# **Tasks**

**Learners have to develop a dashboard to support the answers to the following questions and suggestions for places for newer restaurants.**

**Objective Questions**:

1. What is the total no. of tables present in the data?  
     
   There are total **2** tables present in data
2. What is the total no. of attributes present in the data?  
     
   There are total **20** attributes present in data (**Raw Data)**  
   There are total **2** attributes present in data (**country description)**
3. How many categorical columns are there in the data? [Search about categorical and continuous data, and try to answer this question]  
     
   There are total **11** categorical columns present in data (**Raw Data)  
   CountryCode, City, Cuisines, Currency, Has\_Table\_booking, Has\_Online\_delivery, Is\_delivering\_now, Switch\_to\_order\_menu, Price\_range, Votes, Rating**There are **0** categorical column present in data (**country description)**
4. The data consists of some inconsistent and missing values so ensure that the data used for further analysis is cleaned.  
     
   I have removed all the 36 rows where longitude and latitude is 0.  
   Remove values from column average cost for two as it is showing 0. And the price can not be 0, so removing those rows. Removing 18 rows.
5. Using the LookUp functions, fill up the countries in the original data using the country code.  
   =XLOOKUP(C2, 'country description'!$A$2:$A$16, 'country description'!$B$2:$B$16, "Not Available")
6. Create a table to represent the number of restaurants opened in each country.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Country Name* | COUNTA of RestaurantID |
| Australia | 24 |
| Brazil | 60 |
| Canada | 4 |
| India | 8652 |
| Indonesia | 21 |
| New Zealand | 40 |
| Philippines | 22 |
| Qatar | 20 |
| Singapore | 20 |
| South Africa | 60 |
| Sri Lanka | 20 |
| Turkey | 34 |
| United Arab Emirates | 60 |
| United Kingdom | 80 |
| United States of America | 434 |
| **Grand Total** | **9551** |

1. Also, the management wants to look at the number of restaurants opened each year, so provide them with something here.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Datekey\_Opening - Year* | COUNTA of RestaurantID |
| 2010 | 1080 |
| 2011 | 1098 |
| 2012 | 1022 |
| 2013 | 1061 |
| 2014 | 1051 |
| 2015 | 1024 |
| 2016 | 1027 |
| 2017 | 1086 |
| 2018 | 1102 |

1. What is the total number of restaurants in India in the price range of 4?   
   =COUNTIFS(Table6[Country], "India", Table6[Price\_range], 4)  
   **388** total number of restaurants in India in the price range of 4  
     
   The answer is available in Sheet - Objective Q 8
2. What is the average number of voters for the restaurants in each country according to the data?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Country Name* | COUNTA of RestaurantID | AVERAGE of Votes |
| Australia | 24 | 111.4166667 |
| Brazil | 60 | 19.61666667 |
| Canada | 4 | 103 |
| India | 8652 | 137.212552 |
| Indonesia | 21 | 772.0952381 |
| New Zealand | 40 | 243.025 |
| Philippines | 22 | 407.4090909 |
| Qatar | 20 | 163.8 |
| Singapore | 20 | 31.9 |
| South Africa | 60 | 315.1666667 |
| Sri Lanka | 20 | 146.45 |
| Turkey | 34 | 431.4705882 |
| United Arab Emirates | 60 | 493.5166667 |
| United Kingdom | 80 | 205.4875 |
| United States of America | 434 | 428.2211982 |
| **Grand Total** | **9551** | **156.9097477** |

1. Calculate the average rating for all the restaurants that have price\_range < 4 and provide online delivery. Use only the “IF” function, Logical Operators, and Aggregation functions to solve this problem. **[Note: Don’t use Conditional aggregation in this question.]  
     
   =ARRAYFORMULA(AVERAGE(IF((S2:S<4)\*(O2:O= "Yes"),X2:X)))**

**3.27381151**

1. Using Conditional formatting highlight the rows of restaurants that are located in the countries or cities that you’ve suggested to the management for opening new restaurants.   
     
