

Errata -- Polyhedral Methods for Adaptive Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis

Due to a minor programming error, the specific numbers in the tables should be updated. Overall, the fit statistics improve relative to the published tables. The changes do not affect the basic comparisons among methods and the text of the article remains the same. Details are posted at mitsloan.mit.edu/vc and are available from the authors.

Table 1
Monte Carlo Simulation Results

Magnitude and Heterogeneity			RMSE		Percent Best		Hit Rates		Correlations	
Mag	Het	Question Design	HB	AC	HB	AC	HB	AC	HB	AC
Low	High	random	0.755	0.900	22.9	14.3	0.572	0.558	0.804	0.760
		orthogonal	0.756	0.762	21.6	21.6	0.577	0.579	0.804	0.804
		customized	0.701[†]	0.830	33.4[†]	26.4	0.590[†]	0.581[†]	0.830[†]	0.793
		polyhedral	0.800	0.703[†]	22.1	37.7[†]	0.562	0.584[†]	0.770	0.828[†]
Low	Low	random	0.849	1.158	21.6	13.1	0.456	0.428	0.748	0.644
		orthogonal	0.769[†]	0.894[†]	32.5[†]	27.4	0.470[†]	0.449	0.791[†]	0.727[†]
		customized	0.796	0.984	29.1[†]	37.6[†]	0.465	0.458[†]	0.775	0.723[†]
		polyhedral	0.861	0.938	16.8	21.9	0.453	0.438	0.741	0.703
High	High	random	0.551	0.667	17.6	9.0	0.735	0.711	0.893	0.853
		orthogonal	0.711	0.821	6.3	2.1	0.680	0.659	0.824	0.778
		customized	0.512	0.821	31.8	5.8	0.750	0.638	0.907	0.765
		polyhedral	0.484[†]	0.396[†]	44.3[†]	83.1[†]	0.764[†]	0.793[†]	0.912[†]	0.943[†]
High	Low	random	0.388	0.661	19.5	13.2	0.765	0.680	0.943	0.843
		orthogonal	0.695	0.814	0.7	3.2	0.678	0.637	0.823	0.769
		customized	0.356	1.016	35.9	2.7	0.775	0.515	0.951	0.629
		polyhedral	0.336[†]	0.427[†]	43.9[†]	80.9[†]	0.784[†]	0.754[†]	0.957[†]	0.931[†]

[†] Best or not significantly different than best at $p < 0.05$. Note that lower values of RMSE reflect increased accuracy, while higher values on percent best, hit rates, and correlations denote increased accuracy.

Table 2a
Comparison Summary for Question Design

Magnitude	Heterogeneity	RMSE	% Best	Hit Rates	Correlations
Low	High	Customized Polyhedral	Polyhedral	Customized	Customized Polyhedral
Low	Low	Orthogonal	Orthogonal	Orthogonal	Orthogonal
High	High	Polyhedral	Polyhedral	Polyhedral	Polyhedral
High	Low	Polyhedral	Polyhedral Customized	Polyhedral	Polyhedral

Table 2b
Comparison Summary for Estimation

Magnitude	Heterogeneity	RMSE	% Best	Hit Rates	Correlations
Low	High	AC HB	AC	HB	AC HB
Low	Low	HB	HB	HB	HB
High	High	AC	AC	AC	AC
High	Low	HB	HB	HB	HB

The RMSEs change slightly for the AC-Bayesian Hybrid. The sentence should now read.

Using these theoretical α 's, a convex combination of AC and the population mean provides the best overall estimate (or is not significantly different from the best overall estimate) in all four domains – RMSEs of 0.687, 0.757, 0.386, and 0.338, respectively, the first three are significantly best at the 0.05 level and the last is not significantly different from best ($p > 0.70$).