Robust Design for Profit Maximization With Aversion to Downside Risk From Parametric Uncertainty in Consumer Choice Models

In new product design, risk averse firms must consider downside risk in addition to expected profitability, since some designs are associated with greater market uncertainty than others. We propose an approach to robust optimal product design for profit maximization by introducing a $z$-profit metric to manage expected profitability vs. downside risk due to uncertainty in market share predictions. Our goal is to maximize profit at a firm-specified level of risk tolerance. Specifically, we find the design that maximizes the $z$-profit: the value that the firm has a $(1-a)$ chance of exceeding, given the distribution of possible outcomes. The parameter $a \in (0,1)$ is set by the firm to reflect sensitivity to downside risk (or upside gain), and parametric study of $a$ reveals the sensitivity of optimal design choices to firm risk preference. We account here only for uncertainty of choice model parameter estimates due to finite data sampling when the choice model is assumed to be correctly specified (no misspecification error). We apply the delta method to estimate the mapping from uncertainty in discrete choice model parameters to uncertainty of profit outcomes and identify the estimated $z$-profit as a closed-form function of decision variables for the multinomial logit model. An example demonstrates implementation of the method to find the optimal design characteristics of a dial-readout scale using conjoint data. [DOI: 10.1115/1.4007533]
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1 Introduction

Over the last three decades, a significant portion of the new product development (NPD) literature has been dedicated to the integration of engineering design and marketing processes for differentiated markets. Simple models to determine the most profitable characteristics of a single new product [1, 2] have progressed to account for issues such as product-time design and preference heterogeneity [3–7], competitor reactions [8–10], cost structure [11, 12], distribution channels [9, 13–16], choice-set-dependent preferences [17], and coordination with constrained engineering design decisions [18–26].

As Hsu and Wilcox [27] argue, the trend toward estimating marketing models at lower levels of aggregation that are more structural in consumer behavior representation (as opposed to high-level macro supply and demand equations) has led to models with many parameters and consequently greater uncertainty of those parameters. However, despite the advances in NPD methods, the research has not given much consideration to the intrinsic parameter uncertainty of the demand models. Demand uncertainty directly affects the risk of introducing a new product into the market, and firms evaluate potential projects not only in terms of expected return, but also in terms of risk.

The purpose of this work is threefold. First, we define a robust $a$-profit metric and propose a general framework to incorporate demand uncertainty arising from choice model parameter estimation into the design decision process such that it accounts for varying risk tolerance profiles. Second, we apply the delta method to approximate the $a$-profit function in closed-form for multinomial logit (MNL) choice models to be used efficiently in numerical optimization routines. Finally, we show how ignoring demand uncertainty can lead to suboptimal decisions for risk averse firms.

We do not intend to consider all the various sources of demand model uncertainty [28], and several questions will remain open. In particular, we assume the discrete choice model is correctly specified and ignore uncertainty due to model misspecification, and we assume that the model parameters do not change over time or from the context in which the data were collected to the context in which predictions will be made. Nevertheless, the proposed methodology can be useful, and it serves as a step in addressing design for profit maximization under demand model uncertainty.

This paper begins by discussing the relevant literature on product design, pricing under uncertainty and incorporation of firm risk tolerance in Sec. 2. Section 3 describes the proposed methodology for finding optimal designs for varying levels of tolerated product profit uncertainty and applies it to multinomial logit demand models. Section 4 presents an example application using the multinomial logit demand model to determine the optimal attributes of a dial-readout bathroom scale from the literature for different levels of risk aversion. Section 5 discusses conclusions, limitations, and future work.

2 Literature Review

Demand uncertainty is caused by several factors such as preference dynamics [29], demand model misspecification [30, 31], choice context [32, 33], response variability [34, 35], and sampling errors associated with the estimation procedure [36]. As a result,
several researchers have considered the impact of demand uncertainty on optimal pricing strategies [29,30,37,38]. However, in contrast to prices, design decisions are difficult to change post hoc, especially in durable-goods markets. Products with high start-up capital costs can have virtually unchangeable characteristics, and producers are incentivized to consider demand uncertainty during the initial stages of the design process (e.g., car manufacturers invest a significant portion of capital up front in production equipment, and changing a characteristic such as the footprint of a car leads to very high costs).

Hazelrigg [39] proposed applying von Neumann-Morgenstern [40] utility theory as the frame for selecting among competing design alternatives by taking the firm’s profit (net present value) as the sole design objective and using a firm-level (single-attribute) utility function to manage risk of uncertain profit outcomes. This decision-based design (DBD) framework and its variants have been explored and implemented in subsequent literature (e.g., Ref. [41]), some of which has applied discrete choice models to predict demand as a function of product attributes (e.g., Refs. [19,42]).

The use of firm utility functions to describe risk preference has advantages. In particular, specifying a utility function over profit outcomes is a flexible approach, accounting for risk sensitivity over the entire distribution of outcomes. However, in practice a firm’s utility function can be difficult to identify. This is in part because firm preferences do not necessarily satisfy utility axioms (e.g., ability to express consistent, transitive preferences over all possible outcomes); managers are not accustomed to specifying utility functions or answering lottery questions consistently; and it is not straightforward to assess uncertainty caused by error and misspecification of the firm’s utility function. Indeed, firm utility functions in the DBD literature are typically fictitious or left unspecified (e.g., Refs. [19,43]).

