

A Greedy Approach for Offering to Telecom Subscribers

Piyush Kanti Bhunre, Tanmay Sen, and Arijit Sarkar

Abstract—Customer retention or churn prevention is a challenging task of a telecom operator. One of the effective approaches is to offer some attractive incentive or additional services or money to the subscribers for keeping them engaged and make sure they stay in the operator’s network for longer time. Often, operators allocate certain amount of monetary budget to carry out the offer campaign. The difficult part of this campaign is the selection of a set of customers from a large subscriber-base and deciding the amount that should be offered to an individual so that operator’s objective is achieved. There may be multiple objectives (e.g., maximizing revenue, minimizing number of churns) for selection of subscriber and selection of an offer to the selected subscriber. Apart from monetary benefit, offers may include additional data, SMS, hots-spot tethering, and many more. This problem is known as offer optimization. In this paper, we propose a novel combinatorial algorithm for solving offer optimization under heterogeneous offers by maximizing expected revenue under the scenario of subscriber churn, which is, in general, seen in telecom domain. The proposed algorithm is efficient and accurate even for a very large subscriber-base.

I. INTRODUCTION

Offer optimization or campaign management is one of the routine tasks of a telephone operator for customer retention and service adoption. A telecom operator always looks out for potential subscribers who may be interested for adopting certain service in exchange of an incentive from the telecom operator. To achieve a business objective, an operator’s task is to identify as set of subscribers and a set of appropriate offers that may be accepted by the chosen subscribers. Most of the time, this decision is made through a rule-based system which implement certain business rules and intuitive human judgment. Resende and Pardalos [2008] describe varieties of optimization problems arise in telecommunication systems. Johnson et al. [2013] formulate a constrained Optimization problem for maximizing the profit to a manufacturer by giving discounts to the customers. Pham et al. [2021] proposed a offers recommender system for telecommunications. Cohen [2004] addressed the problem of bank’s marketing campaign optimization by solving a mixed integer programming (MIP) problem. Nobibon et al. [2011] proposed a branch-and-price algorithm to allocate one or more offers to the clients. Verma [2020] proposed a two stage framework for retail offer optimization, firstly, they have exploited generalized non-linear model based on temporal convolutional network to estimate item purchase probability, and secondly offer values are optimized by solving constrained based optimization problem with derived purchase probability.

Piyush Kanti Bhunre, Tanmay Sen and Arijit Sarkar are with Ericsson, Kolkata, India {piyush.kanti.bhunre, tanmay.sen, arijit.sarkar}@ericsson.com

In this paper, we propose a novel greedy algorithm for solving this problem by maximizing expected revenue under the scenario of subscriber-churn from the network. In this variant of the offer optimization problem, apart from a monetary incentive given to the subscribers, the operator may award some other offers to the subscribers such as extra amount of data, talk time, increased limit of hots-spot data usage, unlimited data usage in certain time period of a day or week, download, etc. The objective is to allocate appropriate offer to the subscribers who are most likely to accept the offer and active in the network for a longer time period. The problem under consideration will be referred to as an *Offer Optimization Problem (OOP)*. The contribution of our work is summarized below.

- We have proposed a novel algorithm for finding optimum solution to the underlying optimization problem which our main contribution. The proposed algorithm is able to handles large number of subscribers. It provides optimal solution efficiently and out performs many existing algorithms which is evident from a comparison test given in the experiment section. We also provided a theoretical argument why our algorithm provides accurate and efficiency solution.
- The algorithm is not limited to the offer optimization to telecom domain, but also applicable in solving problems coming from various other domains.

