to be human - always trying to connect numbers with meaning, costs with feelings, the visible with the invisible.

References

1. Diadik, T.V., & Danylenko, V.I. (2023). Stratehii ta taktyky psykholohii marketynhovoi tsinovoi polityky [Strategies and tactics of marketing pricing psychology]. Ekonomikataupravlinniapidpryiemstvamy, (70), 84–88.
2. Kienzler, M. & Kowalkowski, Chr. (2017). Pricing strategy: A review of 22 years of marketing research. Journal of Business Research. 78. 101-110.
3. Monroe, K. B., Rikala, V.-M., & Somervuori, O. (2015). Examining the application of behavioral price research in business-to-business markets. IndustrialMarketingManagement, 44(5), 562–572.

DOI 10.70286/ISU-08.10.2025.006

FROM SNAPSHOT REPORTS TO LIVING MODELS: BUILDING A SYSTEM DYNAMICS SIMULATOR FOR YOUR MARKET

Ivitskiy Igor
Ph.D., Associate Professor
Doctor Ads LTD

Monthly reports freeze behavior in time. Markets do not. A market is a coupled system of stocks, flows, delays, and nonlinear responses in which marketing actions, competitor reactions, and customer learning coevolve. System dynamics models encode this reality by representing accumulations and rates explicitly, which improves explanation and policy testing relative to static dashboards [1], [2]. A workable simulator for a paid-acquisition business can be constructed with a compact state–flow backbone, a small set of empirically grounded response functions, and a calibration procedure that honors uncertainty.

Let x_t denote the state vector at period *t*, for example latent awareness, consideration, and active customer base. Let u_t be observed marketing controls such as channel spend and bid targets, and let z_t capture exogenous drivers such as seasonality or price. A linearized core is often sufficient for policy search:

$x_{t+1} = A\,x_t + B\,u_t + E\,z_t + \varepsilon_t$ where ε_t is process noise. The observable outcomes, such as sessions, leads, or orders, are generated by a measurement map $\mathrm{y_t} = g(x_t)$ with channel-specific saturation and carryover. A practical choice for each channel j is a concave response $\rho_j(s_{j,t}) = \alpha_j(1 - e^{-\beta_j s_{j,t}})$, where α_j is the long-run ceiling and β_j controls diminishing returns. Concavity and distributed lags are well established in contemporary media-mix modeling and can be estimated in hierarchical Bayesian frameworks [5]. Emerging causal MMM approaches further learn the interaction structure among channels rather than assuming it, which reduces specification error in complex portfolios [6].

Stock–flow structure turns common behaviors into equations. For example, a sales base C_t with acquisition and churn is $\mathrm{C_{t+1}} = \mathrm{C_t} + \mathrm{acq_t} - \mathrm{churn_t}$, where acquisition depends on the summed channel responses and conversion efficiency, and churn depends on service quality and price. The principle generalizes to word-of-mouth loops, learning effects in bidding, and competitor entries. Agent-based microfoundations are also defensible when heterogeneity and interaction matter at the micro level; diffusion under social influence is one domain where ABM complements system dynamics [4].

Calibration should be framed as probabilistic inference. Given data $\{y_t, u_t, z_t\}_{t=1}^{T}$, parameters $\theta = \{\mathrm{A, B, E}, \alpha, \beta\}$ are fit by maximizing a penalized likelihood or by full Bayesian estimation. A simple objective is:

$\min_{\theta} \sum_{t=1}^{T} |y_t - \hat{y}_t(\theta)|_2^2 + \lambda \sum_j |\beta_j|$ where $\hat{y}_t(\theta)$ is the simulator's prediction and λ is a regularization weight. Parameters appear with explicit interpretations, which supports governance and scenario critique.

A "living" simulator must support designed experiments. Two examples are informative: (1) a step-test on a single channel isolates β_j by inducing a measurable curvature in marginal response; (2) a portfolio test rotates budget across channels at a fixed total to estimate cross-effects and reallocation efficiency. Portfolio bidding strategies in enterprise accounts are a natural policy layer on top of the response surface, because they translate simulator gradients into budget constraints and risk rules [3].

Validation proceeds from structure to behavior. Structure tests confirm unit consistency and sign expectations in A, B, E. Behavior tests compare simulated impulse responses with observed outcomes after known shocks, such as a scheduled television burst or a documented auction change. Out-of-sample predictive checks complete the loop. The system dynamics literature stresses that policy insights must be robust to parameter uncertainty and alternative plausible structures, not just point fits [1], [2].

The payoffs are tangible. First, the simulator converts scattered metrics into a coherent state estimate x_t, which supports early-warning signals when growth is driven increasingly by reacquisition rather than new-to-brand. Second, counterfactuals such as "shift 15 percent from Video to Generic Search for eight weeks" become testable in silico with credible uncertainty bands. Third, the model clarifies the feasible frontier between growth and efficiency by revealing where marginal returns have already saturated. The approach admits limits. Black-box platforms obscure some mechanisms, and uncontrolled confounding can bias estimates. Recent causal structure learning within MMM mitigates this risk by letting the data inform channel graphs before simulation [6]. In summary, replacing snapshots with a governed, validated, and continuously updated system dynamics simulator yields a decision asset that learns as the market changes, rather than a report that goes stale on delivery [2], [5], [6].

References

1. Sterman J. System dynamics at sixty: the path forward. System Dynamics Review. 2018;34(1–2):5–47. DOI: 10.1002/sdr.1601.
2. Pedeliento G., Mangiò F., Murtas G., Andreini D. Market system dynamics (MSD): A process-oriented review of the literature. AMS Review. 2023;13:173–195. DOI: 10.1007/s13162-023-00260-8.
3. Ivitskiy I. Mastering Google Ads portfolio bid strategies. The Doctor Ads Blog. Available at: https://blog.thedoctorads.com/mastering-google-ads-portfolio-bid-strategies/ (accessed 16 Sep 2025).
4. Rand W., Stummer C. Agent-based modeling of new product market diffusion: an overview of strengths and criticisms. Annals of Operations Research. 2021;305:425–447. DOI: 10.1007/s10479-021-03944-1.
5. Marin J. A new framework for Marketing Mix Modeling: Addressing Channel Influence Bias and Cross-Channel Effects. arXiv preprint. 2023. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2311.05587.
6. Gong C., Yao D., Zhang L., Chen S., Li W., Su Y., Bi J. CausalMMM: Learning causal structure for marketing mix modeling. arXiv preprint. 2024. DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.16728.