Merging DataFrames

This code snippet is performing a crucial step called **merging** or **joining** two DataFrames: doc\_topics\_df and metadata\_df\_cleaned. Think of DataFrames like tables in a spreadsheet. Each DataFrame holds a collection of data organized in rows and columns.

The goal here is to combine relevant information from these two separate tables into a single, more comprehensive table called merged.

merged = doc\_topics\_df.merge(metadata\_df\_cleaned, left\_index=True, right\_on='ETid', how='left')

* merged: This is the name of the new DataFrame that will store the combined data.
* doc\_topics\_df.merge(...): This initiates the merging process using the merge function on the doc\_topics\_df DataFrame.
* metadata\_df\_cleaned: This specifies the other DataFrame that will be merged with doc\_topics\_df.
* left\_index=True: This indicates that the merge should be performed using the index (row labels) of the doc\_topics\_df as the key.
* right\_on='ETid': This specifies that the merge should use the column named 'ETid' in the metadata\_df\_cleaned DataFrame as the key. It means that rows with matching index values in doc\_topics\_df and 'ETid' values in metadata\_df\_cleaned will be combined.
* how='left': This parameter determines the type of merge to perform. In this case, a 'left' merge means that all rows from the doc\_topics\_df (the 'left' DataFrame) will be included in the merged DataFrame. If there are no matching rows in metadata\_df\_cleaned, the corresponding columns in the merged DataFrame will be filled with missing values (usually NaN).

merged.head()

* This line displays the first few rows (by default, the first 5) of the merged DataFrame. It's a common way to quickly inspect the structure and content of the merged data to ensure it has been combined as intended.

In essence, this code combines document topic information with metadata, likely to analyze relationships between topics and other document attributes (like fines or types). The 'ETid' appears to be a common identifier used to link records from the two original DataFrames.

I hope this explanation makes it clearer! Let me know if you'd like a more detailed breakdown of any specific part.
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Okay, let's explore how to analyze the relationship between the assigned topic and its confidence.

Analyzing Topic and Confidence Relationship

You have data where each document is assigned a dominant topic and a corresponding confidence score. This confidence score, typically between 0 and 1, represents the model's certainty about the assigned topic for that document. A higher confidence suggests the model is more sure about the topic assignment, while a lower confidence indicates more uncertainty.

Here's how you can analyze the relationship:

1. Visual Exploration: Scatter Plots

* **Create a scatter plot:** Plot the confidence score on the x-axis and a relevant metric (e.g., document length, fine amount, or another variable of interest) on the y-axis. Each point represents a document. Use different colors or markers to represent different dominant topics.
* **Observe patterns:** Look for trends or correlations in the scatter plot. Do documents with higher confidence scores tend to have higher or lower values for the metric you're comparing? Are there clusters of documents with specific topics and confidence levels?

library\_add

content\_copy

import seaborn as sns  
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  
  
# Assuming 'merged\_df' contains your data  
sns.scatterplot(data=merged\_df, x='Topic\_Confidence', y='Fine [€]', hue='Dominant\_Topic')  
plt.title('Topic Confidence vs. Fine Amount')  
plt.show()

[Körültekintően használja a kódot](https://g.co/legal/generative-code)

2. Statistical Analysis: Correlation and Hypothesis Testing

* **Calculate correlation:** Compute the correlation coefficient (e.g., Pearson's correlation) between confidence scores and the other metric. This will quantify the strength and direction of the linear relationship between the two variables.
* **Perform hypothesis testing:** If you have specific hypotheses about the relationship (e.g., higher confidence is associated with higher fines), you can conduct statistical tests like t-tests or ANOVA to assess the significance of the observed differences.

library\_add

content\_copy

import scipy.stats as stats  
  
# Assuming 'confidence\_scores' and 'fine\_amounts' are arrays  
correlation, p\_value = stats.pearsonr(confidence\_scores, fine\_amounts)  
print(f"Correlation: {correlation}, p-value: {p\_value}")

[Körültekintően használja a kódot](https://g.co/legal/generative-code)

