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# **1. Introduction**

The aim of this project is to perform sentiment analysis on IMDb movie reviews to uncover insightful patterns. Sentiment analysis is a key subfield of Natural Language Processing, involving identifying and interpreting the sentiment behind data, like reviews/comments. Understanding audience sentiments is important for filmmakers, marketers, etc. as it provides valuable insights for improving content quality, audience engagement and identifying key areas for improvement. Analysing sentiments also provides deeper understanding of audience preferences, potentially guiding future creative decisions.

### **Dataset Description**

We used IMDb Movie Reviews Dataset for our analysis, containing a large-scale collection of movie reviews from IMDb (Maas et al., 2011), an online database providing vast information on movies, television shows, and celebrity profiles. The dataset includes 50,000 movie reviews labelled with sentiment classes positive or negative.

### **Objectives of the Analysis**

1. **Exploring distribution of sentiments** to assess whether reviews are predominantly positive or negative.
2. **Identify and analyse common words** used in positive versus negative reviews, providing insights into factors that influence audience perception.
3. **Investigate the relationship between review length and sentiment**, determining whether review length is impacted by a specific sentiment.
4. **Assess if short reviews have more extreme sentiment intensity** compared to longer reviews.
5. **Examine polarity and subjectivity** to understand the emotional intensity and opinion-based nature of reviews.
6. **Highlight the most helpful or extreme reviews** to identify features and patterns in reviews.

This analysis aims to provide valuable insights into audience sentiment trends, review characteristics, and patterns to get a deeper understanding of user-generated content.

# **2. Data Description**

### **Dataset Details**

This project uses the IMDb movie reviews dataset containing 50,000 reviews with sentiment labels. It was compiled by researchers as a benchmark for sentiment analysis (Maas et al., 2011) and made available via Kaggle

* **Dataset Source:** [IMDb Dataset of 50K Movie Reviews](https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/lakshmi25npathi/imdb-dataset-of-50k-movie-reviews/data) (Lakshmi, 2020).
* **Dataset Size:** 50,000 movie reviews**.**

### **Data Structure**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Column Name** | **Description** | **Data Type** |
| review | Textual movie reviews from users | Text (String) |
| sentiment | Binary classification labels of reviews, either "*positive*" or "*negative*". | Text (String) |

Each entry in the dataset has individual movie reviews, with clearly labelled by sentiment, making it ideal for sentiment analysis.

### **Data Characteristics/Features**

Initial overview:

* **Textual data: Unstructured text data that required preprocessing.**
* **Binary Sentiment Labels:** Values are categorical, either positive or negative.
* **Balanced Sentiments:** Equal representation of positive and negative reviews, with **25,000 entries each.**
* **Duplicate Reviews:** **418 duplicates** were identified, reducing the final dataset size to **49,582 unique reviews.**
* **Varying Review Lengths**:The review lengths varied between 4 to 2450 words

The dataset was cleaned/pre-processed for the analysis, the steps involved included removing duplicate entries, html tags, punctuation, whitespaces and converting all text to lowercase. The final dataset consisted of 49,582 reviews.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sentiment** | **Review count** | **Percentage** |
| Positive | 24884 | 50.19% |
| Negative | 24698 | 49.81% |

# **3. Method of Data Analysis**

This sections outlines the systematic approach of different analysis techniques used to extract meaningful insights from the dataset.

### **Data Preprocessing**

To prepare the data for analysis, the following preprocessing steps were applied:

* **Duplicate Removal**
  + Removed 418 duplicate reviews, reducing dataset from 50,000 to 49,582 unique reviews.
* **Text Cleaning**
  + Converted the text to lowercase.
  + Removed HTML tags, punctuation and extra spaces.
* **Removing stop-words**
  + Used NLTK package to remove stop-words i.e. non-informative words like “a”, “an”, “the”, “for”, etc.

These steps helped clean the dataset for further analysis.

### **Data Analysis Techniques**

The below analysis techniques were used:

1. **Sentiment Distribution Analysis**
   * Analysed the distribution of sentiment labels (positive vs. negative) in the dataset, visualised using bar chart.
2. **Word frequency and WordClouds**
   * Generated word clouds to visualize the most frequent words to understand the difference in vocabularies used in positive and negative reviews.
3. **Review Length Analysis**
   * Calculated the word count in reviews to check whether length correlates with sentiment.
4. **Sentiment Intensity Analysis in Short vs. Long Reviews**
   * Used scatter plot to analyse the relationship between review length and polarity.
5. **Polarity and Subjectivity Distribution Analysis**
   * Generated histograms for clear visualisation of distribution of polarity and subjectivity.
6. **Most helpful or Extreme Reviews Analysis**
   * Identified reviews with extreme sentiments and longest reviews to recognise any patterns.

### **Tools and Implementation**

* **Pandas and NumPy:** Used fordata manipulation, getting statistics, preprocessing.
* **Matplotlib, Seaborn, Bokeh:** Used forcreating visualisations.
* **WordCloud:** Used forvisualisation of frequent words.
* **TextBlob:** Calculating polarity and subjectivity (Loria, 2018)
  + **Polarity:** Polarityranges from -1 (highly negative) to +1 (highly positive), to measure emotion.
  + **Subjectivity:** Subjectivity ranges from 0 (objective) to 1 (subjective), to measure opinion.

