ABSTRACT

Mobile games make up the largest segment of the games industry, in terms of revenue as well as players. Hundreds of thousands of games are available with most being free to download and play. In freemium games, revenue is predominantly generated by users making in-game purchases. As only a small fraction of users make purchases, predicting these users and their Customer Lifetime Value are key challenges in Game Analytics and currently barely explored in academic research. Furthermore, while social factors have been shown to be essential for retention in games in general, the impact on retention and monetization in mobile games is unexplored. In this paper, the problem of defining social features in freemium casual mobile games is addressed through a case study with over 200,000 players. The study evaluates the influence of specific types of social interactions typical of casual mobile games, on predictions of premium users and Customer Lifetime Value by applying classifiers and regression models respectively. Results indicate that social activity does not correlate with the tendency to become a premium user, but that social activity increases over time in a cohort.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Mobile games comprise the largest segment of the 100 billion USD games market worldwide [18], having outgrown console and PC games, both in terms of size and growth rate, with hundreds of thousands of mobile games being available. The vast majority of mobile games follow the freemium or Free-to-Play (F2P, FtP) business model, as compared to the retail model utilized by most major commercial titles across not only console and PC platforms but also non-mobile phone handheld platforms. Unlike major commercial titles (“AAA” titles) that carry the largest price tags, F2P games can be
played for free. Players, however, have the option to spend money on In-App Purchases (IAPs) to purchase a wide range of incentives, such as virtual currency, temporary boosts, aesthetic augmentations to the game, and elimination of the presence of advertisements (which are a minor but commonly adopted source of revenue for F2P games) [11, 24].

In F2P games, there is typically a disparity amongst players who spend money on IAPs and those who do not [14, 22, 23, 27]. We will refer to the former as premium players, and the latter as non-premium players following the definition from [23, 26]. Non-premium players comprise the vast majority of F2P players leading to highly imbalanced datasets for prediction in mobile games [14, 23, 27, 32]. Therefore, a key challenge for mobile game developers is not only to reduce player churn and increase retention, but also to convert players from non-premium to premium players. A related goal is to increase the average Customer Lifetime Value (CLTV) [9, 21, 26, 27], since User Acquisition Costs (UAC) have notably increased in recent years for mobile applications. Very recently, UACs have been reported to be continually rising for mobile games, where costs per install regularly rise above 4.50 USD for mobile platforms using iOS, even reaching as high as 5.90 USD in April 2017 [12]. Given the heavy imbalance in player “premiumship”, combined with rising UACs in the market, the capability to identify and predict players’ behavioral outcomes is an integral factor for a mobile game developer’s success. It can inform in-game targeting of advertising, price promotions, game difficulty, and provide critical decision support to marketing/product managers and game designers [14, 23, 26, 27, 32].

Previous work on prediction in mobile games has primarily focused on churn, whereas purchase prediction and CLTV are largely unexplored problems [26]. While social aspects of user behavior in mobile games have been shown to significantly affect retention and revenue, social indicators have not been explored in this context [1]. In most F2P casual mobile games, players have the option to log into the game using social media profiles, and send or receive requests via their contacts to compete against, collaborate with, or simply to receive benefits in the game [15, 16, 31]. Players sending game requests is a form of free advertising for the developers and should be accounted for as an added value to the player [1, 24, 30]. It is therefore of interest to investigate the impact of adding measures of the “social value” of a player to CLTV predictions.

2 CONTRIBUTION
This paper investigates two problems in mobile game analytics in an explorative manner: CLTV prediction modeling and the impact of features describing casual online social interactions in mobile titles on such models. As a case study, we adopt a cohort of players from a casual F2P mobile game published by a leading developer with the features at use being generic to such titles more broadly [23, 27]. The features derive from initial friend requests, forming a connection between players, and subsequent requests or messages between players. These simple social mechanics are common in current casual mobile titles. After a brief exploratory analysis we present binary prediction models of premium and social players. Results indicate that social and premium players rarely overlap, but that predicting both types of behaviors using typical observation windows is possible. The study then extends these results in using regression to predict the monetary value of a player, including social features in the set of predictors. Social features are shown to have minimal impact on this prediction. In summary, the present study advances previous work in the field by moving from churn and purchase prediction to an integrated prediction of CLTV, with an emphasis on social activity as predictor. Results highlight that social players, as defined in the current context of social network requests, and premium players may encompass distinctly different segments in casual mobile games.