The rest of the paper is organized as follow. In Section II, we present the mathematical problem formulation which leads to solving the telecom OOP. The optimization algorithm along with necessary data structures, complexity analysis and relevant discussions are presented in Section III. Section IV is furnished with experimental results and comparisons with a couple of standard algorithms to validate the novelty and merit of the proposed algorithm. Finally we conclude in Section V.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

First we shall formulate the OOP under the incentives with different denominations. The same formulation is enough for solving more general problem with heterogeneous offers, where a offer may be monetary or non-monetary services or advantages to the subscribers. This generalization can be done by a simple transformation or interpretation of the non-monetary offers which we shall discuss later part of this section. Here, we assume that any of the existing subscribers may churn out from the network with some probability. Further, each subscriber or a group of subscribers has some susceptibility towards an offer, which will be referred to as

offer acceptance rate. The offer acceptance rate is used to model the probability of accepting an offer by a subscriber, which is incorporated in the objective function.

Suppose S is a set of n subscribers, and the i^{th} subscriber possesses the following characteristics:

- p_i : monthly top-up done by the subscriber
- α_i : probability that the subscriber may churn out
- γ_i : acceptance rate, a parameter that defines sensitivity of i^{th} subscriber towards an offer
- β_i : probability of accepting an offer, and it is dependent on γ_i .

The parameters α_i 's are estimated by using ML-based models and the subscriber's profile and usage data. The rate of acceptance β_i 's are estimated from data related to past offer campaigns and acceptance as well as subscriber profile. The monthly top-up amount p_i 's comes from the rate plan and top-up history of the subscribers.

Note that for a large segment of subscribers, if the amount offer to a subscriber is increased, then it is more likely that the subscriber will accept the offer. So, the probability of offer acceptance by a subscriber is modeled by the exponential distribution with mean or rate of the distribution as the acceptance rate. So, the acceptance probability is expressed as $\beta_i = 1 - e^{-\gamma_i x_i}$, where x_i is the incentive offered to the subscriber.

The revenue can be generated from a subscriber if the customer does not churn out. Note that a revenue p_i is generated from the subscriber i when it is sure that the subscriber does not churn out. In the churn scenario, the subscriber stays in the network with probability $1 - \alpha_i$ and pays p_i . So, the expected revenue from i^{th} subscriber is $(1 - \alpha_i)p_i$.

Now consider the case when an offer is made to the subscriber who may accept the offer with probability $1 - \beta_i$ or may reject the offer with probability β_i . If he does not accept the offer, the revenue is $(1 - \alpha_i)p_i$ with probability $1 - \beta_i$. If he accepts x_i as an offer, then the revenue is $p_i - x_i$ with probability β_i . So, the expected revenue from the i^{th} subscriber is

$$f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = \beta_i(p_i - x_i) + (1 - \beta_i)(1 - \alpha_i)p_i \quad (1)$$

The possible values of the offers may be non-negative integers or some predefined discrete values. Suppose there are k different types of offers and the j^{th} type has an offer value δ_j and it can be awarded to n_j subscribers. So, possible discrete offer denominations are $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_k\}$. Then the total value of type j offers is $w_j = \delta_j n_j$ and the total number of offers is $K = n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_k$, and hence, the total budget is $W = w_1 + w_2 + \dots + w_k$. Further, the unknown offer value x_i for i^{th} subscriber can be represented as $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_j x_{i,j} = \delta \cdot \mathbf{x}_i$, where vectors $\delta = [\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_k]$ and $\mathbf{x}_i = [x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,k}]$ and each $x_{i,j}$ is a binary variable such that $x_{i,j} = 1$ implies the j^{th} offer is selected for i^{th} subscriber. Note that the revenue function can be written as $f(\delta \cdot \mathbf{x}_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = \beta_i(p_i - x_i) + (1 - \beta_i)(1 - \alpha_i)p_i$. Then the offer optimization problem can be

stated as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n f(\delta \cdot \mathbf{x}_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) \\ \text{S.t.} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^k x_{i,j} \leq 1, \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n \\ & \sum_{i=1}^n x_{i,j} \leq n_j, \quad \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k \\ & x_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \ \& \ j \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the unknown variables are given by $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n]^T$, $\mathbf{x}_i = [x_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, \dots, x_{i,k}]$, and the acceptance probability is computed as $\beta_i = 1 - e^{-\gamma_i \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_j x_{i,j}}$. However, this probability may be estimated by using different types of distribution and the algorithm is equally applicable for optimizing the function $F(\mathbf{x})$. A subscriber may receive at most one of the possible offers, which is enforced by the first constraint of the optimization problem. The second constraint ensures that the number of specific type of offers never exceed the number of available offers of the type. The third constraint implies that the decision variables are binary.

