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# TASK 1 – *Clustering: Analysis of Craft Beer Recipe Dataset to isolate preferred IPA recipes and brewing process.*

1. **Definition of Problem**

The objective of this task is to look at publicly available homebrew recipes for craft beer and determine if patterns can be established to isolate the American IPA beer recipes most likely to favour the following characteristics:

* Stronger than average alcohol by volume (ABV).
* Generally, more bitter in taste (scores higher on the ‘International Bittering Units’ – IBU – scale).
* Darker colour (just a personal preference).

A website called the [Brewer’s Friend](https://www.brewersfriend.com/search/) allows homebrew enthusiasts to upload and share their own recipes. A Kaggle project is located here: [Brewer's Friend Beer Recipes | Kaggle](https://www.kaggle.com/jtrofe/beer-recipes), which has scraped most of the recipe information into a dataset of 75,000 records of homebrew beers.

The investigation/output criteria listed in the bullet points above reflect my personal preference. The ideal outcome for this assignment task is to assess if clusters/segments exist in the recipe dataset that represent a brewing process, which I can try out domestically, that is most likely to deliver my desired type of American IPA homebrew beer.

To conduct this analysis, I downloaded the 14Mb homebrew recipe dataset from Kaggle and ran a parallel set of clustering investigations using both SAS Enterprise Miner and a small Python program, written in Jupyter Notebooks.

This complimentary approach allowed me to take advantage of the visual and data outputs from the ‘*Cluster*’ and ‘*Segment Profile*’ nodes in SAS EM, while also having a logical basis for the numbers of clusters chosen – based on the Python code that ran a KMeans analysis on the filtered dataset.

In this task report I will alternate between SAS EM and Python screenshots, depending on which format is best suited to represent information.

1. **Data Exploration & Descriptive Analytics**

*Basic Dataset Dimensions and Quality*

The dimension of the craft beer homebrew recipe dataset is:

* 73, 861 rows
* 23 columns
* 12 numerical features
* 11 categorical columns

A quick Python generated snapshot of the dataset shows the following columns:
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Fig 1. Python – Dataset Dimensions and Colum List

Looking at the attributes in SAS EM provides more detail on data quality:

Table
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Fig 2. SAS EM – EXPLORE View of Dataset Attributes

Looking at the statistics on the homebrew dataset, it does look like data preparation will be required before we attempt to identify clusters out of the data.

*Focus on American IPA First*

This task assignment is only interested in American IPA recipes. Although, at 16% of the dataset, American IPA is the single largest style there are **175** other styles included, such as Belgian Blond Ale, Oatmeal Stout and so on.

A quick filter in SAS EM / Python creates an American IPA dataset, which is identified by a ‘*Style\_Id*’ = 7.
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Fig 3. SAS EM – Filter Only on America IPA

I chose to do this filtering step before any other data analysis and preparation as I am not interested in cleaning up outliers, missing data, or errors for non-American IPA rows.

*Closer Look at Data Quality*

Beer recipe records are user reported in through the Brewer’s Friend website and the quality of numerical data appears to be very good, possibly encouraged by the layout of the data entry webpage. There are some data ranges that look a little suspect, but we will review these specifically in the next section.

The categorical attributes are of a very variable quality. SAS EM reports that there are no missing categorical rows, but it can be seen in Fig. 2 that the most common value for most categorical attributes is ‘N/A’. These attributes largely describe post fermentation activity, and I will return to them in the final stages of this task.

*What Attributes are Important for this Clustering Task?*

Taking the personal preferences for American IPA into account, as described in Section 1, and looking at this very simple diagram of the homebrew process (below), we can identify the key numerical attributes upon which our cluster analysis should be built.

Diagram
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Fig 4. Homebrew Process**[1]**.

* *OG* - The original gravity (sugar content) of the beer post Wort cooldown.
* *FG* - The final gravity (remaining sugar content) of the beer after fermentation.
* *ABV* - Calculated alcohol by volume, determined by difference between OG and FG.
* *IBU* - International Bittering Units, which is how perceptively bitter the beer is.
* *Size* – Amount (in litres) brewed for specific recipe.
* *Colour* – Light to Dark (zero to 40+ scale).
* *Boil Time* - how long the wort was boiled.
* *Efficiency* - how much possible sugars were extracted from the grains.

These of attributes match the general selection used in other clustering Notebooks on Kaggle**[2]**.

*Brief Analysis of Key Clustering Numerical Attributes*

The filtering of the homebrew data to only American IPA has removed several of the more obvious outliers and suspicious data elements, such as beers with ABV values between and very unhealthy 40% - 80%, and bitterness levels at an impossible 1000+ score.

