Linked in

A/B Testing in Dense Large-Scale Networks: Design and Inference NeurIPS 2020











YeTu



- A violation of Stable Unit Treatment Value Assumption (SUTVA), where Response depends on Own treatment + Neighbors' treatment (**network effect**)
- Average treatment effect (ATE): Average response when the whole population is receiving treatment B - Average response when the whole population is receiving treatment A
- **Incorrect ATE** estimation in **classical A/B testing**, since all neighbors of a treated node are not receiving the same treatment as the treated node

- Most literature on network A/B testing:
 - Graph clustering + cluster-level randomization for treatment assignment
 - Not suitable for dense graphs
- assumption on treatment propagation.
- A two-step approach (OASIS)
 - each experiment unit (by solving a constrained optimization problem)
 - estimating the average treatment effect

Preprint available on arXiv:

P. Nandy, K. Basu, S. Chatterjee, Y. Tu (2020). A/B Testing in Dense Large-Scale Networks: Design and Inference. arXiv:1901.10505.

We present a complementary approach that does not require graph clustering by relies on certain

1. An approximate experimental design to provide a "correct" counterfactual experience to 2. Post-experiment adjustment (via importance sampling) to correct for any leftover bias in

Agenda

- Motivating Example
- Main Assumption
- OASIS
- Empirical Evaluation

A/B Testing Content Recommendation on LinkedIn News Feed

- Every member in the network is a content consumer and a content producer
- Treatment = Content recommendation model
- Response = Member engagement
- Response of a member depends on consumer-side experience (content quality) + producer-side experience (# likes, #comments, ...)
- Producer-side experience (network effect) depends on neighbors' recommendation model (treatment)



The Main Assumption





Step 2: Randomly Choose Nodes to Assign C







with respect to certain constraints controlling the risk of the experiment



Step 4: Run Experiment and Collect Data

Response: $\{Y(\mathbb{A})\}$ and $\{Y(\mathbb{B})\}$

Observed Total Exposure: $\{X(\mathbb{A})\}$ and $\{X(\mathbb{B})\}$

Expected Total Exposure:

$\{X(\mathbb{A})\}$ and $\{X(\mathbb{B})\}$





Step 5: Importance Sampling Correction

Average Treatment Effect:





 $\frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{A} \{Y(A) \frac{fexpected(X(A))}{fobserved(X(A))} \}$

- 1. Randomly assign A and B
- 2. Randomly choose additional nodes X
- 3. Solve a constrained optimization to assign (C) to (X)
- 4. Run experiment and collect data
- 5. Importance sampling correction



- Implemented for LinkedIn Feed experiments and using it for experiments targeted toward creator experience enhancement
- **C** = **A** * boost factors (normalized to have each column sum equals 1)
- Solve a large-scale optimization to get boost factors, where we control risk by setting a lower and an upper bound for boost factors
- Update boost factors regularly to handle dynamic network/treatment
- Correct bias with importance sampling
- See simulation and real-world experiment results in the paper



	Individual Effect	Network Effect	Total Effect
Classical A/B Testing		X	X
OAS + Average Difference		\approx	\approx
OASIS	\checkmark		

Pros:

- Theoretically sound under certain assumptions
- Works well for dense networks
- Can handle multiple treatments simultaneously
- Can handle dynamic networks and dynamic treatments
- the optimization

Cons:

- Relies on a number of assumptions
- Works only for a certain type of experiments
- P. Nandy, K. Basu, S. Chatterjee, Y. Tu. A/B Testing in Dense Large-Scale Networks: Design and Inference. arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.10505, 2019.

Can control the risk of the experiment explicitly by adding constraints in

Thank you