We take an alternative approach, instead asking the decision-maker to specify a single parameter $x$ to represent risk preference and then conducting parametric studies to help the decision-maker understand how the optimal design changes with different choices of $x$. The main restriction is that we assess the distribution of profit outcomes at a single critical point, rather than assessing the entire distribution. However, the advantages include (1) closed-form solutions that enable efficient optimization; (2) improved intuition and ease of managerial interpretation and specification; and (3) case of parametric study to understand the sensitivity of design choices to risk preference.

We are interested in uncertain profit outcomes that result from uncertainty in product demand predictions. Several authors have addressed product demand uncertainty resulting from variation in engineering design model parameters (e.g., due to manufacturing variability or usage conditions) [19,21,36,39]. Two of these publications also account for uncertainty in the marketing model parameters: Luo et al. [36] and Besharati et al. [21], and both model this uncertainty using intervals.

In particular, Luo et al. [36] use the parameter covariance matrix of part-worth utility point estimates to obtain 95% confidence intervals around the point estimates from the design parameter best- and worst-case scenarios for a set of product alternatives under consideration. The greatest utility under the best-case scenario and lowest utility under the worst-case scenario within the confidence interval are compared to the similarly constructed estimates of utility for competitor products. The highest own-utility is compared to the sum of the lowest competitor-utilities and vice versa to construct interval estimates of market shares (these no longer represent statistical confidence intervals for market share). They then use pair-wise comparisons to eliminate dominated alternatives (defined as alternatives that have a best-case market share worse than an alternative’s worst-case market share, perform worse on worst-case performance, and have higher performance variability). All nondominated designs are then considered for prototyping and further subjective evaluation.

Besharati et al. [21] use a framework similar to Luo et al. [36], but they change the optimization criteria arguing that looking for the best performance on the worst-case condition might be too conservative. Alternatively, they replace the design objectives of worst-case performance and performance variability with multi-objective optimization of nominal performance characteristics. The marketing model is also treated as a multi-objective optimization problem of maximizing nominal market share and minimizing the market share variance (penalizing both positive and negative variation) resulting from uncertainty in both engineering design parameters and part-worth utility estimates. Finally, they develop a ranking system for pair-wise comparison of designs on the design and marketing criteria.

Hsu and Wilcox [27] use the estimation error associated with the parameter estimates to find the stochastic market share prediction in a multinomial logit framework. They use a simulation-based approach for approximating the distribution efficiently.

Table 1 compares the above papers that consider the uncertainty in demand model parameters as a source of demand uncertainty and positions our contribution against this prior work. We address variance of profit estimates but do not seek to minimize it as a means to improve robustness because profit uncertainty is harmful to a firm only in the negative tail—i.e., when product demand is less than expected —and we avoid penalizing uncertainty that could lead to higher than expected profits.

We apply an $x$-profit metric in conjunction with discrete choice models as a means to incorporate firm risk tolerance into the new product design optimization process. This allows us to develop a framework to find optimal product characteristics and price in a continuous domain, instead of requiring a discrete set of product alternatives; and in contrast to Luo et al. [36] and Besharati et al. [21], we can treat demand uncertainty as a continuous probability distribution instead of representing it as an interval. We use the delta method to derive a closed-form approximation for points on the market share distribution, since a simulation-based approach such as the one used.

---

Table 1 Papers that consider choice model parameter uncertainty as a source of demand uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Treats demand uncertainty as</th>
<th>Design attributes</th>
<th>Design objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hsu and Wilcox [27]</td>
<td>Probability distribution of market share obtained by simulation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo et al. [36]</td>
<td>Interval estimates of market shares obtained using 95% confidence levels for the utility function</td>
<td>Discrete</td>
<td>—Maximize nominal market share —Minimize performance variance —Maximize worst-case performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besharati et al. [21]</td>
<td>Interval estimates of market shares obtained using 95% confidence levels for the utility function</td>
<td>Discrete</td>
<td>—Maximize nominal share —Minimize share variance —Maximize nominal performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>Probability distribution of market share estimated by delta method</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>—Maximize profit at specified downside risk tolerance level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3Though it is possible to conduct sensitivity analysis on the parameters defining the firm’s utility function, misspecification of functional form remains, and interpretation of parametric sensitivity is generally cumbersome.
by Hsu and Wilcox [27], though efficient for estimating the stochastic distribution of a single design, would be computationally expensive and noisy when used as an intermediate function in a numerical optimization loop. Our framework focuses on demand models derived from random utility theory, particularly MNL models [44].

The α-profit methodology can be extended to multinomial probit (MNP) [45], mixed logit (MIXL) [46], and generalized logit (G-MNL) [47] models; however, any functional forms that require numerical simulation to compute may be computationally burdensome and introduce potential numerical issues when embedded within an optimization loop.

3 The Proposed Methodology

We want to find the characteristics of a new product in order to maximize a firm’s profit; however, the uncertainty present in the demand model parameter estimates will result in uncertainty about predicted market share and resulting predicted profit, which we model as a distribution of potential profit outcomes for each design alternative. (A similar framework can also be used for maximizing alternative objective functions, such as market share.)