# **4. Results**

Below are the results of the Exploratory Data Analysis performed on the dataset.

Google Colab Notebook Link: <https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1T5Y68YAz2MWrdia0iPZ70jzqFE7d2E9S?usp=sharing>

### **1. Sentiment Distribution**

The sentiment distribution in the dataset is almost same, with 50.2% positive reviews and 49.8% negative reviews, ensuring unbiased analysis (Figure 1).
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### **2. Most Common Words**

The word cloud analysis (Figure 2 & 3) highlights common words in both positive and negative reviews.
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### **3. Review Length Analysis**

The distribution of review lengths (Figure 5) is right-skewed, with most reviews falling between 100 to 250 words
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### **4. Sentiment Intensity vs. Review Length**

Figure 6 shows a weak negative correlation (approximately -0.05) between review length and sentiment polarity.
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### **5. Polarity and Subjectivity Distributions**

Figures 7 and 8 show that most reviews have moderately positive polarity and are moderately subjective.
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### **6. Extreme and Long Reviews**

Figure 9 shows that extremely opinionated reviews are mostly short, while the longer reviews are more neutral.
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# **5. Discussion**

Below are some interpretations and key insights derived from the results of the visualisations of the IMDb reviews.

### **1. Sentiment Distribution**

There is a balanced distribution of reviews with 50.2% positive and 49.8% negative reviews. This balance means that the data is not skewed towards one class making it suitable for unbiased sentiment analysis.

### **2. Most Common Words**

The WordClouds reveal that positive reviews mostly contain words like "great", "best", “good” and “fun”, while negative reviews have words like “bad”, “awful”, “worst” and “boring”. Both sentiments mention “movie” and “film” which means they both focus on the movie experience and have similar tones but very different contexts.

### **3. Review Length Analysis**

This histogram of review lengths is right-skewed, with most reviews between 100 to 250 words. Both positive and negative reviews have almost same average word lengths with 224 for negative reviews and 228 for positive reviews. There are very few outliers exceeding 1,000 words (41 reviews), which suggests that the sentiment does not strongly impact the review length.

### **4. Sentiment Intensity vs. Review Length**

The scatter plot shows that short reviews have high polarities, whereas longer reviews all cluster around neutral polarity. The weak negative correlation (approximately -0.05) suggests longer reviews are more detail focused and shorter reviews are emotional.

### **5. Polarity and Subjectivity Distributions**

The polarity histogram shows most reviews are mildly positive (0 to 0.5), and extreme sentiments are rare. The subjectivity distribution shows most reviews are moderately subjective (0.5 to 0.7), meaning reviews are not exaggerated and highly objective/subjective reviews are rare.

### **6. Extreme and Long Reviews**

Most extreme sentiment reviews are around 10 to 50 words which confirms that shorter reviews have stronger emotion. However the longest reviews (over 2000 words long) have almost neutral polarity meaning they focus more on the details of the movie.

### **Limitations and Challenges**

The biggest limitation would be the dependency on TextBlob as it may misinterpret sarcasm or irony in some reviews. Also there is very minimal text preprocessing done which could mean the data has some leftover noise or ambiguity, affecting the accuracy slightly.

Additionally there was a lack of context information like reviewer demographics, genre, move star ratings which could have provided deeper insights. Without user upvotes, getting the actual helpfulness of reviews was not possible.

# **6. Conclusion**

This sentiment analysis of IMDb movie reviews successfully shows meaningful patterns in user opinions, usage of vocabulary, sentiment distribution, and review characteristics. One good thing about the dataset was its balanced composition, meaning approximately 50% of the reviews given were positive and about 50% were negative reviews, providing a solid foundation for drawing comparisons.

The analysis showed that while there was some overlap in frequently used words, clear differences emerged in the vocabulary between positive and negative reviews. Positive reviews often praised elements like storytelling, acting, or emotional impact using favourable words, on the other hand negative reviews focused more on expressing dissatisfaction and criticism with stronger, negative language. The length of a review did not strongly affect whether it was positive or negative. However, shorter reviews often showed stronger emotions, both very positive and very negative. While longer reviews had a balanced tone and were usually more detailed. Polarity and subjectivity analysis using TextBlob showed that extreme sentiments were relatively rare. Most users preferred nuanced, moderately positive expressions, adding objective details with personal opinions. This reflects a general trend among IMDb reviewers to provide thoughtful, well-rounded feedback instead of extreme judgments.

Despite limitations such as the basic sentiment tool used (TextBlob), minimal text preprocessing, and the absence of explicit review helpfulness metrics, the project successfully met its core objectives. It offered valuable insights into how sentiment is expressed in online movie reviews.

### **Future Work**

For future work, using advanced NLP techniques such as transformer-based models (e.g., BERT) could help increase sentiment detection with better contextual understanding. Topic modelling could also help find any hidden themes across genres, and adding more review metadata like helpfulness votes (user voting on reviews) could help verify assumptions about what makes a review impactful. Comparing IMDb with other platforms for reviews could also reveal whether these insights are general across domains and not specific to IMDb. Overall, this study lays a strong foundation for deeper analysis of user-generated content in the entertainment media.
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