   **=ISNUMBER(MATCH($D2, INDIRECT("'Subjective Question 10'!$A$21:$A$25"), 0), $X2 > 4.2)  
     
   The formula checks if the country in column D exists in the list of suggested countries and if the rating in column X is greater than 4.2. It is used for conditional formatting to highlight rows meeting both criteria.**
2. **Create a new customized price column that consists of the abbreviation/symbol of the currency along with the Average\_cost\_for\_two value. [Use string operations to do this task]**

Step 1. In currency column we get the symbol from currency column

Step 2. Get data of symbol into Rawdata sheet with vlookup formula

=VLOOKUP('Raw Data'!K2, Currency!$B$1:$D$16, 3, FALSE)

Step 3. Use concat formula to get the cost for two with symbol

=IFERROR(TRIM(MID([@Currency], FIND("(", [@Currency]) + 1, FIND(")", [@Currency]) - FIND("(", [@Currency]) - 1)) & [@[Average\_Cost\_for\_two]], "")

1. How can you create an array formula in Excel or Google Sheets to count the number of restaurants listed that do not offer online delivery, are in the lowest price range, and have an average cost for two people less than or equal to 250 Indian Rupees?  
     
   As I am using microsoft excel

This formula calculates the number of restaurants that **do not offer online delivery**, are in the **lowest price range**, and have an **average cost for two less than or equal to ₹250**:

**=COUNTIFS(Sheet1!$N$2:$N$9552, "No", Sheet1!$Q$2:$Q$9552, 1, Sheet1!$T$2:$T$9552, "<=250")**

**1694**

**Subjective Question:**

1. Suggest a few countries where the team can open newer restaurants with lesser competition. Which visualization/technique will you use here to justify the suggestions?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Row Labels** | **Restaurants** | **Average of Rating** |
| Indonesia | 21 | 4.3 |
| New Zealand | 40 | 4.3 |
| Philippines | 22 | 4.5 |
| Qatar | 20 | 4.1 |
| Turkey | 34 | 4.3 |
| Grand Total | 205 | 4.1 |

To identify optimal countries for restaurant expansion with lower competition and high customer satisfaction, we apply a two-step filtering logic:

**Criteria:**

**Threshold Applied:** Countries with fewer than 50 restaurants

**Justification:**

* The dataset includes countries with restaurant counts ranging from as low as 4 to over 8,000.
* Countries like India (8,642), USA (425), and UK (80) are clearly oversaturated and not ideal for market entry.
* Setting a cutoff at < 50 isolates countries that are:
  + Less crowded
  + Easier for new brands to stand out
  + Offer more potential for organic market penetration

This threshold allows us to retain promising yet underserved countries like:

* Indonesia (21)
* Philippines (22)
* Turkey (34)
* New Zealand (40)
* Qatar (20)

It strikes a balance between market potential and competitive intensity.

**🔹 2. High Customer Satisfaction**

**Threshold Applied:** Countries with an average rating greater than 4.0

Justification:

* In the restaurant industry, a rating above 4.0 is seen as an indicator of strong customer satisfaction, food quality, and service standards.
* Using a threshold of > 4.0, rather than ≥ 4.0, helps focus on above-average performers, since the global average in the dataset is ~4.08.
* These markets show positive consumer behavior and are more likely to embrace new brands and quality experiences.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Restaurants** | **Avg. Rating** | **Insight** |
| Philippines | 22 | 4.5 | Highest satisfaction and low saturation. Excellent for market entry. |
| Indonesia | 21 | 4.3 | High satisfaction with manageable competition. Strong potential. |
| Turkey | 34 | 4.3 | Balanced opportunity — decent size, high satisfaction. |
| New Zealand | 40 | 4.3 | Close to the competition threshold but with strong customer sentiment. |
| Qatar | 20 | 4.06 | Smaller market with a receptive audience — ideal for niche offerings. |

**Insights:**

* **Indonesia** (21 restaurants, 4.3 rating): High satisfaction, low saturation — ideal for growth.
* **Philippines** (22 restaurants, 4.5 rating): Highest rating, very promising for expansion.
* **Qatar** (20 restaurants, 4.1 rating): Smaller market, but customers respond well.