3.1 General Mathematical Formulation. Our goal is to find the design whose predicted profit distribution maximizes the α-profit: the value below which less than an α fraction of the cumulative profit distribution falls. The parameter α is set by the firm to reflect sensitivity to downside risk (or upside gain), and parametric study of α reveals the sensitivity of optimal design choices to firm risk preference. We define the α-profit \(\pi_\alpha(X)\) as the value of the profit distribution at level α ∈ (0,1) for product \(j\) given some competitive set of \(\hat{b}\) and \(X\), then \(\pi_\alpha(\hat{b}, X)\) is the maximum value of \(\pi_j\) for which \(\pi_j(\hat{b}, X) \leq \alpha\), i.e., for which \(Pr(\pi_j < \pi_\alpha) \leq \alpha\) (see Fig. 1). If \(\pi_j(\hat{b}, X)\) is continuous and invertible, then \(\pi_\alpha(\hat{b}, X) = \pi_j^{-1}(\alpha)\). Our objective is to find the product attributes and price that maximize the robust profit given the α level that reflects firm sensitivity to downside risk. That is, we seek the robust optimal new product characteristics \(x_j^*\) at level \(\alpha\), where \(x_j^*\) = \(\text{argmax}_{x_j} \left(\pi_j(\hat{b}, X)\right)\); i.e., \(x_j^*\) is the design that maximizes the value of profit that the model predicts a \(1 - \alpha\) chance of exceeding. As shown in Fig. 2, the probability density function of profit for two alternative designs. Design 1 is preferred over design 2 when optimizing for the expected value of profit. However, design 1 has more downside risk, and a risk averse firm optimizing for the α-profit with small α would prefer design 2.

Fig. 1 α-profit shown for (a) probability density function of profit and (b) cumulative distribution function of profit

In the Secs. 3.2–4.3, we will show how to find the robust optimal new product attributes, as defined in this section, for the MNL demand model, given uncertainty in the estimated parameters.

3.2 Application to Multinomial Logit Demand Model. We apply the proposed methodology to the MNL model [44] for several reasons: (1) it is among the most simple discrete choice model specifications, permitting closed-form choice probabilities and closed-form expressions for alpha profit in our applications; (2) it is the most widely used discrete choice model broadly and within the NPD literature specifically [14,48,49], due to its closed-form choice probabilities and interpretability [50]; and (3) several discrete choice models evolved from MNL, such as MIXL and G-MNL, and a better understanding of how uncertainty affects NPD under MNL models may be useful in understanding the effects of uncertainty under its variants. For the purposes of this paper, we assume that the model is correct and that the uncertainty arises from the parameter estimation and not model misspecification.

In a multinomial logit model, given some competitive set of \(J\) products, the predicted market share \(s_j\) for product \(j\) can be computed as

\[s_j(x) = \frac{e^{\beta x_j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} e^{\beta x_k}}\]

where \(x = (x_1, ..., x_J)\) is the vector of observable utility point estimates of the respective products and the no-choice option (outside good) is not included.

The utility function is often specified to be linear in parameters: \(v_j = \beta^T x_j\), resulting in predicted market share \(s_j(x)\) for product \(j \in \{1, ..., N\}\) :

\[s_j(x) = \frac{e^{\beta^T x_j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} e^{\beta^T x_k}}\]

Ignoring constant fixed costs without loss of generality, in a multinomial logit demand model the predicted profit \(\pi_j\) can be computed as

\[\pi_j = \int_{s_j(\alpha)}^{\infty} p(s_j) ds_j\]
\[ \pi_j(X) = m(p_j - c_j)s_j(X) = m(p_j - c_j) \frac{e^{\beta^T x_j}}{\sum_{k=1}^{J} e^{\beta^T x_k}} \]  

The classical practice is to use maximum-likelihood methods to estimate the parameters \( \beta \) in multinomial logit models [27]. Train [50] notes that the estimates are easily obtained since the log-likelihood function is concave for linear utility specifications, and Wooldridge [51] proves that the maximum-likelihood estimator \( \hat{\beta} \) is asymptotically normally distributed with distribution \( \hat{\beta} \sim N(\beta, \Sigma) \), where \( \hat{\beta} \) is the vector of means and \( \Sigma \) is the covariance matrix, implying that \( \hat{\beta} \sim N(\beta^T x_j, \Sigma x_j x_j^T) \).

The exact distribution of \( \hat{\beta} \) is unknown, but the delta method enables analytic approximation of a transformed distribution using a linear approximation of the mapping function. This frees us from the computational burden of simulating a market share distribution for each choice of product attributes in the optimization loop, as would be required by the method in Hsu and Wilcox [27]. The delta method states that any function of a normally distributed random variable (in this case the estimated parameters) converges asymptotically to a normal distribution (see Ref. [51] for proof).

The delta method relies on a Taylor series expansion of the mapping function \( g \). If the function of the expected value of the parameters is \( g(\hat{\beta}) \), then \( g(\hat{\beta}) \approx g(\beta) + \nabla g(\beta)(\hat{\beta} - \beta) \) where \( \nabla g(\beta) \) is a row vector. The mean and variance of \( g(\hat{\beta}) \) can be calculated as

\[ E[\hat{g}(\hat{\beta})] \approx E[g(\beta) + \nabla g(\beta)(\hat{\beta} - \beta)] = g(\beta) \]  

\[ \text{Var}[\hat{g}(\hat{\beta})] \approx \text{Var}[g(\beta) + \nabla g(\beta)(\hat{\beta} - \beta)] \]  

\[ = \text{Var}[g(\beta) + \nabla g(\beta)\hat{\beta} - \nabla g(\beta)\beta] \]  

\[ = \text{Var}[\nabla g(\beta)\hat{\beta}] \]  

\[ = \nabla g(\beta)\text{Var}[\hat{\beta}]\nabla g(\beta)^T \]  

\[ = \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \]  

As with any linear approximation to a nonlinear function, the approximation may lead to significant distortion of the function outside the neighborhood of \( g(\beta) \).