3. Grouping and Aggregation

* **Group by topic and confidence:** Divide your data into groups based on the dominant topic and confidence levels (e.g., high confidence vs. low confidence).
* **Calculate summary statistics:** Compute statistics like the mean or median of the other metric within each group. This can reveal differences in the distribution of the metric across different topic-confidence combinations.

library\_add

content\_copy

# Assuming 'merged\_df' contains your data  
grouped\_df = merged\_df.groupby(['Dominant\_Topic', pd.cut(merged\_df['Topic\_Confidence'], bins=2, labels=['Low', 'High'])])['Fine [€]'].mean()  
print(grouped\_df)

[Körültekintően használja a kódot](https://g.co/legal/generative-code)

4. Content Analysis

* **Examine documents with varying confidence:** Manually inspect a sample of documents with high and low confidence scores for a given topic. Look for qualitative differences in their content that might explain the variation in confidence. Are there specific keywords, themes, or writing styles associated with higher or lower confidence levels?

**Important Considerations:**

* **Context:** The relationship between topic and confidence can vary depending on your specific dataset and the context of your analysis.
* **Data Size:** Ensure you have sufficient data to draw meaningful conclusions from your analysis.
* **Model Limitations:** Remember that topic models are probabilistic and may not always assign topics with perfect accuracy. Confidence scores reflect the model's uncertainty, but they are not guarantees of correctness.

By combining these approaches, you can gain valuable insights into the relationship between assigned topic and its confidence and understand how it relates to other aspects of your data. Remember to carefully interpret your findings and consider the limitations of the data and methods used.
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Okay, let's discuss some baseline models you can compare your topic model with.

Baseline Models for Topic Modeling Comparison

When evaluating the performance of your topic model (LDA in this case), it's crucial to establish a baseline for comparison. This helps you determine if your model is truly capturing meaningful patterns or just reflecting random noise.

Here are some baseline models you can consider:

1. Random Topic Assignment

* **Method:** Randomly assign each document to a topic, ignoring the actual content.
* **Purpose:** Establishes a lower bound for performance. Your model should significantly outperform this baseline.
* **Metrics:** Compare your model's coherence score, perplexity, or topic diversity to those of the random assignment.
* **Implementation:** You can easily implement this by randomly selecting a topic ID for each document within the range of your desired topic number.

2. Uniform Topic Distribution

* **Method:** Assign each topic to an equal number of documents, regardless of content.
* **Purpose:** Similar to random assignment, but ensures a more balanced distribution of topics.
* **Metrics:** Same as random topic assignment.
* **Implementation:** Divide the total number of documents by the desired number of topics, and assign each topic to that many documents sequentially.

3. Most Frequent Words per Topic

* **Method:** For each topic, select the most frequent words in the entire corpus and assign those as the topic's representative words.
* **Purpose:** Represents a simple, content-based baseline that doesn't involve complex modeling.
* **Metrics:** Compare the top words generated by your model to those of this baseline. Assess the overlap and interpretability of the topics.
* **Implementation:** Use a word frequency counter and select the top N words for each topic.

4. K-Means Clustering

* **Method:** Apply K-Means clustering to document embeddings (e.g., TF-IDF vectors) to group documents into clusters.
* **Purpose:** Offers a non-probabilistic clustering approach to compare with LDA's probabilistic topic assignments.
* **Metrics:** Evaluate clustering performance using metrics like silhouette score or Davies-Bouldin index. Compare the resulting clusters to LDA's topics.
* **Implementation:** Use scikit-learn's KMeans class and your chosen document embeddings.

5. Non-Negative Matrix Factorization (NMF)

* **Method:** Apply NMF to document embeddings to decompose the data into topic and word matrices.
* **Purpose:** A similar matrix factorization approach to LDA, but with different assumptions and constraints.
* **Metrics:** Compare coherence, perplexity, or topic diversity between LDA and NMF models.
* **Implementation:** Use scikit-learn's NMF class and your chosen document embeddings.

