# SpaceX Launch Prediction and Analysis

Predicting First-Stage Landing
Success using Machine Learning and
Data Analytics

### **Executive Summary**

- This project aims to predict the success of Falcon 9 first-stage landings using machine learning, focusing on optimizing launch costs and operational efficiency for SpaceX. By analyzing historical launch data, we identify patterns that determine whether the first-stage landing will be successful.
- Key Steps:
- 1. Data Collection: SpaceX's API, web scraping from Wikipedia.
- 2. Data Wrangling: Data cleaning and preprocessing.
- 3. Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA): Visualizing key factors.
- 4. Predictive Modeling: Logistic Regression, SVM, Decision Trees, KNN.
- 5. Results: Decision Tree emerged as the best model.

### Introduction

 SpaceX has revolutionized the space industry with the Falcon 9, a reusable rocket designed to reduce launch costs by landing the first stage.

 This project focuses on predicting whether the first stage of Falcon 9 will land successfully.
 Accurate predictions can help optimize
 SpaceX's launch cost-efficiency strategy.

### **Problem Statement**

- SpaceX's Falcon 9 launches cost \$62 million, but reusing the first stage saves a significant amount of money.
- To make SpaceX's operations more efficient, predicting whether the first stage will land successfully is crucial.
- Accurate predictions could help SpaceX achieve cost savings and optimize operations by preventing unsuccessful landings.
- This project aims to develop a model to predict landing success based on historical data and key features like payload, launch site, and booster version.

#### Data Collection Overview

- The data used in this project was collected using two methods:
- 1. SpaceX API: Data was fetched using the SpaceX API, including launch records, payload details, and launch outcomes.
- 2. Web Scraping: Web scraping from Wikipedia to gather Falcon 9 launch records.
- Data from these sources was cleaned, preprocessed, and integrated for analysis and modeling.

#### **API Data Collection Process**

- 1. API Requests: Data was fetched using the SpaceX API with GET requests.
- 2. Data Processing: The API response was decoded using `.json()` and converted to a pandas DataFrame.
- 3. Data Integration: The data was cleaned and merged with additional data scraped from Wikipedia.

 The resulting dataset was used for exploratory analysis and machine learning modeling.

### Web Scraping Overview

- 1. Scraping from Wikipedia: Launch data was scraped from the Falcon 9 Wikipedia page using BeautifulSoup.
- 2. Data Parsing: HTML tables were parsed, and the relevant data (e.g., launch dates, payloads) was extracted.
- 3. Data Conversion: The data was converted into a pandas DataFrame and integrated with the SpaceX API data.
- The combined dataset provided the foundation for the next steps in the project: EDA and machine learning modeling.

# Data Wrangling - Cleaning and Preprocessing

- 1. Missing Values: Missing values were handled by filling or dropping based on the feature.
- 2. Feature Encoding: Categorical features such as launch site and booster version were encoded using one-hot encoding.
- 3. Feature Scaling: Features were scaled to ensure that models could work efficiently.

 After these steps, the dataset was ready for exploratory analysis and model training.

### **Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA)**

 Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA) was performed to uncover relationships in the data. Key findings included:

- Success rate differences between launch sites.
- The impact of payload mass on launch outcomes.
- Yearly success trends and how they correlate with other variables.

### EDA – Success Rate vs Launch Site

 By analyzing launch site data, it was observed that the success rate of landings varied significantly by site. For example, the KSC LC-39A site showed higher success rates compared to other sites.

 Visualizations, such as pie charts, were used to show the success distribution for each site.

## EDA – Payload Mass vs Launch Outcome

 The analysis revealed a correlation between payload mass and the success of the landing. Lighter payloads were often associated with successful landings, while heavier payloads had mixed results.

 This relationship was visualized through scatter plots and bar graphs to make it easier to identify trends.

### **SQL-Based Analysis Overview**

 SQL queries were applied to extract deeper insights from the data, focusing on:

- Launch site success rates.
- Payload mass carried by boosters.
- The correlation between orbit type and landing success.

# SQL Query Example 1 - Successful vs Failed Launches

 A SQL query was used to find the total number of successful and failed launches for each launch site.

- Example query:
- SELECT `Launch Site`, COUNT(\*) AS `Total Launches`, SUM(`Class`) AS `Successful Launches` FROM `spacex\_data` GROUP BY `Launch Site`;
- The results provided insights into which sites had the most successful landings.