The quantity of interest \( s_j \) is itself a function of \( \hat{\beta} \), but \( s_j \in (0, 1) \), which does not match the domain of the normal distribution. Instead, we select the intermediate function \( g(\hat{\beta}) = \ln(1/s_j - 1) \in (-\infty, +\infty) \) so that it has the same domain as a normal distribution and so that in the case of a monopolistic single-product firm with an outside good, the approximation leads to the exact distribution of \( g(\hat{\beta}) \).

\[ g(\hat{\beta}) = \ln(1/s_j - 1) = \ln \left( \frac{\sum_{k \neq j} e^{\beta^T x_k}}{e^{\beta^T x_j}} - 1 \right) = \ln \left( \sum_{k \neq j} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x_j)} \right) \]  

By the delta method, we know that

\[ g(\hat{\beta}) \sim N\left( g(\beta), \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right) \]  

Since

\[ \nabla g(\beta) = \sum_{k \neq j} (x_k - x_j)e^{\beta^T x_k} \]  

we can approximate the variance of \( g \) for any given \( X \). See Appendix A for details and Appendix B for formulation when an outside good is present. Because

\[ s_j < s_j^* \iff \left( \frac{1}{s_j^*} - 1 \right) > \left( \frac{1}{s_j} - 1 \right) \iff g(\hat{\beta}) > \ln \left( \frac{1}{s_j^*} - 1 \right) \]  

we can calculate

\[ \Pr(s_j < s_j^*) = \alpha \iff \Pr(g(\hat{\beta}) > \ln \left( \frac{1}{s_j^*} - 1 \right)) = \alpha \]  

Normalizing the right hand equation

\[ \Rightarrow \Pr \left( \frac{g(\hat{\beta}) - g(\beta)}{\left( \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right)^{1/2}} \leq \frac{g(\beta) - g(\beta) - \ln \left( \frac{1}{s_j} - 1 \right)}{\left( \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right)^{1/2}} \right) = \alpha \]  

Since

\[ \left( \frac{g(\beta) - g(\beta)}{\left( \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right)^{1/2}} \right)^{1/2} \sim N(0, 1) \]  

The probability expression is the cumulative distribution of a standard normal, thus

\[ \Pr(s_j < s_j^*) = \alpha \iff \Phi \left( \frac{g(\beta) - g(\beta) - \ln \left( \frac{1}{s_j} - 1 \right)}{\left( \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right)^{1/2}} \right) = \alpha \]  

where \( \Phi \) is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. Solving for \( s_j^* \)

\[ s_j^* = \left( 1 + \exp \left( g(\hat{\beta}) - \Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \left( \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T \right)^{1/2} \right) \right)^{-1} \]  

Equation (16) enables a modeler to compute the estimated market share at the \( \alpha \) risk level as a closed-form deterministic function of the decision variables using only the mean \( \beta \) and covariance matrix \( \Sigma \) defining the choice model parameter estimates. Both \( \beta \) and \( \Sigma \) are available from standard estimation procedures. The \( x \)-profit can then be computed as \( \pi_x^j = m(p_j - c_j)s_j^* - C_j \). In the special case of a monopolistic single-product firm, this framework leads to the exact distribution of \( g(\hat{\beta}) \), since

\[ g(\hat{\beta}) = \ln(e^{-\beta^T x_j}) \]  

\[ = -\beta^T x_j \sim N(-\beta^T x_j, \nabla g(\beta)\Sigma\nabla g(\beta)^T) \]  

which is identical to the delta method approximation in Eq. (9).

Figure 3 illustrates the mapping for a model with a single parameter showing the normal distribution of the estimated model coefficient \( \beta \), the resulting distribution of \( g(\hat{\beta}) \), its normally distributed approximation via the delta method, and the resulting distribution of \( s_j \) and its (non-normal) approximation via the delta method.

As a result of the delta method formulation, the distribution of \( \hat{s}_j \) depends on the variance of \( g(\hat{\beta}) \), which depends on \( \nabla g \).
Because \( \nabla g \) is proportional to \( \sum_{i \in J_j} (x_i - x_j)^T e^F x_i \), the distribution of \( \hat{\beta} \) is influenced by the distance of the new product’s attributes from each of the attributes of existing products. All else being equal, greater differentiation implies higher uncertainty in market share predictions for the logit specification.

When an outside good is included in the problem formulation, the variance of \( g(\beta) \) additionally depends on the difference between the firm’s product attributes and the reference vector \( \theta \) (see Appendix C for details). This is problematic because the reference level can be arbitrarily chosen. As an example, for a set of products with a temperature attribute, the variance of \( g(\beta) \) differs when temperature is measured in Kelvin with reference level 0 K versus measured in Celsius with reference level 273 K, even though a consumer would not perceive a difference in the product. The form of the logit model imposes a structure of increased uncertainty with distance from competitor attribute levels, and these levels are not meaningful with an outside good. For this reason, the method is recommended only for markets with no outside good, as in the example application.