**Choosing the Right Baseline**

The most appropriate baseline depends on your specific research question and the type of evaluation you're conducting. Consider the following factors:

* **Model Complexity:** If your model is relatively simple, a basic baseline like random or uniform assignment might suffice. For more complex models, consider using K-Means, NMF, or the most frequent words approach.
* **Evaluation Metrics:** Choose baselines that align with the metrics you're using to evaluate your model. For example, if you're focusing on topic coherence, compare your model's coherence to that of a baseline with interpretable topics.
* **Dataset Characteristics:** Consider the size and complexity of your dataset. For large datasets, more sophisticated baselines might be necessary.

By comparing your topic model to these baselines, you can demonstrate its effectiveness and provide evidence that it's capturing meaningful patterns beyond simple heuristics or random noise. Remember to clearly document your baseline choices and the rationale behind them in your analysis.

I hope this helps you select suitable baselines for your topic model comparison! Let me know if you have any other questions.
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Okay, let's generate code for creating a baseline using random topic assignment and comparing it to your existing LDA model using coherence score.

library\_add

content\_copy

import numpy as np  
from gensim.models import CoherenceModel  
  
# Assuming you have already:  
# - 'lda\_model': Your trained LDA model  
# - 'corpus': Your document-term matrix  
# - 'dictionary': Your vocabulary dictionary  
# - 'texts': Your original document texts (dict)  
  
# 1. Random Topic Assignment  
num\_topics = lda\_model.num\_topics  
num\_documents = len(corpus)  
random\_topics = np.random.randint(0, num\_topics, num\_documents)  
  
# 2. Calculate Coherence for LDA Model  
lda\_coherence\_model = CoherenceModel(model=lda\_model, texts=list(texts.values()), dictionary=dictionary, coherence='c\_v')  
lda\_coherence = lda\_coherence\_model.get\_coherence()  
  
# 3. Calculate Coherence for Random Baseline  
# Create a dummy model with random topic assignments  
class RandomTopicModel:  
    def \_\_init\_\_(self, num\_topics, random\_topics):  
        self.num\_topics = num\_topics  
        self.random\_topics = random\_topics  
  
    def get\_document\_topics(self, bow, minimum\_probability=None):  
        doc\_id = bow[0][0]  # Assuming bow is in the format [(doc\_id, freq), ...]  
        topic\_id = self.random\_topics[doc\_id]  
        return [(topic\_id, 1.0)]  # Assign probability 1.0 to the random topic  
  
random\_topic\_model = RandomTopicModel(num\_topics, random\_topics)  
random\_coherence\_model = CoherenceModel(model=random\_topic\_model, texts=list(texts.values()), dictionary=dictionary, coherence='c\_v')  
random\_coherence = random\_coherence\_model.get\_coherence()  
  
# 4. Compare Coherence Scores  
print(f"LDA Model Coherence: {lda\_coherence}")  
print(f"Random Baseline Coherence: {random\_coherence}")  
  
# You can further visualize the comparison:  
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  
plt.bar(['LDA', 'Random'], [lda\_coherence, random\_coherence])  
plt.title('Topic Model Coherence Comparison')  
plt.ylabel('Coherence Score')  
plt.show()

[Körültekintően használja a kódot](https://g.co/legal/generative-code)

**Explanation:**

1. **Random Topic Assignment:** We generate random topic assignments for each document using np.random.randint.
2. **LDA Coherence:** We calculate the coherence score for your existing LDA model using CoherenceModel.
3. **Random Baseline Coherence:** We create a dummy RandomTopicModel class to simulate the random assignment and calculate its coherence.
4. **Comparison:** We print and visualize the coherence scores of both models.

**Important:**

* This code assumes you have already trained your LDA model and have the necessary variables (lda\_model, corpus, dictionary, texts).
* Adjust num\_topics if it's different in your LDA model.
* The texts variable should be a dictionary where keys are filenames and values are the corresponding document texts.

I hope this helps you establish a baseline and compare it to your LDA model! Let me know if you have any other questions.
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