### **Recommendations**

### **Expand in the Philippines**

### Why: Highest customer satisfaction (4.5) with only 22 restaurants.

### Action: Launch flagship store in major cities (e.g., Manila, Cebu) with localized menus and strong marketing.

### **Target Indonesia and Turkey for Scalable Growth**

### Indonesia: High acceptance and low competition — ideal for franchise partnerships.

### Turkey: Balanced and growing market — suitable for urban expansion with scalable formats.

### **Explore New Zealand and Qatar as Secondary Markets**

### New Zealand: Slightly higher competition, but high satisfaction allows for selective premium expansion.

### Qatar: Promising small market — great for boutique or experiential dining models.

**Conclusion**

By applying smart filters (< 50 restaurants and > 4.0 rating), we identified five countries—  
🔹 Philippines, 🔹 Indonesia, 🔹 Turkey, 🔹 New Zealand, 🔹 Qatar—as ideal for restaurant expansion.

**These countries combine:**

* Low market saturation
* High customer satisfaction
* Cultural receptiveness to new brands

1. **Come up with the names of States and cities in the suggested countries suitable for opening restaurants.**

**Approach & Justified Criteria**

To identify suitable cities for restaurant expansion, we analyzed **location-level data** using two key factors derived from actual metrics:

**1. Low Restaurant Density**

* Measured by the **Count of RestaurantID** in each city.
* Fewer restaurants indicate **less competition**, making it easier to gain **market visibility and customer loyalty**.

**2. Customer Affordability / Market Potential**

* Evaluated using **Sum of Average Cost for Two (in ₹)**.
* A higher spend indicates cities with **stronger purchasing power** or **appetite for dining out**.
* Especially important in countries with **high average customer satisfaction** (as seen in earlier analysis).

**Based on previous analysis and refined with city-level data:**

* Philippines
* Indonesia
* Turkey
* Qatar
* New Zealand

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **City** | **Restaurant Count** | **Avg. Cost for Two (₹)** | **Observations** |
| **Philippines** | **Pasay City** | 3 | ₹61,000 | High spend; opportunity for premium formats |
|  | **Mandaluyong City** | 4 | ₹48,800 | Strong urban hub; high value per outlet |
|  | **Taguig City** | 4 | ₹42,090 | High-income area; ideal for upscale casual |
|  | **Pasig City** | 3 | ₹17,080 | Urban with moderate saturation and decent spend |
| **Indonesia** | **Jakarta** | 16 | ₹25,168.5 | Largest urban market; scalable and profitable |
|  | **Bogor** | 2 | ₹1,632 | Low cost, early-entry opportunity |
|  | **Tangerang** | 2 | ₹2,550 | Suburban expansion potential |
| **Turkey** | **Istanbul** | 14 | ₹2,964 | Cultural capital; opportunity for brand presence |
|  | **Ankara** | 20 | ₹4,537 | Political capital with mid-range affordability |
| **Qatar** | **Doha** | 20 | ₹1,02,030 | Extremely high cost; luxury or fine dining potential |
| **New Zealand** | **Wellington City** | 20 | ₹71,962.5 | High purchasing power; ideal for premium positioning |
|  | **Auckland** | 20 | ₹68,932.5 | Large urban market with strong spend culture |

**Insights by Country Strategy**

**Philippines –** High-Value Urban Strategy

* Cities: Pasay, Taguig, Mandaluyong, Pasig
* Why:
  + Strong customer demand and high spending capacity
  + Mid-to-low competition (3–4 restaurants/city)
* Strategy: Launch premium casual or fine dining outlets in metro areas; tap into office hubs and malls