However, there are still a range of changes to make to these features to remove certain skews in the data and to fit within the objectives of this task. These changes are elaborated in the next section.

1. **Data Preparation**

There is no missing data from our required numerical columns in the American IPA sub-dataset, so there is no need to impute or remove rows because of data gaps.

However, using a mixture of domain knowledge and personal preference a certain number of rows will be eliminated based on the following criteria;

* Colour less than 0.5 on the beer colour scale. These rows also correspond to zero/near zero IBU entries. This is practically just water, and presumably an error.
* Efficiency levels above 85%. Values near 100% seem unrealistic for my set-up.
* No recipes aimed at homebrew output greater than 50 litres. This task is not focusing on recipe data for home brew produced at a near industrial levels. There are also some Size values more than 1000 litres that are skewing this data attribute badly.
* IBU values greater than 150. This seems a reasonable threshold in terms of taste but there are also a small range of values stretching from 200 to approximately 1250 that are almost certainly bad data entries and are incorrectly skewing this data element.

Looking at the histograms after the above changes gives us a much more satisfactory set of data elements with which to proceed to the clustering analysis phase of this task.
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Fig 5. SAS EM Post-Data Preparation View of Key Numerical Attributes

This filtering has also ensured that:

* The OG value is less than the desired upper limit of 1.15
* The FG value is always just above 1.00

The OG and FG data points above, along with many of the other numerical attributes, now conform with data range values that an experienced homebrewer would expect to see in a recipe**[2]**.

1. **Details of Algorithms & Configurations**

*Additional Preparation for Cluster Analysis*

Setting up SAS EM for Clustering analysis is relatively straightforward.
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Fig 6. SAS EM Cluster Node Set up

Although it can more correctly be considered part of the Data Preparation process, the numerical data needs to be standardised first before the Cluster Analysis. This is done because for inputs to create clusters they should have similar measurement scales.

In SAS EM it is a simple setting on the ‘Cluster’ node:
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Fig 7. SAS EM Cluster Node Setting for Standardisation

In Python it is a few lines of code. A small segment of data is displayed in this diagram to show the effect of the scaling routines.
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Fig 8. Python Code for Standardisation

*How Many Clusters?*

Running the SAS EM *Cluster* node with the default ‘Automatic’ Specification Method for ‘Numbers of Clusters’ generates nearly **50** clusters in the node results. In practice. this is an unwieldy number with which to work and process into Segment Profiling of the clusters.

The Python code for cluster analysis is being run in parallel to provide us with additional options to determine a logical number of clusters. A scaled dataset has been created in our Python environment and we can feed this into a KMeans algorithm to determine an optimal number of clusters to use in our homebrew analysis.

The Python code sets up an iteration to generate a graph to which we can apply the ‘Elbow Method’ to visually assess the appropriate numbers of clusters we should use.
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Fig 9. Python Code for KMeans

The following graph is generated:

**Chart, line chart
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Fig 10. The Elbow Method Graph

In this diagram we can see the elbow bend between 6 and 8. Thus, the optimal cluster number appears to be **7**.

1. **Model Performance Metrics & Evaluation of Results**

*Adjusting the SAS EM Cluster Node Setting and Reviewing Results*

The *Cluster* node in SAS EM allows us to manually set the number of clusters. We will enter ‘7’ based on the Python output from the previous section.
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Fig 11. SAS EM Cluster Node Setting for User Set Cluster Number

The ‘Results’ output from the *Cluster* node represents the 7 clusters statistically and in a pie chart.
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Fig 12. SAS EM Cluster Node Setting for User Set Cluster Number

Although this gives us a high-level view of the Cluster breakdown, it is necessary to proceed to the *Segment Profile* node to gain a better understanding of how the clusters have been determined.

*Segment Profiles of Interest*

Looking at the results from the *Segment Profile* node we can get a sense of how and why data elements are grouped in each cluster.

For this analysis, the cluster closest to our desired attributes is Cluster **4**. This determination is made based on the graphical results output by the *Segment Profile* node.
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Fig 13. SAS EM Cluster 4 Segment Profile

This red overlay shows the average distribution for the shown attributes. This cluster skews slightly higher on ABV and IBU.

In addition, looking at the ‘Variable Worth’ graph for Cluster 4 it is evident that ABV and IBU are noticeable characteristics in this cluster.
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Fig 14. SAS EM Cluster 4 Segment Profile

*Final Step: Extracting Usable Cluster 4 Recipes*

The *Segment Profile* node labels each dataset row according to its cluster value. The SAS EM diagram has been extended with additional filter nodes to isolate Cluster 4 entries, and then remove any rows that have missing categorical attributes describing the brewing process. Thus the process leaves us with rows from Cluster 4 that have complete brewing instructions.