### 4 Example Application

In this section, we examine the application of the proposed method to the optimal design of a dial-readout bathroom scale for a manufacturer using an engineering model and choice-based conjoint data from the literature [20]. It is assumed that the manufacturer is operating as a single-product firm and that it only produces one product. The variance of \( g(\beta) \) differs when the scale is measured in Kelvin with reference level 0 K versus measured in Celsius with reference level 273 K, even though a consumer would not perceive a difference in the product. The form of the logit model imposes a structure of increased uncertainty with distance from competitor attribute levels, and these levels are not meaningful with an outside good. For this reason, the method is recommended only for markets with no outside good, as in the example application.

#### 4.1 Demand Side

Using the data from Michalek et al. [20], a conjoint survey was administered to 184 respondents. Each respondent was presented with 50 choice sets, consisting of three hypothetical analogue bathroom scales represented by the consumer attributes weight capacity, platform aspect ratio (ratio of length to width), platform area, gap between weight interval tick marks (readability), number size (weight reading), and price. In each choice set, the respondents selected which one of the three scales they would purchase or if they would not purchase any of the three (outside good option). The full data set consists of 250 choice observations, the constant, capacity, capacity2, aspect ratio, aspect ratio2, and price are statistically significant at the 0.01 level and number size is significant at the 0.05 level. The resulting utility curves for \( E(\beta) \) are plotted on top of the utility curves resulting from 500 draws of \( \beta \) from the multivariate normal distribution in Appendix D.

The information matrix obtained from the maximum-likelihood optimization problem is shown in Table 3. The attributes have been scaled for optimization stability and efficiency.

### Table 2 Product characteristic and price levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desc.</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Weight causing a 360 deg dial turn</td>
<td>Lbs</td>
<td>200 250 300 350 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio</td>
<td>Platform length divided by width</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6/8 7/8 8/8 8/7 8/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Platform length times width</td>
<td>in. 2</td>
<td>100 110 120 130 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>Distance between 1-lb tick marks</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>2/32 3/32 4/32 5/32 6/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number size</td>
<td>Length of readout number</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>0.75 1.00 1.25 1.50 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>US dollars</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10 15 20 25 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Source—Michalek et al. [20].

#### Table 3 Multinomial logit model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product attribute</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-stat</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t-stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-21.49</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>-5.07</td>
<td>-12.95</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity/100</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>13.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Capacity/100) 2</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-3.10</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect ratio</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aspect ratio) 2</td>
<td>-8.22</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>-5.44</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area/100</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gap x 10) 2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number size</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number size 2</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price/10</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-5.20</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-39.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results vary depending on which respondents are drawn.*
Table 4  Coefficient variance-covariance matrix for \( n = 250 \) estimation data points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \beta ) const</th>
<th>( \beta ) cap</th>
<th>( \beta ) cap(^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta ) asp</th>
<th>( \beta ) asp(^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta ) area</th>
<th>( \beta ) gap</th>
<th>( \beta ) gap(^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta ) num</th>
<th>( \beta ) num(^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta ) price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-17.97</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-4.48</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.89</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>-15.23</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Michalek et al. [20].

Table 5  Engineering and marketing design variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and description</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_1 ) Capacity</td>
<td>200 lbs</td>
<td>400 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_2 ) Aspect ratio</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_3 ) Platform area</td>
<td>100 in.(^2 )</td>
<td>140 in.(^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_4 ) Number size</td>
<td>0.75 in.</td>
<td>1.75 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p ) Price</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Engineering variables   |             |             |
| \( x_1 \) Length from base to force on long lever | 0.125 in. | 21 in. |
| \( x_2 \) Length from force to spring on long lever | 0.125 in. | 21 in. |
| \( x_3 \) Length from base to force on short lever | 0.125 in. | 24 in. |
| \( x_4 \) Length from force to join on short lever | 0.125 in. | 18.175 in. |
| \( x_5 \) Length from force to joint on long lever | 0.125 in. | 18.175 in. |
| \( x_6 \) Spring constant | 1.00 lb./in. | 200 lb./in. |
| \( x_7 \) Distance from base edge to spring | 0.50 in. | 12 in. |
| \( x_8 \) Length of rack | 1.00 in. | 16.2 in. |
| \( x_9 \) Pitch diameter of pinion | 0.25 in. | 24 in. |
| \( x_{10} \) Length of pivot’s horizontal arm | 0.50 in. | 1.9 in. |
| \( x_{11} \) Length of pivot’s vertical arm | 0.50 in. | 1.9 in. |
| \( x_{12} \) Dial diameter | 1.00 in. | 25 in. |
| \( x_{13} \) Cover length | 5.55 in. | 19 in. |
| \( x_{14} \) Cover width | 7.4 in. | 25 in. |

Note: Adapted from Michalek et al. [20].

Table 6  Product attributes as a function of engineering design variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product attribute ( z )</th>
<th>( f(x) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( z_1 ) (capacity)</td>
<td>( \frac{4x_8x_{19}x_{10}(x_1 + x_2)(x_1 + x_2)}{x_7(x_1 + x_2) + x_1(x_1 + x_3)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_2 ) (aspect ratio)</td>
<td>( x_1x_{13}x_{14} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_3 ) (platform area)</td>
<td>( x_1x_{13}x_{14} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_4 ) (tick mark gap)</td>
<td>( \pi^2x_1x_{12} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( z_5 ) (number size)</td>
<td>( \frac{(x_{13} + x_{12})x_5}{(\tan \frac{\pi}{2} - \tan \frac{\pi}{2})} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Michalek et al. [20].

