

# BDE Assignment

## Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
2	About the datasets.....	2
3	Data Cleaning and Preparation .....	2
3.1	Parsing the data .....	2
3.2	Understanding the datasets.....	2
3.3	Cleaning the datasets .....	4
4	Merging the datasets .....	5
5	Results .....	7

## 1 Introduction

This documentation outlines a data engineering project aimed at creating a joined dataset from three distinct sources: Google, Facebook, and Website data.

The report was created by Sándor Kolumbán.

A summary presentation of the results is available here: <https://app.pitch.com/app/public/player/41f05329-b0c7-4cb9-98d9-44566e87fdb4>

The code belonging to the assignment is available here: <https://github.com/Explorer-Consulting/Test-Assignment-Exadel-BDE>

## 2 About the datasets

We have three different files for the datasets:

- Facebook\_dataset.csv
- Google\_dataset.csv
- Website\_dataset.csv

These datasets contain some basic information about companies (e.g. Company name, address, categories, phone number, etc.) from different sources.

## 3 Data Cleaning and Preparation

### 3.1 Parsing the data

Reading the datasets was not so straightforward. For the Facebook and Google dataset there were columns which data also contained commas escaped by \ characters, so we had to specify escape character parsing the data. These two datasets also contained some strange values in the 'phone' column, so we had to also tell the pandas to parse the 'phone' column as string. For the website dataset, the data was separated by semicolons.

```
dtype_dict = {
    'phone': str
}

df_facebook = pd.read_csv(path, escapechar='\\', dtype=dtype_dict)
```

Figure 1 Phone numbers must be understood as strings and \ character should be understood as escape character.

### 3.2 Understanding the datasets

After parsing the datasets, deeper understanding of the data structure was obtained by utilizing the `pandas.DataFrame.describe()` method for each dataset, allowing us to examine the fundamental characteristics of the datasets and better comprehend the nature of the data we are working with.

```
>>> FACEBOOK DATASET
Length of the facebook dataset: 72010
Sample from the facebook dataset:
   domain      address      categories      city country_code country_name      description email      link      name      page_type      phone phone_country_code region_code region_name zip_code
4691  elitedirectnetwork.ca 180 kennedy road sout...      NaN      brampton      ca      canada      Elite Direct Netwo...      NaN      NaN      https://elitedirectne...      Elite Direct Netwo...      LocalBusiness      NaN      NaN      on      ontario      NaN
6834  insurance.kansas.gov 1300 sw arrowhead rd,...      NaN      topeka      us      united states      Kansas Insurance Depa...      NaN      NaN      https://insurance.kan...      Kansas Insurance Depa...      Organization      +17852963071      NaN      ks      kansas      66604
11840  gamigos.com      NaN      NaN      NaN      NaN      Solitaire Story Commu...      NaN      NaN      https://gamigos.com      Gamigos      Organization      NaN      NaN      NaN      NaN      NaN
307  atlasworkwear.ca 4727 101 street no, t...      Clothing Stores      edmonton      ca      canada      Atlas Workwear Ltd. F...      NaN      NaN      https://atlasworkwear.ca      Atlas Workwear Ltd.      LocalBusiness      +17802495078      ca      ab      alberta      NaN
71180  robinsonscakery.com      NaN      NaN      NaN      NaN      Robinson's Bakery      NaN      NaN      https://robinsonscale...      Robinson's Bakery      Organization      +14164529856      ca      NaN      NaN      NaN
```