**Indonesia –** Balanced Urban-Suburban Mix

* Cities: Jakarta, Bogor, Tangerang
* Why:
  + Jakarta is ideal for scalable formats
  + Bogor and Tangerang offer first-mover advantage
* Strategy: Use tiered expansion — main brand in Jakarta, test low-cost formats in satellite towns

**Turkey –** Brand Visibility Hubs

* Cities: Istanbul, Ankara
* Why:
  + High footfall, central to business and tourism
  + Mid-range affordability; moderate saturation
* Strategy: Focus on culturally localized formats, market with experience-based offerings

**Qatar –** Premium Dining Play

* City: Doha
* Why:
  + ₹1,02,030 average cost for two — very high purchasing power
  + Market suited for exclusive or luxury dining
* Strategy: Launch boutique fine-dining or premium global fusion restaurants

**New Zealand –** Affluent Urban Entry

* Cities: Wellington City, Auckland
* Why:
  + Both cities show very high average cost for two (₹68K–₹72K)
  + Indicates strong dining culture and affordability
* Strategy: Position premium or upscale casual formats, starting with central business districts

**Recommendations:**

1. **Philippines (Metro High-Spend Strategy)**
   * Focus on **Pasay, Taguig, Mandaluyong** for flagship urban restaurants.
   * Emphasize **local ingredients, upscale ambience**, and **family-oriented formats**.
2. **Indonesia (Mixed Urban-Rising Towns Strategy)**
   * Launch in **Jakarta** with standard formats.
   * Pilot **compact or cloud kitchen models** in **Bogor** and **Tangerang** for price-sensitive segments.
3. **Turkey (Mid-tier Cultural Strategy)**
   * Set up in **Istanbul and Ankara**, targeting **young professionals and tourists**.
   * Integrate **Turkish fusion themes** with international concepts.
4. **Qatar (Luxury Strategy)**
   * Doha presents a **premium pricing opportunity**.
   * Best suited for **exclusive experiences**, e.g., chef-driven or themed dining.
5. **New Zealand (Urban Premium Entry)**
   * Enter through **Wellington and Auckland** with **well-branded, upscale restaurants**.
   * Prioritize **menu innovation**, **ambience**, and **loyalty programs**.

**Conclusion**

By combining restaurant count and average customer spend, we identified cities where:

* Customer affordability is high
* Market saturation is still manageable

This allows the brand to pursue a hybrid expansion strategy:

* Urban metro launches in the Philippines and Indonesia
* Boutique upscale positioning in Qatar and New Zealand
* Culturally adaptable growth in Turkey

Each city offers unique positioning — from premium lifestyle brands to affordable everyday dining, enabling both growth and differentiation.

1. According to the countries you suggested, what is the current quality regarding ratings for restaurants that are open there?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Row Labels** | **Average of Rating** |
| Australia | 3.7 |
| Canada | 3.6 |
| Indonesia | 4.3 |
| Philippines | 4.5 |
| Qatar | 4.1 |
| Singapore | 3.6 |
| Sri Lanka | 3.9 |
| **Grand Total** | **4.0** |

Among the suggested countries for expansion, **the Philippines (4.47)**, **Turkey (4.3)**, **Indonesia (4.29)**, and **New Zealand (4.26)** stand out with the **highest average ratings**, indicating strong customer satisfaction. These countries also offer **moderate restaurant counts**, suggesting less saturated markets. On the other hand, **Australia (3.66)**, **Singapore (3.58)**, and **Canada (3.58)** have relatively **lower average ratings**, which may indicate a more competitive or less satisfied market. Overall, the data supports prioritizing **high-rating countries** with **lower competition** for strategic restaurant expansion.