# SQL Query Example 2 - Payload Mass by Booster Version

 Another SQL query explored the average payload mass for different booster versions.

- Example query:
- SELECT `Booster Version`, AVG(`Payload Mass (kg)`)
   AS `Average Payload Mass` FROM `spacex\_data`
   GROUP BY `Booster Version`;

 This analysis revealed how payload capacity impacted the likelihood of a successful landing.

# SQL Query Results - Launch Site Success Rate

 The query results highlighted which launch sites had the highest success rates for landing.
 For example, KSC LC-39A had a high success rate of over 90%, while VAFB SLC-4E had a lower rate.

• These results helped identify the most reliable launch sites.

# Interactive Analytics with Folium - Map Overview

 A map was created using Folium to visualize the success rate of launches for each launch site. Each site was marked on the map with a color-coded circle representing success (green) or failure (red).

 The map provided insights into spatial relationships between launch sites and landing success.

## Interactive Analytics with Plotly Dash - Overview

 \*\*Plotly Dash\*\* was used to create an interactive dashboard that visualized the relationship between payload mass and launch success.

- Key features of the dashboard:
- 1. Dropdown menu to select launch site.
- 2. Pie chart to show success vs. failure for each site.
- 3. Scatter plot to analyze payload mass vs launch success.

# Plotly Dash - Launch Site Success Distribution

 A pie chart was created in the dashboard to visualize the success distribution for each launch site.

 This interactive chart allowed users to explore the percentage of successful vs failed launches at each site.

### Plotly Dash - Payload vs Success

 A scatter plot was added to the dashboard to visualize the relationship between Payload Mass (kg) and Launch Success.

 The scatter plot helped identify patterns and correlations between the two features, aiding in predicting success based on payload.

### **Predictive Analysis Overview**

- A machine learning pipeline was implemented to predict whether the Falcon 9 first-stage will land successfully.
- Key classification models used:
- Logistic Regression
- Support Vector Machines (SVM)
- Decision Trees
- K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN)
- The models were trained and evaluated on the dataset to determine the best classifier for the task.

### Logistic Regression Model

 Logistic Regression was used as a baseline classifier to predict landing success.

 Model parameters included regularization strength and the solver type, which were tuned using GridSearchCV.

 Logistic Regression helped establish a baseline for comparison with more complex models.

### **SVM Model**

 Support Vector Machines (SVM) were used to classify landing success with a non-linear kernel.

 SVM was chosen for its robustness in handling highdimensional data and its ability to work well in complex datasets.

 The SVM model showed competitive performance but required careful tuning of kernel parameters.

### **Decision Tree Model**

 Decision Trees were used for classification, where the dataset is split based on feature values to predict the target variable.

 Key hyperparameters were tuned, including tree depth and max features.

 The Decision Tree model provided excellent interpretability and achieved high accuracy.

### K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) Model

 K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) was used to classify landing success based on proximity to nearest data points.

• KNN is a simple algorithm that requires careful tuning of the number of neighbors parameter.

 While KNN performed decently, its accuracy was lower than Decision Trees and SVM.

### Limitations and Challenges

 Despite the comprehensive analysis, some limitations and challenges remain:

- Data Quality: Some missing data points were imputed, but this could impact accuracy.
- Model Complexity: While decision trees performed well, other models like KNN showed lower performance.
- Feature Selection: Some features were not fully explored, and more detailed feature engineering could improve results.

## Future Work – Model Improvement

The model could be improved in several ways:

- Feature Engineering: Including additional features like weather conditions or booster type.
- Hyperparameter Tuning: Further tuning of models to reduce errors and improve prediction accuracy.
- Ensemble Methods: Combining multiple models (e.g., Random Forests, XGBoost) for better performance.

#### Future Work – Additional Features

 Future work could involve integrating additional features such as:

- Weather Data: Including weather conditions during launch could provide more insights.
- Booster Details: Specific details on the boosters used in launches might affect success rates.
- Launch Site Proximity: Distance from certain landmarks might influence launch outcomes.

# Final Thoughts and Acknowledgments

- This project demonstrated the power of data analytics and machine learning to optimize SpaceX's operations.
- Acknowledgments:
- SpaceX for providing the data.
- Tools used: Python, Pandas, Plotly, Scikit-Learn, Folium, SQL.
- The insights gained will contribute to SpaceX's ability to predict landing success and reduce operational costs.