3 RELATED WORK
While prediction modeling in freemium games is of commercial value, the vast majority of the work being done at various development and publishing houses is not publicly available [11, 23, 27]. Within published research, there are roughly two dozen publications available that directly target mobile game analytics, with the majority of these focusing on churn prediction. In this section we will thus focus on related work regarding churn, premium prediction, the definition of “social” in a gaming context, and the incorporation of social features through a network of player requests. Due to space constraints, we will focus on the key related works.

Churn Prediction
Churn and retention prediction in games is a recent topic, and even more recent outside of mobile games [28]. Hadiji et al. and Runge et al. [14, 23] formally defined the problem of churn prediction for F2P games, and proposed a range of features to integrate in models, presenting results for cross-game models. Runge et al. and Rothenbuehler et al. [22, 23] predicted the departure of high value players for casual F2P mobile games and investigated churn as a binary classification problem, comparing different classifiers and feature sets with an emphasis on Hidden Markov Models. Drachen et al. [10] introduced rapid prediction of retention using heuristics models, stressing the need to iteratively develop predictions in rapidly changing mobile games. Perianez et al. [19] describe a churn detection procedure using survival
ensembles. Across the recent work on churn prediction in F2P mobile games, the importance of temporal features has been highlighted, e.g. features associated with the number of sessions per time period, the time between sessions, and average duration of sessions [14]. Features related to specific game design were generally reported to be less important for F2P titles than in other types of games, such as sandbox games [14, 23, 28, 32].

Premium and CLTV Prediction
The concept of Customer Lifetime Value has an extensive history in marketing, social media and finance research - among other domains - and is a core metric used for customer selection, segmentation, and marketing resource allocation as well as customer relationship management [21]. Prediction models for CLTV in these sectors build using a variety of models ranging from simple regression to complex machine learning [9]. These models directly inspired Game Analytics to begin adopting the same principles in the mid-2000s when Facebook games and other social media combined with the introduction of widespread mobile platforms provided a wealth of behavioral customer data to game development companies [1, 11, 24].

Within the context of games, Sifa et al. [26] introduced two models for predicting player purchase decisions as a three-step process, obtaining accuracies well over 80% across different observation windows. The authors formulate the process of predicting premium players (predicting that an IAP will take place) as a combination of a classification and a regression problem. Sifa et al. [26] also emphasizes the presence of rarity when analyzing premium players and provide a synthetic oversampling solution to predict rare purchase decisions, which is later combined with deep neural networks for predicting CLTV and recommending players based on their future value ranking [27]. Xie et al. [32] concentrated on predicting first purchases using standard classifiers in combination with a perspective on engagement modeling. To the best knowledge of the authors, there are no publications focused on impacts of social network features in CLTV prediction in games.

Social Network Analysis in Games
The analysis of relations between people has recently become a commonly employed tool outside of games, with online platforms such as Facebook and Twitter providing a direct vehicle for investigation. Prior work has targeted not only analysis of social networks themselves, but also their potential for product recommendation, advertising, and prediction of user behavior. Social Network Analysis (SNA) is less well-represented in games, but has applications in this context, where the value of social relationships to the players and on retention has been documented in a number of studies, e.g. Yee [33], focusing on Massively Multi-player Online Games (MMOs). In the context of eSports, Iosup et al. [17] examined networks in Dota 2 and Starcraft with a specific focus on modeling social structures and Jia et al. [15] introduced networks generated from team-based match data.

Social Analytics Outside Games
There is a substantial amount of research on this topic outside games. To briefly cover a few key references from social media, Weiberg and Berger [30] introduced an extended definition of Customer Lifetime Value named Connected Customer Lifetime Value. It is defined as the present value of the contribution associated with purchases that user plus the present value of the contributions associated with purchases by other users influenced by that user. This perspective on social value is seconded by Solis [29] who highlights the impact of social capital in CLTV. Wu et al. [31] working from a healthcare context, evaluated CLTV for the purpose of customer-specific marketing strategies. The authors developed a CLTV model which includes network influencing opportunities as well as churn risk assessment. The key element is regarding the market as a social network, and thus adding the social influence role of a customer into the CLTV evaluation. Jointly, the work on social value in CLTV contexts outside of games indicate that this is a perspective that bears investigation in games. Given the dearth of publicly available knowledge on the topic, we focus here on investigating and predicting social behavior itself, rather than trying to convert social behavior into a monetary figure.