1. Also, what is the current expenditure on food in the suggested countries, so we can keep our financial expenditure in control?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Average\_Cost\_for\_two\_RS** |
| Australia | 2074 |
| Canada | 3121 |
| Indonesia | 1434 |
| Philippines | 9802 |
| Qatar | 5102 |
| Singapore | 13410 |
| Sri Lanka | 641 |
| **Grand Total** | **5275** |

To maintain financial discipline during expansion, we analyzed the **average food expenditure (Rs Conversion)** in the recommended countries. The data shows that:

* **Turkey (₹220.62)** and **Sri Lanka (₹641.25)** have the **lowest average cost**, making them extremely cost-effective markets.
* **Indonesia (₹1,434.07)** and **Australia (₹2,073.58)** offer **moderate average prices**, balancing affordability and market potential.
* **Canada (₹3,121.13)** and **New Zealand (₹3,522.38)** are on the higher end of the acceptable price range but remain within the ₹4,000 threshold.
* Conversely, **Philippines (₹9,801.59)**, **Qatar (₹5,101.50)**, and **Singapore (₹13,410.08)** show **significantly higher food expenditure**, which could challenge affordability and pricing strategies.

For cost-effective expansion, prioritize **Turkey**, **Sri Lanka**, and **Indonesia**, where average food costs are significantly lower. These markets allow for strategic pricing, better margins, and easier affordability for a broader customer base.

1. Come up with the names of restaurants from the recommended states that are our biggest competitors and also those that are rated in the lower brackets, i.e. 1-2 or 2-3.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **City** | **Count of RestaurantID** | **Average of Rating** |
| Montville | 1 | 2.4 |
| Paynesville | 1 | 2.6 |
| Mayfield | 1 | 2.9 |
| **Grand Total** | **3** | **2.633333333** |

### **Competitive Landscape & Low-Rated Players in Suggested Countries**

Based on our analysis of top recommended countries—**Indonesia, New Zealand, Philippines, and Turkey**—we identified **key competitors** and **low-rated outliers** in terms of restaurant ratings.

#### **Biggest Competitors (High Ratings ≥ 4.5)**

These restaurants are established players with strong customer loyalty, high visibility, and consistent quality. Competing in markets where they operate may require unique value propositions:

* **New Zealand**: Baduzzi, Depot Eatery and Oyster Bar, Federal Delicatessen, Giapo, Miann, Milse, The Hangar
* **Turkey**: Draft Gastro Pub, Gaga Manjero, Hattena Hatay Sofrası, Karaköy Güllüoğlu, Meşhur Özçelik Aspava, Pizza Al Forno, Starbucks
* **Philippines**: Le Petit Soufflé, Locavore, NIU by Vikings, Ooma, Sambo Kojin, Silantro Fil-Mex, Spiral - Sofitel, Satoo
* **Indonesia**: Sushi Masa, Talaga Sampireun, Union Deli

These restaurants represent **established competition**, so entering these markets will require **strong branding, localized menus**, and **competitive pricing**.

#### **Low-Rated Competitor (Rating 1-3)**

Only **one restaurant** falls under the lower rating bracket (1–3):

* **De Fontein Belgian Beer Cafe** *(New Zealand)* – **Rating: 2.3**

This restaurant presents an **opportunity zone** where we could **capture dissatisfied customers** with better quality, service, and pricing.

### **Conclusion:**

While countries like **New Zealand** and **Turkey** have notable competitors, **opportunities exist in cities where even well-known brands have mixed ratings**. Strategic entry with targeted offerings could help capitalize on service gaps and customer expectations.

1. Which cuisines should we focus on in the newer restaurants to get better feedback? Does the choice of cuisines affect the restaurant ratings?

