted in the pane of Fig. 2 titled ForTune. While the predicted probability of visits is overestimated, there is a significant overlap of the ForTune and treatment histograms.

⁴We also ran the experiment using constraints based on the twelve features and the results were similar.




Figure 2: Probabilities of Visit. The “control” and “treatment” panes reports the probability of visit in the control and treatment sets. The panes titled “ForTune” and “match” shows the estimated probability of visit \hat{v}_{test} on the treatment set by the respective methods. We observe that even though the “match” predictions align better with the histogram in the “treatment” pane the “ForTune” predictions are quite good.

4.1.3 Nearest Neighbor Matching (NNM). Besides the experiment described above, we also re-weight the Criteo dataset using NNM, also known as greedy matching. The objective is to have another point of comparison for the ForTune method. Nearest Neighbor Matching is a type of Propensity Score Matching (PSM) [8, 21], a family of methods typically used when one intends to identify causal relations from an observational study but in doing so, a set of weights is evaluated to match as closely as possible the control to the treatment set. This is also what ForTune intends to do, so it makes sense to compare the two methods.

The idea behind Nearest Neighbor Matching is the following. For each individual in the treatment group, it tries to find in the control group the most similar individual (or individuals) based on a set of observed characteristics — hence the term “nearest neighbors”. Here we use the `matchit` function in the `MatchIt` R package [10], which is based on the propensity score computed using generalized linear model (glm).

NNM cannot be used when we only dispose of a scenario like the one ForTune uses. On the other hand, we expect it to be more

accurate because it makes use of more detailed information so we interpret it as an upper bound on what ForTune can achieve in term of accuracy. The results of NNM are reported in the “match” pane of Fig. 2. We see that the histograms from the “match” pane better coincide with the “treatment” pane and sits between ForTune and “treatment”. The ForTune performance is nevertheless quite good considering that we only needed a simple scenario to specify the problem.

4.1.4 Analysis. The control and treatment actual probabilities of visit are reported in the top and bottom panes of Fig. 2. It might surprise some to see that the probability of visits is lower in the treatment group, but a possible explanation is that users in the treatment group are targeted less often but with more accuracy, leading to both less exposure and higher conversion rates.⁵ The predictions of Matching and ForTune methods are plotted in the two middle panes. As expected, Matching performs better; we can see that the histograms generated by the bootstrap runs overlap partially. The effect of the treatment is underestimated by ForTune but the direction is correct and the magnitude is not too different. Overall, considering that the constraints in Eq. (7) is only a very high level description of the actual effects of the treatment, ForTune predictions are remarkably close. This kind of results is representative of what we often observe; the predictions are not perfect but they nevertheless point to the right direction and are therefore useful to inform decision making.

4.2 ForTune at Spotify

Spotify is the world’s largest audio streaming service, delivering music, podcasts, and audiobooks to users worldwide. As a large business, Spotify comprises many different teams, each of which can have different key performance metrics, some of which are competing. One team may prioritize driving conversion to the premium product, while another team may focus on long-term retention or engagement. These teams run a host of experiments usually attempting to optimize for one or two metrics. Historically, one of the most influential surfaces within the Spotify app is the homepage where users discover new content and revisit known content. Given that making changes to the homepage can significantly impact key metrics, we opted to analyze ForTune through a series of experiments conducted on that surface. Specifically, we decided to focus on business metrics as they are of the utmost importance and have been focused on slightly less in the past in favor of easier to measure, shorter-term engagement metrics.⁶

The methodology we use is the same as in the previous section. We use the control branch and a scenario to predict the metrics of interest observed on the treatment branch. The main result is that out of 10 monitored metrics from 5 experiments run on Spotify’s

⁵Based on a personal conversation with a former Criteo employee.

⁶The business estimates reported here need to be obfuscated to preserve confidentiality. For this reason, we always apply a monotonic transform to the business estimates and the variables they depend on. Moreover, we only report relative change, never absolute values and we normalized them to span the $[-1, 1]$ domain. The different figures report the results on different cohorts of users but we do not specify how these cohorts are defined. When we report the obfuscated business metric changes against some feature values, the definition of these features is intentionally unspecific. While these measures protect Spotify business confidentiality, they do not prevent the analysis to illustrate the possibilities of the method we propose in this paper.