Figure 2 Results of describe() for the Facebook data

In the Facebook dataset, we observed a total of 72,010 records (see Figure 2). It's noteworthy that the 'domain' column was unique across all records, with each row featuring a distinct domain entry. This unique characteristic sets the 'domain' column apart from the others in the dataset and made it a good candidate for joining.

```
>>> GOOGLE DATASET
Length of the google dataset: 356520
Sample from the google dataset:
   address      category      city country_code country_name      name      raw_phone region_code region_name      text zip_code      domain
308121 994 E Altamonte Dr, A...      Funeral Services & Ce...      altamonte springs      us      united states      Baldwin Fairchild Fun...      (407) 831-2031      fl      florida      4.4 (35) - Funeral ho...      32701      dignitymemorial.com
45415 15 Middlewood St, Sal...      Real Estate Rental      salford      gb      united kingdom      New Maker Yards by Ge...      +44 161 589 2600      eng      england      4.7 (26) - Furnished ...      m5 4gp      getliving.com
85703 1369 ME-102, Bar Harb...      Hair Salons      bar harbor      us      united states      Carisa's Salon      (207) 288-9444      me      maine      4.9 (13) - Hair salon...      04609      facebook.com
189613 210-33 26th Ave, Quee...      NaN      queens      NaN      united states      ENT and Allergy Assoc...      210-33 26      ny      new york      4.3 (128) - Otolaryng...      11360      entandallergy.com
228981 150 Oak St, Old Town,...      Middle Schools      old town      us      united states      Leonard Middle School      +1 207-827-3900      me      maine      4.3 (6) - Middle scho...      04468      rsu34.org

[5 rows x 15 columns]

Description of the google dataset:
   address      category      city country_code country_name      name      phone      raw_address      raw_phone region_code region_name      text zip_code      domain
count      330552      304870      311002      304084      311039      356488      323048      ...      311875      328160      310849      310854      353085      273400      356520
unique      282513      470      22200      213      187      353897      285821      ...      140744      293157      678      1508      349054      103062      72010
top      Montreal, Quebec, Canada Clinics - Surgeons & ...      calgary      us      united states      Lincoln Elementary Sc...      +443457223344      Toronto, ON, Canada      +44 345 722 3344      on      ontario      No reviews - Universi...      97239      facebook.com
freq      1111      17229      4591      110803      132132      21      759      ...      1593      748      40046      40045      48      667      71983
```

Figure 3 Results of describe() for the Google data

Within the Google dataset (see Figure 3), we encountered a total of 356,520 records. None of the columns exhibited the characteristics of being both unique and set in every row of the dataset, setting it apart from the Facebook dataset. However, an observation was made regarding the 'domain' column, where the unique count equaled 72,010, precisely matching the number of records in the Facebook dataset. This observation suggests a potential correspondence between the domains in the two datasets, indicating that multiple rows within the Google dataset may share the same domain.

```
>> WEBSITE DATASET
Length of the website dataset: 72018

Sample from the website dataset:
  root_domain domain_suffix language legal_name main_city main_country main_region phone site_name tld s_category
12959 unitedexpress.in in en NaN NaN kurnool india andhra pradesh 9.14E+11 United Express in Shipping Couriers
65329 communitas.ca ca en NaN NaN edmonton canada alberta 17804825467 The Communitas Group ca Housing Programs
17283 mayersanitation.ca ca fr Mayer Gilles R Sanita... lachute canada quebec 16136322581 Mercier Styles ca Garbage Collection & ...
48079 stlawencemarket.com com en NaN NaN toronto canada ontario 14163927219 St. Lawrence Market com Fruit & Vegetable - M...
42150 greenwichbraces.com com NaN NaN NaN greenwich united states connecticut 12038692044 Greenwich Braces com Orthodontists
39537 neweracombatssports.com com en New Era Combat Sports... kanata canada ontario 16135924216 Merivale com Martial Arts Gyms
11488 torontopilatesstudio.com com NaN NaN NaN toronto canada ontario 16475190395 Pilates com Yoga Studios
6971 kringvrienden.nl nl de NaN NaN winkel netherlands north holland 31736135098 Kring Vrienden nl Museums
13565 londonbuildingsolutio... com en London Building Solut... kingston upon thames united kingdom england 4.48E+11 LBS com Home Builders & Renov...
55064 dorland-haighgallery... com en Dorland-Haigh Gallery... wasaga beach canada ontario 19058751751 Dorland-Haigh Galleries com Art Galleries

Description of the website dataset:
  root_domain domain_suffix language legal_name main_city main_country main_region phone site_name tld s_category
count 72017 71980 66826 31989 60966 64869 60933 65640 68714 71757 70634
unique 72017 667 71 30619 9598 294 1114 60853 67541 293 562
top converterman.com com en Blackboard, Inc. toronto canada ontario 4.42E+11 Mysite com Executive, Legislativ...
freq 1 33534 56177 211 3293 37618 20827 651 40 33513 1506
```

Figure 4 Results of describe() for the Website data

We identified 72,018 records within the Website dataset (see Figure 4), which is slightly surpassing the number of records in the Facebook dataset. Similarly to the Facebook dataset, the **domain** column in the Website dataset was unique, and the count of unique domains closely matched those in the other datasets. This consistent pattern of unique domains across the dataset indicates that the **domain** column held distinct values in each dataset and was pivotal in our data analysis.