To evaluate which cuisines are best suited for newer restaurant openings, we analyzed cuisine performance across various countries using two key metrics:

* **Average rating** (as a proxy for customer satisfaction)
* **Restaurant count** (to ensure reliability of ratings)

We filtered the dataset to include only those cuisines with **more than 10 restaurants**, ensuring that the feedback is based on a statistically relevant sample size. The analysis spans countries such as **United Arab Emirates, India, New Zealand, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Cuisines** | **Average of Rating** | **Count of RestaurantID** |
| United Arab Emirates | Indian | 4.4 | 25 |
| India | Modern Indian | 4.3 | 16 |
| New Zealand | Cafe | 4.3 | 14 |
| South Africa | Cafe | 4.2 | 12 |
| United Arab Emirates | American | 4.2 | 11 |
| United Kingdom | British | 4.2 | 12 |
| United States of America | Desserts | 4.2 | 19 |
| United States of America | International | 4.1 | 12 |
| United Kingdom | Indian | 4.1 | 17 |
| United States of America | Southern | 4.1 | 24 |
|  |  |  |  |

* **Indian cuisine** stands out as a top performer in the UAE and UK, with high average ratings and wide acceptance.
* **Cafe-style formats** have performed consistently well in both **New Zealand and South Africa**, indicating a strong preference for casual and comfort-driven dining.
* **Desserts** and **Southern cuisine** have emerged as highly rated categories in the **United States**, showing potential for niche positioning in those markets.
* **Modern Indian cuisine** is a rising trend in **India**, combining tradition with innovation, and achieving strong customer appreciation.

**Conclusion:**

Yes, the **choice of cuisine significantly affects restaurant ratings**.  
Cuisines like **Indian, Cafe, Modern Indian, and Desserts** show consistently higher average ratings in their respective countries. For newer restaurant launches, focusing on these high-performing cuisines is likely to result in **better customer feedback, stronger brand perception, and faster market traction**.

**Recommendation:**

* **Align menu offerings with regional preferences.** For instance, focus on Indian cuisine in UAE and UK, Cafe-style dining in South Africa and New Zealand, and desserts in the U.S.
* **Prioritize cuisines with both high ratings and strong presence**, ensuring the feedback is reliable and scalable.
* **Use this cuisine-based insight to guide menu engineering, marketing, and onboarding of food partners** in new locations.

1. According to our current data, should we go for online delivery and table booking? Does that affect the customer’s ratings?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Restaurants** | **Table Booking** |  |  | **Restaurants** | **Online Booking** |  |
| **Country** | **No** | **Yes** |  | **Country** | **No** | **Yes** |
| Australia | 24 | 0 |  | Australia | 24 | 0 |
| Canada | 4 | 0 |  | Canada | 4 | 0 |
| Indonesia | 21 | 0 |  | Indonesia | 21 | 0 |
| Philippines | 8 | 14 |  | Philippines | 22 | 0 |
| Qatar | 19 | 1 |  | Qatar | 20 | 0 |
| Singapore | 20 | 0 |  | Singapore | 20 | 0 |
| Sri Lanka | 20 | 0 |  | Sri Lanka | 20 | 0 |

Our current data reveals a clear trend:

* Restaurants **without** online delivery or table booking have the **lowest average rating** of **2.68**.
* Introducing **table booking alone** improves ratings to **3.41**, while **online delivery alone** raises it to **3.22**.
* When **both services are offered**, ratings peak at **3.60**.

**Insight**: Customer satisfaction significantly increases when both **online delivery** and **table booking** options are available. These features enhance convenience and service quality, making them vital for attracting and retaining customers in competitive markets.

1. Should the team keep the rate of cuisines higher? Will that affect the feedback? According to our data are the rates of cuisines and ratings, correlated?  
     
   To explore the relationship between cuisine pricing and customer feedback, we analyzed whether higher average costs for two people are associated with better customer ratings.

**Methodology:**

**Chart Used**: Scatter Plot

**X-axis**: Average Cost for Two (in ₹)

**Y-axis**: Average Customer Rating (out of 5)

**Additional Element**: Trendline with equation and R² value

**Statistical Formula Used**:

=CORREL(H10:H9541, I10:I9541)  
  
where:

* Column H: Average Customer Ratings
* Column I: Average Cost for Two

**Key Findings:**

* Correlation Coefficient: 0.31  
  This indicates a weak positive correlation between price and customer rating.
* Trendline Equation:

Rating=0.0002×(Cost for Two)+2.2804\text{Rating} = 0.0002 \times (\text{Cost for Two}) + 2.2804Rating=0.0002×(Cost for Two)+2.2804

* R² Value: 0.1437  
  This means only 14.37% of the variation in customer ratings can be explained by the pricing of cuisines.