In our problem formulation, the restrictions on the budgets for each type of offer (i.e., w_j 's) and the total budget (W) are implicit and ensured by the given constraints. Hence, we have ignored additional constraints such as $\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_j x_{i,j} \leq w_j$, $\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and $\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_j x_{i,j} \leq W$ in the optimization.

Note that if the number of subscribers, n is large (i.e., in order of million), the number of binary variables nk is very large. Naturally it is very difficult to solve such a problem efficiently and accurately. In this study, we propose an efficient greedy algorithm for solving this problem.

III. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

The problem stated in Sec. II is a very large scale optimization as the number of subscribers may be in the order of million. Solving this problem by a general optimization technique, in general, is difficult and inefficient. Here we propose a greedy algorithm which is simple, elegant, and efficient for finding an optimal solution to the problem.

A greedy algorithm finds an optimal solution based on some "local optimal criteria" that leads to a global optimal solution. We would like to maximize the objective function by offering one subscriber at a time and the subscriber is selected by a greedy choice. Let us take a closer look at the objective function $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_i f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$, where each $f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$ is non-negative function, and it defined on a discrete set of values. We expect to maximize each of these functions in order to maximize $F(\mathbf{x})$. Here we adopt the following greedy choice:

GREEDY CHOICE / SELECTION: Choose a subscriber i and an offer value δ_j from the available set of offer such that $f(\delta_j; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$ is maximum among all available alternatives.

So, every time we choose the one that provides the maximum revenue and we continue till there is no more offer or all subscribers received the offer.

Suppose initially we have the set of subscribers, $S = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ to whom the offers will be made and let A , initialized to $A = \emptyset$, denote the set of subscribers who already have received an offer. We consider k buckets, each containing a set of offers with same value. Our approach would be to select a subscriber i from the set of unassigned subscribers such that $f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$ is maximum for some offer, say $x_i = \delta_j$. This offer can be written as vector $\mathbf{x}_i = [x_{i,1} = 0, x_{i,2} = 0, \dots, x_{i,j} = 1, x_{i,j+1} = 0, \dots, x_{i,k} = 0]$, and $x_i = \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \delta$. As soon as we find such a subscriber i and an offer δ_j , we assign the offer to the subscriber i , and remove it from S , remove the offer from j th bucket and we put (i, j) in A . Next, from the remaining set of subscribers in S , we choose a subscriber l and an offer δ_m from the available set of offers such that the revenue function of the subscriber is maximum, i.e., $f(x; \alpha_l, \gamma_l, p_l)$ is maximum at $x = \delta_m$. Then we remove the offer from the m th bucket and the subscriber l from S , and put (l, m) into A . This process is continued until all subscribers are assigned with an offer or all the offer buckets are empty. If buckets are empty before S is empty, then the remaining subscribers will not receive any offer. For unified interpretation, we assume each unassigned subscriber receives a zero offer.

A. Data Structures

For an efficient implementation of the proposed algorithm, we need appropriate data structures. For a speedy execution of the greedy choice, we exploit the priority queues of the revenue values $f(x; \alpha, \gamma, p)$ for each subscribers. In order to make a greedy choice for a subscriber and an offer, we need to determine $\max_j \{ \max_i f(\delta_j; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) \}$. For a given offer type j , we construct a *max-priority queue* Q_j of subscribers with the priority values as the revenue from the subscriber. So, the priority value for i th subscriber is $f(\delta_j; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$. Since, there are k possible types of offers, we shall maintain k priority queues, namely Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k . Each of these priority queues is implemented by using binary heap, which is a complete binary tree stored in an array. The space complexity of a binary heap or priority queue is $O(n)$ and it can be constructed in $O(n)$ time., where n is the number of elements. The front element or the max-priority element of a priority queue lies at the root of the underlying binary heap, and hence it can be found in $O(1)$ time. Since deletion of an element from the queue requires $O(\log n)$ time in an n -element queue, additional $O(\log n)$ time is required to maintain the queue after removal of the max-priority element.