With the understanding that the **domain** column could serve as the key for joining the dataset, we sought to determine the presence of domains in each of the datasets. Our objective was to assess whether all domains were represented in every dataset and how many times each domain appeared in which dataset.

To achieve this, we counted the occurrence of every domain within each dataset. A portion of the results is given in Figure 5.

Domain	Nr. in google	Nr. in facebook	Nr. in website
facebook.com	71983	1	1
postoffice.co.uk	6010	1	1
instagram.com	5647	1	1
ihg.com	4356	1	1
marriott.com	3979	1	1
hilton.com	3477	1	1
doctolib.fr	3105	1	1
ameripriseadvisors.com	2378	1	1
choicehotels.com	1625	1	1
uhaul.com	1518	1	1
gov.uk	1511	1	1
bit.ly	1486	1	1
spar.co.uk	1428	1	1
411habitation.com	1097	1	1
bestwestern.com	1093	1	1
etsy.com	1054	1	1
dignitymemorial.com	1050	1	1
uchealth.org	1032	1	1
anchorhanover.org.uk	1012	1	1
vagaro.com	992	1	1

Figure 5 Occurrence nr. of domains in various datasets (the list continues).

Our analysis now provides a clear overview of the frequency with which domains are represented in the datasets. It's clear now that only the Google dataset contains domains appearing multiple times.

The multiple occurrences of domains in the Google dataset may have different underlying reasons. So, the next step was to see what is the relationship between entries in the Google dataset sharing the same domain.

Our investigation also extended to examining the differences between the sets of domains in the three datasets, which resulted in the following observations:

- Unique to Google: An empty set, indicating no domain is unique to the Google dataset.
- Unique to Facebook: An empty set, implying no domain is exclusively found in the Facebook dataset.
- Unique to Website: Several unique entries were identified, and all of them were non-domain entries like 'Fitzwilliam NH 03447', 'Avenida Food Hall & Fresh market', 'Paint &', 'MARTIN-LAFLAMME' and others.

These distinctive entries are specific to the Website dataset and are not shared with the other datasets.

### 3.3 Cleaning the datasets

Prior to commencing the dataset integration process, we recognized the need to standardize and prepare the data. To begin this data preparation, we applied the **\_(dataset\_name)** suffix to every column in each of the datasets. The first step involved working with the Google dataset.

In the Google dataset, we encountered non-conforming values within the **address** and **raw\_address** columns. These values included unnecessary information, which we successfully removed using regular expressions (regex), see Figure 6.

```
# Remove the unnecessary part from the address and raw address columns
regex = r'(\d+)\+ years in business . '
df_google['address'] = df_google['address'].str.replace(regex, '', regex=True)
df_google['raw_address'] = df_google['raw_address'].str.replace(regex, '', regex=True)

# Remove quotes from the address columns
regex = r'\".*\"'
df_google['address'] = df_google['address'].str.replace(regex, '', regex=True)
df_google['raw_address'] = df_google['raw_address'].str.replace(regex, '', regex=True)
```

Figure 6 Remove years in business and quotation marks from address fields in Google data

Next, we turned our attention to the **categories** column, where we observed variations in how categories were presented. In order to standardize this data and improve its consistency, we made the decision to separate the category values and transform them into a list of categories within a dedicated column.

```
# split the category column into list of categories
# The categories are separated by a '&', and '-' convert them into a list
df_google['category_list'] = df_google['category'].str.split('&|-| and ')
# strip the values, make them lowercase and sort them
df_google['category_list'] = df_google['category_list'].apply(
    lambda categories: np.sort([category.lower().strip() for category in categories])
)
```

Figure 7 Splitting category information into a list format

We also performed column renaming to establish a more standardized and consistent naming

convention, to ensure that the column names across the datasets followed a uniform pattern, making it easier to work with and integrate the data seamlessly.

Our data cleaning process for the Facebook dataset followed a pattern, like the one for the Google dataset. We maintained consistency in naming conventions by renaming specific columns. The category values were transformed into a list of categories also.