4 DATASET AND METHODS
The analysis presented here was completed using tracking data of a cohort of over 219,000 players from a Free-to-Play (F2P, Fp) mobile game developed and published by a leading mobile game developer. The title of the game is omitted from this work due to the confidentiality of the data. The game is a casual puzzle game similar to Candy Crush with a Saga-based level progression, paywalls or gates every 20 levels, and offering in-app purchases. The game also includes the option to connect with a Facebook account, a feature that is prevalent among casual social games.

The dataset was obtained in January 2017 and it consists of in-game behavior data for players that installed the game during the same month one year earlier. Three distinct types of behavior were observed: gameplay, purchase, and social. Each of these types of behavior are described by various metrics. Game play behavior consists of a player’s playtime, the number of days that they played the game, the sessions and rounds that they completed (multiple rounds can be played within a
Figure 1: Number of active players over time since game installation for the 219,000 player cohort. The curve shape follows the power law commonly observed in F2P mobile games [14, 23, 32].

Imbalance in Dataset

It is important to understand the retention of players in our dataset. As is common with mobile games, many players “churn” (i.e. stop playing the game) only a few days after installation. However, a small portion of players play the game for many days, sometimes upwards of a year, after installation. The retention curve in Fig. 1 shows the number of active players as a function of time after game install.

It is also important to understand the imbalance present among players with respect to both social and purchase behavior. Only 11 percent of players ever sent a request, and an even smaller portion of players, 2.5 percent, ever made a purchase. Given that a player makes at least one purchase, their first purchase is likely to occur soon after installation. Only 23 percent of first-time purchases occur more than 90 days after installation. First-time requests sent are similar; only 9 percent occur more than 90 days after installation. Fig. 2 shows the cumulative purchase and social request rates across days since install.

There exists a trade-off in the number of purchases a player makes versus the number of requests they send. This is due to the structure of the game our dataset is based on. At certain points throughout the game, players are blocked from moving forward until they either make a purchase, send requests to their friends for help, or wait for a few days. Since purchases and requests can be used for the same purpose, it is rare for a player to have both made a large number of purchases and sent a large number of requests. This is visible on the scatter-plot in Fig. 4 - most players are located near the axes of the plot.

Social Network Features

In order to understand the social behavior of players on a deeper level than just the raw count of requests that they
sent and received, a social network was created connecting players in the cohort. Each player was represented by a node in the network, and requests sent between players were represented by edges. The network formed was sparse, as only 11% of players sent any requests, but analysis of the network was still able to provide insight into player relationships. It was not possible to find any publicly accessible numbers on whether the sparsity of the network is comparable to other casual mobile titles. However, the kinds of social features in the game (i.e. integration with social network accounts, ability to help friends with boosts and in-game resources) are typical of casual mobile titles. Non-casual mobile games such as *Clash of Clans* and *Infinity Blade* can feature more extensive social features, including guild support and group-based activities, and it is possible that the networks are less sparse in such games.

Commonly used network metrics (closeness, degree, betweenness, page-rank, and eigencentrality) were calculated as features for each player. Also, the “number of triangles” that a player belonged to was calculated so that we could see which of the players played the game and utilized its social features with a group of friends.

Table 1 summarizes the features used in our analyses.

**Methods**

We use a two-step process to predict the CLTV of players in our dataset. We first classify whether a player was a premium player or not, followed by predicting the monetary value that the player brings. For our classification task, algorithms such as Random Forests (RF) [4], Extreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) [6], which is an implementation of Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM), Adaptive Boosting (Adaboost) [13], and C5.0 Trees [20] were used. For the regression task, Random Forests and XGBoost were used. Both these tasks were done using an observation window of 7 days. 7 days is broadly used in the F2P game industry as the standard time frame to measure the behavior of a player [11, 24]. Both models were trained on the gameplay, purchase, and social features.

The Machine Learning (ML) algorithms applied are fast to implement for an iterative process, and accessible with proper documentation. Related work on churn prediction in games across industry and academia have explored similar algorithms, and these are adopted here to assist with cross-comparability of results in the domain [6, 14, 23, 26, 27, 32]. Amongst ML algorithms, tree-based methods are seen to be some of the more easily understood methods as they more closely mirror human decision-making. [14, 23]. Previous work has explored CLTV predictions in the mobile gaming space [26, 27] but does not incorporate features that measure the social behavior of players within the game and how that affects the CLTV they bring to the game. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to take the social value into account when it comes to CLTV predictions. The insights presented here are seen as a first step in enabling companies to not only bolster revenue from players through targeted engagement, but also gain insight as to how players interact with each other and how that affects the monetary value they bring.