Figure 3: The business metric is scaled to range between -1 and 1. Consumption distribution is evaluated by bootstrapping ($B=50$) for each value of the consumption percent lift on the x-axis. The distribution is represented both by a violin plot and a regular box plot. The business metric value is distributed around 0 when the consumption lift is null. The variability results from bootstrapping and gives an estimate of the intrinsic noise in the data.

homepage in the mobile app, 6 of which were statistically significant, the estimated mean as provided by ForTune was directionally aligned 9 times and the estimated mean histograms overlapped the observed value 8 times. This is of course anecdotal evidence, but it helped us building confidence in the tool. In Section 4.2.3 we return to the failed experiment to analyze it in more detail.

We proceed by illustrating representative results that we obtained on these experiment and how we can use them.

4.2.1 Dealing with Scenario Uncertainty. When designing a scenario, it is often difficult to identify precise values to set the constraints. For example, Spotify has some measure of control over user consumption, either by altering what is surfaced or by changing the user interface. While we can build some knowledge on how much such changes can alter user consumption, some uncertainty will remain about the exact amplitude of the change.

A natural step then is to evaluate different scenarios where consumption varies on a domain of values that reflects this uncertainty. Fig 3 represent the relation between user consumption and some business metric of interest. In this particular case, the relation is approximately linear and decreasing. It is also important to note that ForTune is not constrained to linear relations and we have other cases where the business metric flattens beyond certain values of the control feature.

The information provided by Fig 3 is useful to decide how to act on cohorts and markets of interest. Depending on whether the slope is positive or negative in a given market, the company might apply different strategies. If the slope is close to zero for business

metrics like user retention, user satisfaction, revenue, expenses or any other business metrics of interest, then this might help in deciding to deprioritize a project in favor of another one with more promising outcomes.




Figure 4: Scaled User Satisfaction. Estimation of user satisfaction in relation to music consumption and discovery of new content based on 50 bootstraps.

4.2.2 Exchange Rates. The need to trade off between two metrics appears naturally at many decision points. For example, podcast consumption might compete with music consumption for user time to a certain extent, although we could also argue that an increase in consumption of one type might expose the user to more opportunities to consume the other type. It is often difficult to predict which of two opposing effects will dominate, in particular when the control variables vary in intensity; the trade-offs between podcast and music consumption is potentially different when comparing users with light and heavy consumption.

We can use ForTune to quantify the impact of such trade-offs on business metrics of interest and introduce the notion of an exchange rate between control variables. The objective is to answer the question: for a fixed value of the business metric, how much must podcast consumption change to compensate for a change in music consumption?

Such trade-offs are ubiquitous in complex applications. In web search, advertisements compete with organic search and diversity of the result list competes with recall. At Spotify discovery of new music competes with users’ desire for familiar content, and popular content competes with more personalized niche content. In the example we introduce below, we examine the trade-offs between music consumption and discovery of new content on a metric akin to user satisfaction.

We run a ForTune experiment with bootstrapping ($B = 50$) over a grid of music consumption and discovery values and we report the

associated business metric in Fig. 4. Each cell displays the median of the business metrics and the empirical standard deviation. We can observe a clear trend where user satisfaction increases with discovery and with music consumption, even though it is not statistically significant. We can also reason about the interplay between consumption and discovery; the figure suggests that a decrease of discovery rate below -4 is associated with a more severe decrease in user satisfaction, although the effect is mitigated by a positive increase in music consumption.

This technique, while still being refined, is being used at Spotify to inform decisions about top level targets for company strategies focusing on increasing content discovery and user satisfaction.

4.2.3 Example of a Miss-Specified Scenario. We study a case where ForTune was not able to provide a prediction directionally aligned with the treatment branch outcome. We show how this scenario was improved by adding more constraints. This emphasizes the importance of how the scenario is defined, as already alluded to in Section 2.4.