In the Website dataset, we executed transformations akin to those performed in the other datasets. We converted its category column named **s\_category** into a list of categories, and column renaming was applied to standardize the naming conventions as well.

Furthermore, in the Website dataset it was required to determine the most accurate company name, by evaluating and choosing between two of its columns: **legal\_name** and **site\_name**. Following consideration and analysis of the data, we made the decision to prioritize **site\_name** whenever it was available for determining the company name. In most cases it seemed more accurate than the value in the **legal\_name** column, however there may still be room for improvement.

## 4 Joining the datasets

Upon gathering the insights into the data, we quickly determined that joining the datasets based on the **domain** columns was the most logical and effective approach. However, we also recognized the unique challenge posed by the Google dataset, which contained multiple rows for each domain. To successfully address this, we would need to find out a suitable strategy to handle these multiple entries within the Google dataset while integrating it with the others.

Our approach was to merge the datasets based on the **domain** column, creating rows that included the columns of each dataset for every domain entry. Subsequently, we undertook the task of selecting the most accurate values for the final columns that held significance for us, such as **Company Name**, **Address**, **Category**, and more.

In most cases, the values found in the Google dataset proved to be the most suitable and reliable choice for the final columns, so we chose them when they were available. However, in cases where the Google dataset values were not present, we selected the Facebook dataset as our secondary choice, favoring it over the Website dataset.

Of all the columns, two specific columns that required distinct treatment were the **category\_list** and **company\_name** columns.

### 4.1 Category lists

For the **category\_list** column, our approach involved consolidating the content of category lists from all the dataset columns. This method was effective in most cases, allowing us to merge category lists seamlessly.

However, it's important to note that in some instances, we encountered values that did not align with the other category list values (e.g. a business doing car repairs and car part sales was also

marked as yoga studio). As a continuation of the data cleaning process, currently popular LLMs could be asked to determine if there is an outlier in a given category list.

## 4.2 Company name

Resolving the **company\_name** column presented a more complex challenge, primarily due to the data in the Google dataset. In certain rows, the company names in the Google dataset included human names, which could be interpreted as employees or individuals. However, in other cases, there were sub-company names associated with a single domain. Based on this insight we classified domains in the Google dataset in three categories:

- A domain representing a single company, with proper data.
- A domain appearing multiple times, and the multiple occurrences are due to employees or individuals of the same company being recorded multiple times.
- A domain that can be thought of as an aggregator.

The case of aggregator domains (a large number of entries in the Google dataset sharing the same domain) can occur when smaller businesses don't own their own domain and their most visible online presence is under an aggregator domain (like facebook.com).

To achieve this classification, we needed to determine when to rely exclusively on the data from the Google dataset (in case of aggregator domains, i.e. facebook, there is no point in joining data belonging to facebook.com to every small business only visible there) and when to choose the most appropriate value from the available values in all datasets. For this, we looked at the domain count table (Figure 5) and decided that when a domain is encountered more than a specific number (in our case 500), we prioritize using the **company\_name\_google** value whenever it's available. This approach addresses scenarios where multiple companies are associated with a single website, such as in the case of **facebook.com**.

We also had to address the second situation, where the values in the **company\_name** column from the Google dataset appeared to be employee names. To tackle this issue, we implemented a relatively straightforward solution involving the use of a regular expression (regex) to identify titles resembling human names, like M.D., Ph.D., and others. While this method may not be entirely foolproof, it effectively resolves the issue in the majority of cases. There are packages that allow recognition of human names as well, utilizing such a package might improve the detection of such cases.

All other cases were thought of as regular companies, represented by proper entries in the Google dataset, having matching data in other datasets. In order to get an improved version of the Company name, we utilized the **Levenshtein** distance metric. The choice for the company name in the joined dataset was the most central one according to this metric. If not all three datasets contained a company name, then the central one is not uniquely defined, in such cases we prioritized Google over Facebook, and the data from Website was used as last resort.

Following the completion of the joining process, we shifted our focus to address the potential issue of duplicated values, which had not been previously handled. To resolve this, we made the decision to eliminate duplicate entries based on the **address** and **phone** columns.

## 5 Results

In the final stages of this process, we generated two datasets. The first dataset contains all the merged columns from the three original datasets, along with our chosen values. The second dataset contains only the selected values. Both datasets were organized and sorted based on the **domain** column.