**5 ANALYSES AND RESULTS**

This section will be split into two major parts - first, we build classification models to identify players as premium or non-premium, as well as social or non-social. We build binary classification models for premium and social, as well as combining them into a four-class classification model. Then, we run regression models to predict CLTV, building further upon the customers we identified in the classification section and compare the results to other customer segmentation methods and heuristics.
Player Classification

Data Selection and Pre-processing: We begin with approaching the problem of classifying players as social or non-social, as well as premium or non-premium. We define a social user as one who has sent at least one request to another person. This is based on the simple structure of social interactions in the game, which again is common in casual mobile titles. This is unlike the pattern in more strongly socially oriented games such as Clash of Clans, which can be played in single-player mode but include incentives to encourage players to form clans, which in turn gives access to further game features. Social requests, whether to form "friend" connections or subsequently to send requests along these connections, are in the current case sent through Facebook. This means that the person receiving a request may or may not be a current player of the game.

We define a premium player as one who has made at least one purchase within the game. In addition to binary classifications (social or not social, premium or not premium), we also combine the premium and social classifications into a four-class classification model: premium only, social only, both premium and social, or neither. The purpose of this four-class model is to enable evaluation of the interaction between the classes.

Given the short life cycle of mobile game players, we use a snapshot as of Day 7 within our dataset (i.e. the observation window used for model training) in order to classify premium and social players within the next week (Days 8 - 14) as well as within each player’s lifetime (Days 8+). These windows are based on temporal windows are common in the publicly available work on mobile churn prediction [14, 23, 26, 32]. Because being a premium or social player is much less common than being non-premium or non-social, there is a huge imbalance in the dataset, as shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

Table 2: Distribution of Premium vs. Non-Premium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Non-Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days 8 - 14</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>57,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 8+</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>56,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Distribution of Social vs. Non-Social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Non-Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days 8 - 14</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>56,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 8+</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>55,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Distribution of Four Class Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Window</th>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days 8 - 14</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 8+</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>54,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification Methodology: Four classification algorithms were utilized, based on consideration of related work as described above. The models were: Random Forest [4], XGBoost [6], Adaboost [13], and C5.0 [20] algorithms. The use of multiple classifiers is common in game analytics and behavioral prediction in general for identifying the best models for a specific task [14, 23, 26]. We randomly split the dataset into training and test sets, then applied SMOTE to the training set only. Because the test set was not rebalanced, we used 50% of the data as the test set in order to capture sufficient amounts of the minority classes to test our model on. All models were subsequently ten-fold cross-validated.

We ran binary classification models for predicting premium players and predicting social players on our two time windows using all four methodologies just mentioned. For the four-class classification, we used Random Forest and XGBoost only, but still used both time windows.

Table 5: Premium Binary Classification Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>AUPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days 8 - 14</td>
<td>Random Forest</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaboost</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XGBoost</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5.0</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days 8+</td>
<td>Random Forest</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaboost</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XGBoost</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5.0</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification Results: The results of the binary classification models are shown in Tables 5 and 6. We display two metrics to evaluate model performance, Area Under the Curve (AUC) and Area Under the Precision-Recall Curve (AUPR). AUC measures the probability that the model will
classify a randomly chosen premium player as premium with more confidence than a randomly chosen non-premium player. However, since our test dataset is highly imbalanced, we also show AUPR which gives a more informative view on performance in such cases of high imbalance [7]. From our results, we can see that either Random Forest or XGBoost performs the best across all cases, which is why we only used those two methods for our four-class classification.

The results of the four-class classification are shown in Table 7. Due to the model being multi-class classification, only accuracy could be obtained as a model evaluation metric. However, Table 8 shows the confusion matrix for the Random Forest model trained on the Days 8 - 14 time window, which gives a better view into which classes the model performs better for. The confusion matrix shows for each actual class (on the columns), what proportion of those players was predicted in each class by the model (on the rows). Therefore, each column sums to 1. We can see that the model excels at predicting players that are Neither (i.e. neither premium nor social) as well as Social Only, whereas it struggles at predicting Premium Only and Both. Because Premium players are a very low proportion of the total playerbase, and Premium and Social players are an even lower proportion of the playerbase, the model cannot identify the decision boundaries for these classes accurately, even with the training dataset rebalanced with SMOTE.