Table 7  Optimization problem parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( y_1 )</td>
<td>Gap between base and cover</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_2 )</td>
<td>Minimum distance between spring and base</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_3 )</td>
<td>Internal thickness of scale</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_4 )</td>
<td>Minimum pinion pitch diameter</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_5 )</td>
<td>Length of window</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_6 )</td>
<td>Width of window</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_7 )</td>
<td>Distance between top of cover and window</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_8 )</td>
<td>Number of lb measures per tick mark</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_9 )</td>
<td>Horizontal distance between spring and pivot</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_{10} )</td>
<td>Length of tick mark + cap to number</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_{11} )</td>
<td>Number of lbs that number length spans</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_{12} )</td>
<td>Aspect ratio of number (length/width)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_{13} )</td>
<td>Minimum allowable distance of lever at base to centerline</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Michalek et al. [20]
Table 8  Optimal product characteristics for several $z$-levels ($n = 250$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$z_1$ Cap (lbs)</th>
<th>$z_2$ Asp. ratio</th>
<th>$z_3$ Area (in.$^2$)</th>
<th>$z_4$ Gap (in.)</th>
<th>$z_5$ Num. size (in.)</th>
<th>$p$ Price ($)</th>
<th>Market share (%)</th>
<th>Normalized profit ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>22.32</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>23.49</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max $E[\pi]^b$</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Calculated using the delta method approximation.

$^b$Calculated using Monte Carlo simulation.

\[ g_23: (x_4 + x_5) \leq x_{13} - 2y_1 \]
\[ g_{24}: x_5 \leq x_2 \]
\[ g_{25}: x_7 + y_9 + x_{11} + x_8 \leq x_{13} - 2y_1 \]
\[ g_{26}: x_8 \geq (x_{15} - 2y_7 - (\frac{z_1}{2} + y_9) - x_9 - x_{10}) \]
\[ g_{27}: (x_1 + x_{13} - x_{14})^2 \leq (x_{13} - 2y_1 - x_7)^2 + (y_{21}/2) \]
\[ g_{28}: (x_1 + x_{13}) \geq (x_{13} - 2y_1 - x_7)^2 + y_{13} \]

where

\[ s^2 = \left(1 + \exp \left(g(\bar{\beta}) - 0^{-1}(x) \left(\nabla g(\bar{\beta})^T \nabla g(\bar{\beta})\right)^{1/2}\right)\right)^{-1} \]
\[ \bar{g}(\bar{\beta}) = \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^{y_1} e^{g(\bar{\beta})} \right) \]
\[ c_j = 3 \right| (x|_{x_k} = [200, 0.75, 140, 0.1875, 1.75, 5]) \quad (18) \]

MATLAB's \texttt{fmincon} function was used to solve the problem, and the results are summarized in Table 8. In this example, we define the competitor product as comprised of a set of selected attributes from their respective feasible intervals. Consumers choose to buy

![Profit Distribution for Various Alpha-level optima](image)

**Fig. 4** CDF of profit distribution illustrating that different designs are preferred for $z = 0.10$ versus $z = 0.90$ and maximum expected profit for coefficients estimated using $n = 250$ data points.

Table 9  Engineering characteristics for the $z = 10\%$ and $z = 90\%$ optimal products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and description</th>
<th>$z = 0.1$</th>
<th>$z = 0.9$</th>
<th>Exp. value</th>
<th>Lower bound</th>
<th>Upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_1$ Weight capacity</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>200 lbs</td>
<td>400 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_2$ Aspect ratio</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_3$ Platform area</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100 in$^2$</td>
<td>140 in$^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_4$ Tick mark gap</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.0625 in.</td>
<td>0.1875 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z_5$ Number size</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.75 in.</td>
<td>1.75 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ Price</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>33.81</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>$5.00$</td>
<td>$35.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering variables$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_1$ Length from base to force on long lever</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.125 in.</td>
<td>21 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_2$ Length from force to spring on long lever</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>0.125 in.</td>
<td>21 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_3$ Length from base to force on short lever</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>0.125 in.</td>
<td>24 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_4$ Length from force to join on short lever</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.125 in.</td>
<td>18.175 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_5$ Length from force to joint on long lever</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.125 in.</td>
<td>18.175 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_6$ Spring constant</td>
<td>48.66</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>1.0 lb/in.</td>
<td>200 lbs/in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_7$ Distance from base edge to spring</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50 in.</td>
<td>12 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_8$ Length of rack</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.00 in.</td>
<td>16 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_9$ Pitch diameter of pinion</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.25 in.</td>
<td>24 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{10}$ Length of pivot’s horizontal arm</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.50 in.</td>
<td>1.9 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{11}$ Length of pivot’s vertical arm</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.50 in.</td>
<td>1.9 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{12}$ Dial diameter</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00 in.</td>
<td>25 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{13}$ Cover length</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>5.55 in.</td>
<td>19 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{14}$ Cover width</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>7.4 in.</td>
<td>25 in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Optimal engineering variables are nonunique. See Ref. [20] for discussion. Adapted from Michalek et al. [20]
the new scale or the existing product on the market. A single-
competitor market could represent the choice a consumer faces at
a store that stocks only two options due to shelf-space limitations,
and the two-option scenario mitigates issues with independence
from irrelevant alternatives (IIA) restrictions to substitution pat-
terns [50].