We also maintain an array L of size k that stores the references to the front elements of the priority queues Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k . At any point of time, we simply scan this array to find the elements (i.e., the subscriber) having the maximum priority value among all front elements of the queues. So, finding maximum of maximums can be done in $O(k)$ time. Once this maximum is found, corresponding element is deleted from the queues and the array L is also updated




Figure 1. Main data structures for implementing the proposed greedy algorithm. Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k are max-priority queues of the subscribers. The queue Q_j is a Max. Priority Queue and contains at most n subscribers with $f(\delta_j; \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ as their priority values. The references to the roots of Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k (i.e., max. priority elements) are stored in another list L which helps in finding the maximum of maximum.

accordingly. For details of binary heap and priority queue, and their properties please refer to Cormen et. al Cormen et al. [2009].

We also use a lookup table for performing deletion of an element from k priority queues efficiently. The greedy choice determines a subscriber i and an offer type j such that subscriber i lies at the front of Q_j . So, while deleting corresponding queue element from Q_j is easy and efficient as we know the position of the element in Q_j . However, for the subscriber i , there are corresponding elements in the queues other than Q_j , but their positions are unknown, and hence, their deletions are not straightforward for achieving logarithmic time complexity. In order to achieve efficient deletion of an element from k priority queues, we use a lookup table T , which is a 2-dimensional array of dimension $n \times k$ storing references of each subscriber in the priority queues. To be more precise, the (i, j) th element $T_{i,j}$ in T stores the reference of i th subscriber in j th queue Q_j . The lookup table is updated according to the changes performed in the priority queues. Although this increases the computational overhead of the algorithm, but the time complexities of the operations on priority queues remain unchanged, and update operation on a queue can be performed in $O(\log n)$ time. Implementation of T requires $O(kn)$ memory and $O(kn)$ construction time.

B. Algorithm Greedy Offer(AGO)

The main steps of the proposed greedy algorithm is presented in Algorithm GREEDOFFER, where S denotes the set of subscriber, $K = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j$ denotes the total number of offers, and A denotes the set of 2-tuple (i, j) , which represent assignment of an offer of type j to a subscribers i . First initialization of S , A , and constructions of the max-priority queues Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k are performed in Line 1 to 2. Note that the front element of Q_j has the maximum key value along all key values of the elements stored in Q_j . In the loop at Line 3, the algorithm selects subscribers and assigns offer iteratively by following the ‘‘Greedy Choice/Selection’’ strategy earlier. For example, if the greedy choice provides a subscriber i and an offer type j , i.e., i th subscriber corresponds to the maximum of the key values stored in the j th priority queue Q_j , then $f(\delta_j; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = \max_{l,m} f(\delta_m; \alpha_l, \gamma_l, p_l)$ and it is the maximum over all subscribers and all possible offers. Then

the algorithm inserts (i, j) into A , and deletes i^{th} subscriber from each of the queues Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k and reduce the value of n_j by one, and reduce the total number of available offers K by one. Note that if n_j is zero, no more offer of type- j can be assigned to any of the remaining subscribers, and hence the queue Q_j is no longer needed and hence, it is deleted. In the next iteration, the same steps are repeated for making a greedy choice, and continued till all offers are assigned to subscriber or no subscriber is left. The steps of the algorithm are described below.