In this example a new ranking function for podcasts was tested on Spotify's homepage. This experiment showed a negative, statistically significant impact on two business metrics related to consumption and subscriptions. The control metrics used in the experiment were podcast consumption and user activity on the homepage. Based on this scenario, the tool failed to predict the negative impact on the two business metrics. Instead, it predicted an increase. After a thorough analysis, we added constraints to the features related to consumption of other content types and subscription behavior. This not only led to a more accurate prediction, but it also obliged the experiment designers to revise their hypotheses regarding the effect of the treatment and the specification of the control metrics during the experiment. Fig 5 shows an histogram of the predictions before and after adding the extra constraints (Scenarios A and B respectively). The figure also reports the target metric value observed in the treatment.

CONCLUSION

The limitations of online testing and our desire to produce useful insights for product decisions led us to develop ForTune, a flexible, lightweight, inexpensive approach to investigating hypotheses about changes in consumption behavior, business metrics, and trade-offs between the two. ForTune is an offline and model-free solution that is capable of investigating many hypotheses simultaneously, offering powerful support to product leaders making key decisions.

However, just as most technological advances come with trade offs and sacrifices, it is important to emphasize that not all of ForTune's predictions can be accurate or precise. We expect predictions to have a large variance, to accommodate uncertainty due to the vague and under-specified nature of the scenarios we envision the tool being used for. These scenarios will typically be described by a limited number of unassuming constraints, like a new average or a new proportion, but say nothing about causality of relationships among constraints or user behaviors. It is best used to identify trends in trade-offs, extrapolate changes in consumption due to algorithmic changes to longer-term business metrics, and generate hypotheses for deeper analysis.




Figure 5: Distribution of the estimations given by two different scenarios and comparison with the true value. Adding more constraints shifted the distribution of predictions for each bootstrap and made the median of the distribution closer to the actual value.

Nevertheless, the tool is being applied by teams at Spotify to generate insights that have eluded many teams and leads. These insights have been crucial in making several key product decisions, providing decision makers with an understanding of relationships between key metrics. We intend to continue to expand the tool by adding new diagnostics, particularly measures derived from information theory, and extending it to end-to-end offline evaluation by linking it to off-policy estimation of consumption shifts and projections of user growth.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aman Agarwal, Soumya Basu, Tobias Schnabel, and Thorsten Joachims. 2017. Effective Evaluation Using Logged Bandit Feedback from Multiple Loggers. *KDD* (2017), 687–696.
- [2] Susan Athey, Raj Chetty, Guido W Imbens, and Hyunseung Kang. 2019. *The surrogate index: Combining short-term proxies to estimate long-term treatment effects more rapidly and precisely*. Technical Report. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [3] Zdravko Botev and Ad Ridder. 2017. Variance reduction. *Wiley statsRef: Statistics reference online* (2017), 1–6.
- [4] Diemert Eustache, Betlei Artem, Christophe Renaudin, and Amini Massih-Reza. 2018. A Large Scale Benchmark for Uplift Modeling. In *Proceedings of the AdKDD and TargetAd Workshop, KDD, London, United Kingdom, August, 20, 2018*. ACM. /Users/gdupret/References/2023/20231114T175543--a-large-scale-benchmark-for-uplift-modeling__criteo_scenario.pdf
- [5] Miroslav Dudík, John Langford, and Lihong Li. 2011. Doubly Robust Policy Evaluation and Learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning (Bellevue, Washington, USA) (ICML'11)*. Omnipress, Madison, WI, USA, 1097–1104.
- [6] Bradley Efron. 2000. The bootstrap and modern statistics. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 95, 452 (2000), 1293–1296.
- [7] Jens Hainmueller. 2012. Entropy balancing for causal effects: A multivariate reweighting method to produce balanced samples in observational studies. *Political analysis* 20, 1 (2012), 25–46.