Because optimization results are independent of the constants
for fixed cost \( C \) and market size \( m \) we report the normalized profit,
declared as \( sj(p_j/C_0c_j) \), which represents profit for a market size of
one and fixed cost of zero. Profit for other values of these con-
stants can be computed from the normalized profit post hoc. It
should be noted that determining the correct market size is nontri-
vial and a subject of study in the marketing discipline.

Table 8 reveals that as the firm moves away from a risk neutral
position (\( \max E[\pi] \)), either becoming more risk averse (lower \( a \)-
values) or more risk seeking (high \( a \)-values), the expected value
of profit decreases. The firm is sacrificing the expected value of
profit in order to improve profit at the \( a \)-level (e.g., to reduce
downside risk for small \( a \)). The table also shows the results of
maximizing the expected value of profit (labeled \( \max E[\pi] \))
using a numerical simulation of the profit distribution with
50,000 draws from the beta distribution (predrawn to improve ef-
ficiency and stability). Note that the optimal solution using the
expected value of the coefficients \( \bar{\beta} \) (equivalent to setting
\( a = 50 \%) in Table 8; see Eq. (16)) has lower expected profit
than the solution that maximizes expected profit. Note also
that the product optimized for any given \( \pi^\alpha \) has greater profit at
that \( a \) level than the product optimized for \( E[\pi] \) (labeled
\( \argmax(E[\pi]) \)).

The advantage of the proposed delta method approach over a
simulation-based approach is illustrated in the example. While it
takes approximately 1 min to find the optimal solution for a given
\( a \)-level (using multistart with 20 random starting points); it takes
approximately 30 min to find the solution that maximizes the
expected profit using a function that calculates the average profit
based on 50,000 values predrawn from the distribution of the
coefficients using the same 20 starting points.

Figure 4 shows the cumulative profit distribution for \( x^{\alpha} \) at
\( a = 10 \%) and 90 \% and the optimal solution maximizing the
expected profit. The optimal design for \( a = 10 \%) has lower profit
at \( a = 90 \%) and vice versa. Thus, the optimal design depends on a
firm’s sensitivity to risk. A risk averse firm would prefer the
design resulting in the solid-line \( a = 10 \%) curve because there is
less loss associated with downside risk (where loss and upside
are measured relative to expected value and not in absolute dol-
ars). A risk seeking firm would prefer the design resulting in the
dotted-line \( a = 90 \%) curve because it has the greatest upside
potential (fatter tails). The dashed “Max Expected Profit” curve is
the preferred design of a risk neutral firm. Optimal design attrib-
utes are listed in Table 9.

When more data are used to estimate the beta coefficients and
the uncertainty decreases, the optimal product solutions for vari-
umous levels of \( a \) converge to the same design. This is because the
distributions of profit become tighter about the mean and demand uncertainty reduces. In Fig. 5, the $\alpha = 10\%$, 90%, and max expected optimal product profit distributions lie on top of one another. This highlights the fact that our approach deals only with uncertainty of model parameter estimates. Any remaining uncertainty in model misspecification, context variation, respondent representativeness, or other sources of demand uncertainty are not captured here, and additional choice data are sufficient to reduce parametric uncertainty to near zero.

4.4 Assessing the Delta Method Approximation in the Case Study. In order to check the quality of the delta method approximation, we compare the distribution obtained for the optimal design found at $\alpha = 10\%$ using a Monte Carlo simulation vs. the delta method.

First, we take 50,000 draws of the coefficients using the covariance matrix obtained in the logit estimation. We use these simulated draws to find a simulated distribution of the $g$ function (Eq. (9)) and compare it with the delta method approximation. Using the $g$ function distribution, we can also compute the market share distribution since $s_j = \left(1 + e^{(g(x_j) - g(x^-))}/100\right)^{-1}$.

Figures 6 and 7 show, respectively, the comparisons of the simulated $g$ function and market share distributions with those obtained by the delta method. The delta method approximation yields high accuracy in this example.

Table 10 shows the simulated market share at the $\alpha$-levels estimated in the case study using the delta method. The delta method error is small (less than 0.1% for all alpha levels).

5 Conclusions

Uncertainty in consumer choice model predictions implies uncertainty about the profit a given product design would generate. We propose a method for incorporating discrete choice model parameter uncertainty in the decision problem and for determining the optimal design of a product given a specified level of risk tolerance. In the proposed model, the decision maker specifies the level of sensitivity to downside risk by setting $\alpha(0, 1)$. Specifically, $s_j^2$ is defined as the value below which $\alpha$ fraction of the profit distribution $\tilde{\pi}_j$ lies, and the design is optimized to maximize $s_j^2$ rather than the expected value of profit. We apply the delta method to derive an estimated closed-form function for $s_j^2$ in the case of the multinomial logit model. The closed-form function enables the optimization problem to be computationally efficient, and it is preferable over methods requiring a simulation-based approach when applicable.

We demonstrate the method in a simple scale design example, where the delta method is shown to yield a close approximation to the true distribution. We find that the optimal solution varies with $\alpha$, and the optimal solution designed for one $\alpha$-level may be significantly less profitable at another $\alpha$-level. Thus, optimal design choices depend on risk preference. In the example, the delta method allows the optimization problem to be solved an order of magnitude faster than using simulation.