Algorithm GREEDYOFFER($\alpha[1..n], \gamma[1..n], p[1..n]$)

1. Set $S = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $A = \emptyset$ // $O(n)$
2. Construct Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k // $O(kn)$
3. **while** ($K > 0$ & $S \neq \emptyset$) **do** //repeats n or $\sum n_j$ times
4. $(i, j) \leftarrow \text{FINDMAXOFMAX}(Q_1, \dots, Q_k)$ // $O(k)$
5. $A \leftarrow A \cup \{(i, j)\}$ // $O(1)$
6. $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{i\}$ // $O(1)$
7. Delete i from Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_k // $O(k \log n)$
8. $n_j \leftarrow n_j - 1$, $K \leftarrow K - 1$ // $O(1)$
9. **If** ($n_j == 0$) **do** // $O(1)$
10. Delete Q_j // $O(1)$
11. **return** A

Observe that the proposed algorithm is designed in such a way that a subscriber can receive at most one offer from the available set, which is insured by the steps shown in line 6 to line 10. Also steps in line 8 to line 10 ensure that if a specific type of offers finishes, none of the remaining subscribers receive such offer. So, the constraints of the optimization problem stated in Eq. II are satisfied.

C. Time and Space Complexity

A priority queue of n elements can be constructed in $O(n)$ time, and hence k priority queues can be constructed $O(kn)$ time. In Algorithm GREEDYOFFER, the initialization of the data structures lines 1 to 2 can be executed in $O(kn)$ time. The loop in line 5 is executed $\max\{n, m\}$ times, where total number of offers is $m = \sum_{j=1}^k n_j$. In general, $m < n$, and hence we can assume that this loop is executed m times. Since, in line 9, an arbitrary subscriber can be deleted from a priority queue in $O(\log n)$ time, the execution time of the entire loop consumes $O(km \log n)$ time which is bounded from above by $O(kn \log n)$. Hence, the time complexity of the algorithm is $O(kn \log n)$.

Each priority queue contains at most n elements, one for each subscriber, and each element can be stored using constant amount of space. So the space complexity for storing a single queue is $O(n)$. Since there are k priority queues, one for each type of offer, we need $O(nk)$ memory for maintaining the queues. So, the space complexity of the algorithm is $O(nk)$.

D. Optimality of Solution

We assume that each subscriber is independent from others, i.e., the revenue from a subscriber depends only on the incentive offered to the subscriber, and it is independent of what incentives given to others. Under this assumption, the proposed algorithm provides an optimal solution to the optimization

problem. The revenue function discussed in Section II satisfies this condition. In order to prove our claim, we shall utilize the following observation about the greedy choice made by our algorithm.

Observation 1 (Monotonicity): Suppose the greedy algorithm determines the offers $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_n}$ to the subscribers in the order i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n respectively. Then the corresponding revenues from the subscribers are in decreasing order, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{i_1}; \alpha_{i_1}, \gamma_{i_1}, p_{i_1}) &\geq f(x_{i_2}; \alpha_{i_2}, \gamma_{i_2}, p_{i_2}) \\ &\geq \dots \\ &\geq f(x_{i_n}; \alpha_{i_n}, \gamma_{i_n}, p_{i_n}). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The proof of Observation 1 trivially follows directly from the fact that the greedy algorithm always chooses the subscriber who is giving maximum revenue under the available offers at that moment.

Theorem 1 (Optimality): The solution provided by the greedy algorithm is optimal.