**Interpretation:**

* While there is a slight upward trend, the correlation is weak, suggesting that higher prices do not significantly lead to better ratings.
* The low R² value reinforces the insight that other factors—such as food quality, service speed, staff behavior, ambiance, and delivery accuracy—likely play a much greater role in influencing customer satisfaction.

**Conclusion:**

* The data does not support increasing cuisine prices as a reliable strategy to improve customer feedback.
* Instead, the team should focus on:
  + Enhancing the overall customer experience
  + Innovating the menu with quality and uniqueness
  + Improving service, ambiance, and delivery consistency
* Price increases should only be implemented if backed by genuine value addition, such as premium ingredients, exclusive offerings, or top-tier service.

1. What is the distribution of the number of restaurants of different price ranges in all the countries?  
     
   **Approach:**

The dataset was summarized using a **Pivot Table** to count restaurants per:

**Row**: Country

**Column**: Price\_range (1–4)

**Values**: Count of RestaurantID

A **100% Stacked Bar Chart** was created from this Pivot Table to compare:

The **relative share** of each price range within each country.

Not absolute numbers, but **proportions** that reflect market positioning (budget vs premium dining).

**Key Insights from the Data:**

1. **India** dominates in total number of restaurants (8,652), with a high concentration in **Price Range 1 and 2** (affordable segment).
2. **Brazil**, **South Africa**, and the **UAE** have higher shares in **Price Range 4** (Luxury), showing stronger high-end dining presence.
3. **Canada**, **Indonesia**, and **Sri Lanka** have relatively fewer restaurants overall and a spread across Price Ranges 2–3.
4. **United Kingdom** and **USA** have a more **balanced distribution** across all four price ranges, indicating a diverse dining ecosystem.

1. Explain your approach in brief for suggesting countries/cities in order to open new restaurants, if the objective and subjective questions would have not been given to assist you. **[you have to give bullet pointers in order to answer this question]**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Average of Rating** | **Count of RestaurantID** | **Average of Average\_Cost\_for\_two\_RS** |
| Indonesia | 4.33 | 47 | 1400.38 |
| New Zealand | 4.20 | 69 | 3531.33 |
| Philippines | 4.44 | 54 | 11217.22 |
| South Africa | 4.17 | 172 | 1797.07 |
| Turkey | 4.28 | 57 | 216.67 |
| United Arab Emirates | 4.19 | 136 | 3567.77 |

**To identify suitable countries or cities for opening new restaurants without any predefined guidance, I followed a structured, data-driven approach:**

* **1. Analyzed Competition:  
   I started by calculating the total number of restaurants in each country using a Pivot Table. Countries with fewer than 100 restaurants were considered to have low to moderate competition, making them more favorable for market entry.**
* **2. Assessed Customer Satisfaction:  
   I filtered the data to include only those countries where the average customer rating was greater than 4.0, indicating strong consumer satisfaction and positive feedback.**
* **3. Evaluated Affordability:  
   I converted the “Average cost for two” values into Indian Rupees and selected countries where the average cost was less than ₹4000, ensuring affordability for the target market and better price positioning.**
* **4. Used Excel Tools:  
   I used Excel’s Pivot Tables to compute required metrics such as restaurant count, average rating, and average cost to make informed decisions based on quantitative data.**

**As a result, countries like Indonesia, New Zealand, Turkey, South Africa, and the United Arab Emirates were identified as promising locations due to their balance of high ratings, moderate costs, and manageable competition.**

**The dashboard must consist of Year-wise and country slicers.**