6 Limitations and Future Work

The proposed methodology addresses only the uncertainty of model parameter estimates caused by missing data; therefore, it is useful primarily in situations with limited data where model misspecification can be assumed to be correct, such as some conjoint experiments. Further, the relationship between uncertainty due to missing data and the resulting implications for downside risk of design alternatives can be sensitive to model specification assumptions, such as utility function form and error term specification. For example, the multinomial logit specification exhibits the independence of irrelevant alternatives property, which restricts substitution patterns [50].

The derived approximation for the multinomial logit model can be applied assuming any utility function linear in coefficients (e.g., $U_j = \beta_0 X_j + \beta_1 X_j Y_j + \beta_2 \log X_j$); therefore, it applies to a wide range of utility function specifications. While the $\alpha$ percentile approach can be applied to alternative demand model specifications (e.g., probit, mixed logit), the closed-form approximation of the delta method applies only to the logit model. Future work may expand the method to be used with other choice models (e.g., mixed logit) and address other sources of uncertainty, such as model misspecification.

The delta method approximation was reasonably accurate for the presented case study; however, accuracy will vary with problem details, so similar validation simulations are needed to assess the accuracy of the approximation when applying the method to different data or functional forms.

Nomenclature

c = variable cost
C = fixed cost
$F_x$ = cumulative distribution function of profit estimate
$g$ = mapping function for delta method
$j$ = product index
$J$ = number of products
$m$ = market size
$n$ = number of attributes per product
$p_j$ = price of product $j$
$s_j^*$ = point estimate market share for product $j$
$s_j^*$ = random variable market share estimate for product $j$
$s_j^2$ = market share of product $j$ at risk level $\alpha$
$v$ = vector of point estimates of utility for all products
$v_j$ = random variable observable utility for product $j$
$v_j^*$ = random variable observable utility estimate for product $j$
$x_j$ = column vector of attributes for product $j$
$x_j^*$ = optimal product attributes at level $\alpha$
$X$ = matrix of attributes for all products
$\alpha$ = profit risk tolerance parameter
$\beta = $ column vector of choice model parameter point estimates
$\beta = $ random column vector of choice model parameter estimates
$\beta$ = mean of $\beta$ distribution
$\Sigma$ = covariance matrix of $\beta$ distribution
$s_j^2$ = point estimate of profit for product $j$
$s_j^*$ = random variable profit estimate for product $j$
$s_j^2$ = profit of product $j$ at a level $\alpha$
$\Phi$ = standard normal cumulative distribution function
Appendix A: Derivation of \( V_g \) for a Multinomial Logit Model With No Outside Good

Since \( g(\beta) = \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \right) \)

\[
\nabla g = \nabla \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)}} \nabla \beta \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)}} \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \right) \nabla \beta (\beta^T (x_k - x))
\]

\[
= \sum_{k \in J} (x_k - x) e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k}
\]

Appendix B: Derivation of \( g(\beta) \) and \( V_g \) for a Multinomial Logit Model With Utility of the Outside Good Normalized to 0

\[ s_j = \frac{e^{\beta^T x_k}}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k} + 1} \]

\[
\Rightarrow g(\beta) = \ln \left( \frac{e^{\beta^T x_k} + 1}{e^{\beta^T x_k} - 1} \right)
\]

\[
= \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x} \right)
\]

\[
\Rightarrow \nabla g = \nabla \beta \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x}} \nabla \beta \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x}} \left( \sum_{k \in J} \nabla \beta \left( e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \right) + \nabla \beta \left( e^{-\beta^T x} \right) \right)
\]

\[
= \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} \nabla \beta (\beta^T (x_k - x)) \right) + e^{-\beta^T x} \nabla \beta (-\beta^T x)
\]

\[
= \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (x_k - x)} + e^{-\beta^T x}
\]

Appendix C: Demonstration that the Variance of \( g(\beta) \) is Affected by the Distance of the Products’ Attributes From the Reference Level Only When an Outside Good Option is Present

Let \( x_0 \) be an arbitrary constant vector, \( y_j = x_j + x_0 \), and \( y_k = x_k + x_0 \)

C.1 No Outside Good

\[ g(\beta) = \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k - y_j)} \right) \]

\[ = \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0) - (y_j + x_0)} \right) \]

\[ \nabla g = \sum_{k \in J} \left( y_j - y_k \right) e^{\beta^T y_k} \]

\[ \nabla g = \frac{\sum_{k \in J} \left( x_k + x_0 \right) - (y_j + x_0) e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0)}}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k} e^{\beta^T x_0}} \]

\[ = \frac{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0)}}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k} e^{\beta^T x_0}} \]

C.2 Normalized Outside Good

\[ g(\beta) = \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k - y_j)} + e^{-\beta^T y_j} \right) \]

\[ = \ln \left( \sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0) - (y_j + x_0)} + e^{-\beta^T (y_j + x_0)} \right) \]

\[ \nabla g = \sum_{k \in J} \left( y_j - y_k \right) e^{\beta^T y_k} \]

\[ \nabla g = \frac{\sum_{k \in J} \left( x_k + x_0 \right) - (y_j + x_0) e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0)}}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k} e^{\beta^T x_0}} \]

\[ = \frac{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T (y_k + x_0)}}{\sum_{k \in J} e^{\beta^T x_k} e^{\beta^T x_0}} \]
Appendix D: Part-Worth and Polynomial Utility Functions From the Conjoint Survey for n = 250 Respondents

Fig. 8 (a)–(f) Utility levels
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