PROOF: Let $\mathbf{X} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ be a solution given by the algorithm. Let $\mathbf{Y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n]$ be an arbitrary solution. The revenue corresponding to the offer vectors \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , respectively are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{X}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) \text{ and} \\ F(\mathbf{Y}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n f(y_i; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(y_i), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, for simplicity, we denote $f_i(x) := f(x; \alpha_i, \gamma_i, p_i)$. In order to prove that the greedy algorithm provides an optimal solution, it sufficient to show that $F(\mathbf{X}) \geq F(\mathbf{Y})$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that the subscribers are re-arranged in such a way that the algorithm first finds the offer x_1 for subscriber 1, then x_2 for subscriber 2, and so on, and finally x_n for n . Note that some of these offers may be zero. Let i be the smallest index with $x_i \neq y_i$, i.e., $x_1 = y_1, x_2 = y_2, \dots, x_{i-1} = y_{i-1}, x_i \neq y_i$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{X}) - F(\mathbf{Y}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x_i) - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(y_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(x_i) - f_i(y_i)), \text{ since } x_j = y_j \ \forall j < i \\ &= (f_i(x_i) - f_i(y_i)) + (f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}) - f_{i+1}(y_{i+1})) \\ &\quad + \dots + (f_n(x_n) - f_n(y_n)). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

According to the greedy algorithm, x_i is the best available offer made to the i^{th} subscriber such that the additional revenue coming from the i^{th} subscriber is maximum. i.e.,

$$f_i(x_i) = \max_{z_j \in O_i, k \in S_i} f_k(z_j) \geq f_i(y_i) \quad (6)$$

where O_i is the set of all remaining offers and S_i is the set of remaining subscribers to be offered at the time of the i^{th} greedy choice made by the algorithm. Then by Eq. 5 and Eq. 6, it follows that $f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}) \geq f_{i+1}(y_{i+1})$, $f_{i+2}(x_{i+2}) \geq f_{i+2}(y_{i+2})$, \dots , $f_n(x_n) \geq f_n(y_n)$. Hence, $F(\mathbf{X}) - F(\mathbf{Y}) \geq 0$, i.e., $F(\mathbf{X}) \geq F(\mathbf{Y})$. This completes the proof.

Finally, from the discussions in Sec. III-C and Sec. III-D, the novelty of the proposed algorithm can be summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 2: Algorithm GREEDYOFFER determines an optimal solution the offer optimization problem (given in Eq. II) in

$O(kn \log n)$ time, and it consumes $O(kn)$ memory for solving the problem.

Table I
EXAMPLE OF HYPOTHETICAL NON-MONETARY OFFERS.

Offer Name	Value δ_j \$	Count n_k	Sum $w_j = \delta_j n_k$ \$
5GB Data	5	90	450
Hotspot 2GB	2	50	100
100 SMS	4	80	320
5 Movies	8	70	560
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
		$K = \sum_j n_j$	$W = \sum w_j$

E. OOP with Heterogeneous Offers

The problem stated in Sec. II is designed with offers in terms of monetary incentive. The same is also applicable to a more generalized scenario where the offers are made in terms of services and non-monetary offers such as additional data, hot-spot tethering, additional SMS, value added services or specific download limit, etc. These additional services or non-monetary offers can be represented in terms of equivalent monetary advantages. An example of such offers are shown in Table I, in which offers are presented as different types with equivalent values, and hence, we solve it by using the same formulation as stated in Sec. II. In order to incorporate the subscriber specific profile or usage history of a subscriber, a relative weight to each type of offers can also be set for incorporating in the objective function.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

All experimental results are obtained by using as noted book computer with Intel(R) Core(TM) i5 2.60GHz processor, 16GB RAM, and Windows 10 Enterprise OS. In order to show the novelty of the proposed algorithm, we present the experimental results in two parts.

- Comparison performance with two standard algorithms
- Efficiency and capability of proposed algorithm for handling large problems.

A. Implementation

The proposed algorithm is implemented in pure Python and no special library is used for the implementation. The implementation of max-heap and max-priority queue is done by following the standard algorithm in Cormen et al. [2009]. We have inserted additional steps required for construction of priority queues, deletion key and update operation in the priority queues in order to maintain the consistency of the positions of a subscriber in the queues and in the lookup table adopted in the proposed algorithm. Although the maintenance of lookup table brings a small computational overhead, it makes the deletion and update operation very fast (i.e., logarithmic time).