This final subset of data is downloaded into an XL spreadsheet to provide the basis for further practical homebrew experimentation.
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Fig 15. Extracting Clustered Data into EXCEL

1. **Comparison with other Research & Reflections**

*1 – Feature Engineering with Domain Knowledge*

The Kaggle Notebook by Dereck Bearsong**[3]**, which conducted extensive visualization and analysis of the homebrew recipes was essential to identify erroneous data ranges. This work was informed by a significant amount of domain knowledge and helped pick out values that were skewing inputs to the clustering process. These are discussed in more detail in Section 3 of this task report.

This highlights the advantage of having access to practical experience that can direct feature engineering/data preparation in the machine learning process.

*2 – AI and Craft Beer Recipes*

It was difficult to find specific research beyond Kaggle on the Brewers Friend dataset, but ResearchGate provided access to an article published this year (2021) on AI-techniques to develop machine learning-built IPA recipe templates**[4]**. The source data for this work was also a 70K+ dataset of publicly available craft beer homebrew recipes, which then focused on IPA beers. The concepts were in this research were somewhat challenging to understand, involving seven transformer networks being trained on an end-to-end brew process.

Although I did not take any specific learning from this article into my direct analysis, it gave me confidence that my dataset had significant future AI-driven homebrew potential.

*3 – Malt and Hops: Too many variations.*

A recent study in 2020 by the UCD Geary Institute (Ireland) drew from the Brewers Friend dataset and conducted an analysis of the impact of regional ingredients on beers**[5]**. However, a key difference in the UCD analysis as compared to the Kaggle dataset, is that their scraping of the website also included data on malt and hops content.

An interesting point that this study highlighted with this malt/hops data is that the 70K+ recipes listed in the dataset described names for 4,882 different malts, and 5023 separate Hops. Much of this variation was down to regional naming conventions. Upon further analysis, the dataset has only 170 and 229 genuinely unique malts and hops respectively. This had a material impact on the UCD conclusions around the impact of regional ingredients.

If I were to repeat my American IPA analysis, I would investigate the possibility of scrapping the additional malt and hops values from the Brewers Friend website, and ‘normalise’ the data into a smaller subset of unique numerical values (as in the UCD study). It would be interesting to see if this impacted on the outcome from the IPA Clustering analysis.
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# TASK 2 - *<insert select k Name here e.g. Association Rules Problem>*

1. **Definition of Problem**

Clearly state the problem definition, what type of data mining task is it, where was the data set sourced from, etc.

1. **Data Exploration & Descriptive Analytics**

Include any data insights discovered

1. **Data Preparation**

Include details of any data cleaning, transformations, data enrichment, feature engineering, feature reduction, etc

1. **Details of Algorithms & Configurations**
2. **Model Performance Metrics & Evaluation of Results**
3. **Comparison with other Research**

Compare your results to at least three other researchers (maximum of five) who used the same data set. What lessons did you learning from doing this? How can your work be improved? Did you include any improvements in your work and what impact did it have?

1. **References**

Use the IEEE Referencing style. See this guide for details. <https://libraryguides.vu.edu.au/ieeereferencing/gettingstarted>

# TASK 3 - *<insert select Task Name here e.g. Time Series Analysis Problem>*

1. **Definition of Problem**

Clearly state the problem definition, what type of data mining task is it, where was the data set sourced from, etc.

1. **Data Exploration & Descriptive Analytics**

Include any data insights discovered

1. **Data Preparation**

Include details of any data cleaning, transformations, data enrichment, feature engineering, feature reduction, etc

1. **Details of Algorithms & Configurations**
2. **Model Performance Metrics & Evaluation of Results**
3. **Comparison with other Research**

Compare your results to at least three other researchers (maximum of five) who used the same data set. What lessons did you learning from doing this? How can your work be improved? Did you include any improvements in your work and what impact did it have?

1. **References**

Use the IEEE Referencing style. See this guide for details. <https://libraryguides.vu.edu.au/ieeereferencing/gettingstarted>

# TASK 4 - *<insert select Task Name here e.g. Data Ethical Issues >*

## Task 4-1 : <Title of Case Study)

1. **Overview of problem**
2. **Ethical and Legal Challenges**
3. **Challenges for Data Scientist**
4. **Reflections**
5. **References**

Use one of the commonly used References and Citation formats.

## Task 4-1 : <Title of Case Study)

1. **Overview of problem**
2. **Ethical and Legal Challenges**
3. **Challenges for Data Scientist**
4. **Reflections**
5. **References**

Use one of the commonly used References and Citation formats.