- [8] M.A. Hernan and J.M. Robins. 2023. *Causal Inference: What If*. CRC Press. <https://books.google.com/books?id=KnHIAAACAAJ>
- [9] Miguel A Hernán and James M Robins. 2010. Causal inference: What If.
- [10] Daniel E. Ho, Kosuke Imai, Gary King, and Elizabeth A. Stuart. 2011. MatchIt: Non-parametric Preprocessing for Parametric Causal Inference. *Journal of Statistical Software* 42, 8 (2011), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v042.i08>
- [11] Daniel G Horvitz and Donovan J Thompson. 1952. A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 47, 260 (1952), 663–685.
- [12] Bertrand Iooss and Paul Lemaitre. 2015. A review on global sensitivity analysis methods. *Uncertainty management in simulation-optimization of complex systems: algorithms and applications* (2015), 101–122.
- [13] Thorsten Joachims, Adith Swaminathan, and Tobias Schnabel. 2017. Unbiased Learning-to-Rank with Biased Feedback. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. 781–789.
- [14] Ron Kohavi, Alex Deng, Brian Frasca, Toby Walker, Ya Xu, and Nils Pohlmann. 2013. Online controlled experiments at large scale. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1168–1176.
- [15] Genyuan Li, Herschel Rabitz, Paul E Yelvington, Oluwayemisi O Oluwole, Fred Bacon, Charles E Kolb, and Jacqueline Schoendorf. 2010. Global sensitivity analysis for systems with independent and/or correlated inputs. *The journal of physical chemistry A* 114, 19 (2010), 6022–6032.
- [16] Sicheng Lin, Meng Xu, Xi Zhang, Shih-Kang Chao, Ying-Kai Huang, and Xiaolin Shi. 2023. Balancing Approach for Causal Inference at Scale. [arXiv:2302.05549](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.05549) [stat.ME]
- [17] Thomas M McDonald, Lucas Maystre, Mounia Lalmas, Daniel Russo, and Kamil Ciosek. 2023. Impatient Bandits: Optimizing Recommendations for the Long-Term Without Delay. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1687–1697.
- [18] James McInerney, Brian Brost, Praveen Chandar, Rishabh Mehrotra, and Benjamin Carterette. 2020. Counterfactual Evaluation of Slate Recommendations with Sequential Reward Interactions. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1779–1788.
- [19] Dadong Miao, Yanan Wang, Guoyu Tang, Lin Liu, Sulong Xu, Bo Long, Yun Xiao, Lingfei Wu, and Yunjiang Jiang. 2021. Sequential Search with Off-Policy Reinforcement Learning. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*.
- [20] Paul R Rosenbaum and Donald B Rubin. 1983. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. *Biometrika* 70, 1 (1983), 41–55.
- [21] Donald B Rubin. 1973. Matching to remove bias in observational studies. *Biometrics* (1973), 159–183.
- [22] Yuta Saito, Himan Abdollahpour, Jesse Anderton, Ben Carterette, and Mounia Lalmas. 2024. Long-term Off-Policy Evaluation and Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Web Conference (to appear)*.
- [23] Yuta Saito and Thorsten Joachims. 2021. Counterfactual Learning and Evaluation for Recommender Systems: Foundations, Implementations, and Recent Advances. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems*. 828–830.
- [24] A. Saltelli, K. Chan, and E.M. Scott. 2009. *Sensitivity Analysis*. Wiley. <https://books.google.com/books?id=gOcePwAACAAJ>
- [25] Marco Scutari. 2010. Learning Bayesian Networks with the bnlearn R Package. *Journal of Statistical Software* 35, 3 (2010), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v035.i03>
- [26] Adith Swaminathan, Akshay Krishnamurthy, Alekh Agarwal, Miro Dudik, John Langford, Damien Jose, and Imed Zitouni. 2017. Off-Policy Evaluation for Slate Recommendation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 30. 3632–3642.
- [27] Graham Van Goffrier, Lucas Maystre, and Ciarán Gilligan-Lee. 2023. Estimating long-term causal effects from short-term experiments and long-term observational data with unobserved confounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10625* (2023).
- [28] Yuyan Wang, Mohit Sharma, Can Xu, Sriraj Badam, Qian Sun, Lee Richardson, Lisa Chung, Ed H Chi, and Minmin Chen. 2022. Surrogate for long-term user experience in recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 4100–4109.
- [29] Herbert Weisberg, Jon A Krosnick, and Bruce D Bowen. 1996. *An introduction to survey research, polling, and data analysis*. Sage.
- [30] Chonggang Xu and George Zdzislaw Gertner. 2008. Uncertainty and sensitivity analysis for models with correlated parameters. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety* 93, 10 (2008), 1563–1573.
- [31] Jeremy Yang, Dean Eckles, Paramveer Dhillion, and Sinan Aral. 2020. Targeting for long-term outcomes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15835* (2020).