B. Comparison of Performance

The efficiency (i.e., execution time) of the proposed algorithm is compared with a couple of standard optimization algorithms, namely, i) *Genetic Algorithm* with constraints that is available in the python library *pymoo* (Blank and Deb [2020]), and ii) constraints non-linear solver IPOPT available in the python library *pyomo* (Hart et al. [2011], Bynum et al. [2021]). In general, for problems with large number of unknowns, these techniques either take long time to find a good solution, or fail to converge to a feasible solution. So, the comparison is shown with moderate size of the problem where number of subscribers varies from 100 to 1000 with the second parameter k remains fixed to 5. So, the number of decision variables for corresponding optimization problems varies for $nk = 500$ to $nk = 5000$.

In general, the genetic algorithm demands large population size and large number of iterations, otherwise it cannot find a feasible solution for large number of unknowns. So, for conducting the experiment, the population size and the number of iterations are increased as the problem size increases. The proposed algorithm completes execution in less than a second from finding an optimal solution, which is negligible compared to the time consumed by genetic algorithm.

Note that the *pyomo* solver also consumes significantly longer time than the proposed algorithm for solving the same problem and yet the optimal value of the objective function provided by it is smaller than the one provided by the proposed algorithm.

The execution time and the maximum value of the objective functions for problems with varying size are tabulated in Table II. This result clearly shows that the proposed algorithm always provides largest value of the objective function, while taking smallest amount of execution time. This is expected as these algorithms, in general, provides a sub-optimal solution to a problem, while our algorithm always provides an optimal solution.

C. Efficiency with Large Problems

In order to show the capability of handling large scale optimization problem, we have also furnished experimental results with very large number of subscribers which ranges from 100 thousands to one million, and offer types varies from 5 to 20. The execution time is tabulated in Table III and the growth of the execution time is also visualized in Fig. 2, which shows that the execution time grows slowly, and it is similar to a linear or log-linear function. So, the empirical results does not deviate from the theoretical bound of time complexity of our algorithm.

V. CONCLUSION

Here we conclude with few remarks on applications, efficiency, improvement, and shortcomings.

- In this paper, we proposed a greedy algorithm for solving a special type of combinatorial optimization problem, namely offer optimization problem that comes from telecom domain. However, the algorithm may be used for

Table II

PERFORMANCE COMPARISON PROPOSED ALGORITHM WITH GENETIC ALGORITHM AVAILABLE IN THE PYTHON LIBRARY *pymoo* (BLANK AND DEB [2020], PYM [2020]) AND A NON-LINEAR SOLVER IPOPT AVAILABLE IN THE PYTHON LIBRARY *pyomo* (HART ET AL. [2011], BYNUM ET AL. [2021]). ALL ALGORITHMS ARE EXECUTED ON SIMULATED DATA TO FIND THE MAXIMUM VALUE OF THE OBJECTIVE FUNCTION AND THE CORRESPONDING OFFER DISTRIBUTION.

n	Proposed Algorithm		Genetic Algorithm				Pyomo IPOPT	
	Opt. Val.	Time (sec.)	Pop. size	Iter.	Opt. Val.	Time (sec.)	Opt. Val.	Time (sec.)
100	3676.81	0.0469	200	500	3565.14	1009.5625	3608.85	602.1000
200	7191.99	0.0625	200	500	6729.98	1589.0938	7040.70	602.3029
300	11825.49	0.1094	200	500	11216.57	2198.7813	11753.27	604.4841
400	15285.47	0.1406	200	500	14278.32	3276.4375	14976.10	604.6450
500	18556.30	0.1875	300	600	17682.03	9310.2188	18309.22	606.1524
600	23353.26	0.1889	300	600	20747.12	11443.1406	22789.53	607.9732
700	25780.47	0.2031	500	700	23804.25	20463.4062	24824.68	606.5911
800	29108.80	0.2344	600	800	26931.79	30028.0000	27512.51	606.8904
900	33884.70	0.3594	600	900	31777.81	38664.6406	33742.06	608.2689
1000	37909.31	0.5000	600	900	34911.58	42032.8125	37169.06	616.4576