In Fig. 5 and Fig. 6, the variable importance from the Random Forest models (Days 8 - 14) for premium classification and social classification, respectively, are shown. In the premium classification variable importance, we see the most important features are total days played, number of purchases made, and total spent. This result agrees with previous literature that found players who have already made purchases within the game are the most likely to purchase again in the future [26]. On the other end, the social features did not seem to be predictive in the premium classification. This may be due to the sparsity in the network graph.

In the social classification variable importance, we see that the most important features are closeness and degree. However, the other network features were still unimportant in the social classification, which again indicates that the sparsity in the network graph affected those features’ predictive power.

These results provide a new perspective on classification of player types within the context of mobile gaming. While binary classification on premium vs. non-premium players...
has been done before [26], examining social vs. non-social players and combining these classes into a four-class classification has not been explored before. These results could be useful to companies interested in finding the most influential players of its games - those who spend money in addition to having social clout.

CLTV Prediction Using Regression

Data Selection and Pre-processing: To be consistent with all previous classification models, we use same features described in the Dataset section across all regression models as well. Our response variable is each player’s CLTV. In order to relieve some of the issues caused by the skewed distribution of player CLTV (i.e. an extremely long right tail), we alter the CLTV by adding 1 and applying a log transform.

We first subset the players based on their total amount spent. We build our CLTV prediction on players who have spent more than zero dollars on Days 8+ under the assumption that the classification model we developed could already distinguish between free users and paid users. This restriction reduced our sample size down to roughly 57,700 users.

We also look at other subsets of the playerbase in order to remove the assumption that we can completely distinguish between free users and paid users. We decided to use carefully selected segments that filtered out users that were not likely to spend money, as putting these users into the CLTV model would only decrease efficacy of the model. In order to be consistent with the classification models we built, we again use a snapshot as of Day 7 in the dataset and predict CLTV for Days 8+ for these alternative segments. We use four alternative segmentation methods:

- **Heuristic**: Players who have made a purchase in Days 0 - 7.
- **Predicted**: Players who we predicted to be premium on Days 8+ onwards with our best classification model.
- **Combined Users**: Combination of players who have made a purchase in Days 0 - 7 or who we predicted to be premium on Days 8+ (i.e. the union of the Heuristic and Predicted segments).
- **Play Session**: Players who had more than one play session in Days 0 - 7.

To get a better understanding of those four different segmentation methods, Table 9 indicates how many users are selected after each filtering method is applied. An immediate insight we found was since most people have more than one session from Days 0 to 7, this criterion might not help that much. While we still include it in our modeling, we focus more on the first three methods.

CLTV Prediction Methodology: We apply two popular machine learning methods, Random Forest and XGBoost.

We use these two methodologies since they were the best performing for our classification models and we are using the same features. All models were tuned to find the best parameters and ten-fold cross-validated. The same cross-validation partitions were used for each of two methodologies in order to facilitate fair comparison.

CLTV Prediction Results: The results of the models ran for the original segmentation of Days 8+ premium users is shown in Table 10. We use root-mean-square error normalized by the mean of the response variable (NRMSE) as the evaluation metric for each of the models, but show $R^2$ as well for informative purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>No. Players</th>
<th>No. Premium Players</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Session</td>
<td>55,582</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can tell that XGBoost outperformed Random Forest on both NRMSE and $R^2$. Yet, in general the predictive power of these models is not high enough, since the $R^2$ tells us that roughly only 9 percent of the variance can be explained by the model.

Table 11 shows the results of the four alternative segmentation methods. In addition to showing $R^2$ and NRMSE, we also show mean average error normalized by the mean of the response variable (NMAE).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>NRMSE</th>
<th>NMAE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>1.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Session</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across all models, we can see that the Combined Users method has the best performance. Also, Random Forest is
with previous literature, we can see that this result seems to
be better than XGBoost in general. Across all segmentation
methods and model methodologies, the best model is Com-
bined Users using Random Forest. These results show the
importance of choosing an effective segmentation method,
as the performance of any CLTV prediction is severely di-
minished when a segmentation method allows for a majority
of the players to have a CLTV of zero.