Table III

EXECUTION TIME (IN SEC.) OF PROPOSED ALGORITHM FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF OFFERS $k = 5, 10, 15, 20$ AND INCREASING NUMBER OF SUBSCRIBERS STARTING FROM $n = 100000$ TO $n = 1000000$.

n	$k = 5$	$k = 10$	$k = 15$	$k = 20$
100000	30.453	65.217	74.844	92.6406
200000	54.828	103.469	150.625	186.594
300000	83.625	129.406	167.953	194.453
400000	135.172	175.531	220.344	276.460
500000	152.328	221.109	319.578	344.844
600000	186.797	246.234	322.844	380.250
700000	246.250	297.891	366.000	479.156
800000	259.859	323.609	453.141	511.422
900000	257.406	381.781	492.375	593.094
1000000	292.203	409.906	522.500	666.156




Figure 2. Execution times (in sec.) consumed by the proposed algorithm for inputs with varying number of subscribers (n) from 100 thousand to one million are shown here, where each curve shows the results for $k = 5, 10, 15, 20$, which the number of types of offers.

solving similar problem coming from different domains, which requires allocation and utilization of resources to optimize predefined objectives.

- The time complexity of the algorithm can be improved

by using another priority queue Q for implementing the greedy choice of the proposed algorithm, which compute the maximum of maximums for selecting a subscriber and an offer that make maximum revenue. Instead of the list L , if we use another queue Q to storing the references of the roots of k priority queues, then the greedy choice can be made in $O(\log k)$ time instead of $O(k)$ time.

- The efficiency of the algorithm is achieved with a cost of memory. The space complexity of the algorithm is $O(kn)$ which not a big issue if number of offer types k is of moderate size. The typical values of k in telecom domain may be 5 to 20. For problem coming from some domain such as online retailer, the number of different types of offer may be large, and then the memory requirement will be increased. The algorithm may be extended for the environment of distributed computing to handle such issues as well as increasing the efficiency.

References:

- Multi-objective optimization in python. <https://pymoo.org/>, 2020. Accessed: 12-02-2023.
- J. Blank and K. Deb. *pymoo: Multi-objective optimization in python*. *IEEE Access*, 8:89497–89509, 2020.
- Michael L. Bynum, Gabriel A. Hackebeil, William E. Hart, Carl D. Laird, Bethany L. Nicholson, John D. Sirola, Jean-Paul Watson, and David L. Woodruff. *Pyomo—optimization modeling in python*, volume 67. Springer Science & Business Media, third edition, 2021.
- M-D Cohen. Exploiting response models—optimizing cross-sell and up-sell opportunities in banking. *Information Systems*, 29(4):327–341, 2004.
- Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2009. ISBN 0262032937.
- William E Hart, Jean-Paul Watson, and David L Woodruff. *Pyomo: modeling and solving mathematical programs in python*. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 3(3): 219–260, 2011.
- Joseph Johnson, Gerard J Tellis, and Edward H Ip. To whom, when, and how much to discount? a constrained optimization of customized temporal discounts. *Journal of*

- Retailing*, 89(4):361–373, 2013.
- Fabrice Talla Nobibon, Roel Leus, and Frits CR Spieksma. Optimization models for targeted offers in direct marketing: Exact and heuristic algorithms. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 210(3):670–683, 2011.
- Cong Dan Pham, Tuan Anh Chu, Huy Hung Pham, Manh Linh Dao, Thanh Son Pham, Duc Hai Nguyen, et al. A recommendation system for offers in telecommunications. In *2020 IEEE Eighth International Conference on Communications and Electronics (ICCE)*, pages 302–306. IEEE, 2021.
- Mauricio GC Resende and Panos M Pardalos. *Handbook of optimization in telecommunications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- Ankur Verma. Offer personalization using temporal convolution network and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.08130*, 2020.