Looking deeper at the results of the models, Fig. 7 shows
the variable importance for the general regression on Days
8+ premium users using the Random Forest methodology.
Current Absence Time is the strongest predictor. If we take
a close look at all representing factors, playtime features
and monetary features dominate the plot. This finding is
largely consistent with previous research which has showed
that people who play on a more consistent basis in the first
week and achieve higher levels are much more likely to pay
for the game [23, 26, 27]. Also, playing measures related
to skill, such as Average Moves, Average Stars and Average
Session Duration matter as well, since people may either play
extremely well to unlock further levels of the game or make
a purchase within the game. While all of these results agree
with previous literature, we can see that this result seems to
suggest social features are less relevant to the CLTV of users.
The reason for this again seems to be the sparsity of social
network features. However, these results still contribute
to the research within the context of mobile gaming since
CLTV models with social features as predictors have not
been explored in previous literature. Games where social
and purchasing features complement rather than substitute
each other may find that social features are important to
CLTV prediction.

6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This paper targets two key challenges in mobile game ana-
lytics: a) Predicting the customer lifetime value of a player
(CLTV); b) Evaluating the role of simple online social inter-
actions on retention and CLTV. Results are derived from a
unique dataset of 219,000 players from a F2P casual mobile
title. Game-agnostic features are utilized to facilitate gener-
alization of findings to the broader space of casual social
games [1]. Results can be summarized as follows:

1) We define a social player based on a review of selected
literature and we present a generalizable operationalization
in CLTV prediction for casual mobile games. Our opera-
tional definition is generalizable to other games with simple
social mechanics, but cannot capture the full range of social
interactions possible in titles with complex social mechan-
ics, e.g. Massively Multi-player Online Games (MMOs) or
team-based e-sports titles.

2) We build models for the classification and prediction of
premium and social players. Results indicate that – at least
in the title under investigation here – premium players have
sparse contact with other players, and use IAPs to progress in
the game. Social players, in the sense they are defined here,
rarely convert to premium players, but use social connections
for faster progression in the game. Both types of players
are valuable, but for different reasons: Either they provide
direct revenue contributions or they advertise and potentially
recruit new players through social interaction and online
word-of-mouth.

3) We frame CLTV prediction as a regression problem
and incorporate social features in the prediction from stand-
ard observation windows [14, 26, 27]. Results indicate that
players’ online social interactions have no significant effect
on their purchasing behaviors. The social features analyzed
here do not encompass the range of potential social features
in games, and analysis of games with more complex social
mechanics might provide different results [8, 16].

The present work advances the state-of-the-art in mobile
game analytics by adding CLTV and social perspectives on
top of recent work on churn [14, 23], purchase [26] and CLTV
[27] prediction. Results highlight that social and premium
players can reflect distinctly different play types. It should
also be noted that the multi-class classification approach – i.e.
simultaneously predicting different aspects of player behav-
ior – can be expanded to include other definitions of social
behavior. Furthermore, it can be helpful in understanding
other multi-category behavioral outcomes in mobile games
[25].

Other studies have shown that, in freemium environments
more broadly, social activity drives purchasing [3] and vice
versa [2]. Hence, a key question is: Why do we not find
evidence for such associations in our dataset? Many casual
social games, like the game being analysed here, provide a
social engagement layer that is auxiliary to the core product
and game experience, they e.g. do not offer actual multi-
player gameplay [1]. Commonly, social features in casual
mobile titles are limited to social media account integration
and the sending of requests on the associated social network. Such a somewhat superficial integration and incentivization of social activities may not impact players’ experience sufficiently to be behavior changing and habit inducing.

Summarizing, we explore the role of social behaviors in casual mobile games and their relationship to players’ conversion to premium tiers and CLTV. Results are counterintuitive in showing the non-relevance of social features for purchase and CLTV prediction in casual social games. Prior studies [1] find that added social features, beyond the mere exchange of requests, can substantially drive revenue and engagement of players in casual social games. Game developers should hence strive for social interaction beyond social media account integration to drive revenue generation.

Finally, along these lines, it should be noted that social features are likely to be relevant to the prediction of CLTV in mobile games with deeper social interaction such as Clash of Clans, Mobile Strike or Legendary – Game of Heroes. It remains for future studies to explore CLTV prediction in such games, in further and different casual social games and online social games more broadly.
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