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# Problem Statement

The objective of this group coursework assignment was to demonstrate large data set processing and analysis techniques in a parallel computation environment using Apache Hadoop and/or Spark.

Perform detailed analysis on the Million Song Data using Spark and Scala to understand

* The nature of the data
* Key correlations
* Key insights

The analysis was performed using the following techniques

* 1. Spearman correlation key fields
* 2. Song Tempo and Song 'Hotness Heat map
* 3. Linear Regression classifier

The Million Song Dataset can be downloaded at <http://labrosa.ee.columbia.edu/millionsong/>

# Approach

The following approach was used

* 1. High-level data analysis to understand data structure and to inform further analysis
* 2. Set-up development environment
* 3. Develop and unit test Spark code to analyze the data
* 4. Review results to feed into further analysis and development

# Raw Dataset Analysis

From an initial inspection of the dataset comprised on Hadoop, the data comprised of 26 csv files containing a total of 1 million data records.

The dataset itself had no metadata, so this had to be determined before detailed analysis could commence. Meta data was constructed by comparing the data to various examples on the MSD and echonest sites and looking at field position. **T**able 1 below documents the constructed metadata\*.

A high-level summary analysis was performed on the fields in order to understand data quality and completeness, key observations are listed below

Understanding Track Data

* Each field per row was contained within ““ , e.g. *"1","Progressively Funky","401198","0.0","*   
  - this would require a well-thought “regex” to select the features into correct columns for RDDs
* 1 million total records exist within the data

Feature Analysis

* 50% of Artist latitude and longitude were missing
* Dance ability was meaningless – all values where 0
* Musical features such as mode, key and time signature whilst looking promising provided very little value and differentiation within the dataset. The values were so aggregated/coarse that they provided almost no musical analysis value.

[AP] \*I don’t think we should include the list of fields for MSD – it looks like padding the report. We have an analysis xlsx document in the github repor, msd.xlsx, lets say that our analysis of the dataset is articulated there

| **Field Pos** | **Field name** | **Type** | **Description** | **Example values from a Rick Astley song** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | analysis sample rate | float | sample rate of the audio used | 22050 |
| **2** | artist 7digitalid | int | ID from 7digital.com or -1 | 3204 |
| **3** | artist familiarity | float | algorithmic estimation | 0.754917645 |
| **4** | artist hottnesss | float | algorithmic estimation | 0.507464243 |
| **5** | artist id | string | Echo Nest ID | ARWPYQI1187FB4D55A |
| **6** | artist latitude | float | latitude | 53.45644 |
| **7** | artist location | string | location name | Newton-le-Willows, Merseyside, England |
| **8** | artist longitude | float | longitude | -2.63265 |
| **9** | artist mbid | string | ID from musicbrainz.org | db92a151-1ac2-438b-bc43-b82e149ddd50 |
| **10** | artist name | string | artist name | Rick Astley |
| **11** | artist playmeid | int | ID from playme.com, or -1 | 1338 |
| **12** | audio md5 | string | audio hash code | bf53f8113508a466cd2d3fda18b06368 |
| **13** | danceability | float | algorithmic estimation | 0 |
| **14** | duration | float | in seconds | 211.69587 |
| **15** | end of fade in | float | seconds at the beginning of the song | 0.139 |
| **16** | energy | float | energy from listener point of view | 0 |
| **17** | key | int | key the song is in | 1 |
| **18** | key confidence | float | confidence measure | 0.324 |
| **19** | loudness | float | overall loudness in dB | -7.75 |
| **20** | mode | int | major or minor | 1 |
| **21** | mode confidence | float | confidence measure | 0.434 |
| **22** |  |  |  | 1 |
| **23** | release | string | album name | Big Tunes - Back 2 The 80s |
| **24** | release 7digitalid | int | ID from 7digital.com or -1 | 786795 |
| **25** | song hotttnesss | float | algorithmic estimation | 0.864248831 |
| **26** | song id | string | Echo Nest song ID | SOCWJDB12A58A776AF |
| **27** | start of fade out | float | time in sec | 198.536 |
| **28** | tempo | float | estimated tempo in BPM | 113.359 |
| **29** | time signature | int | estimate of number of beats per bar, e.g. 4 | 4 |
| **30** | time signature confidence | float | confidence measure | 0.634 |
| **31** | title | string | song title | Never Gonna Give You Up |
| **32** | track id | string | Echo Nest track ID | 8707738 |
| **33** | track 7digitalid | int | ID from 7digital.com or -1 | TRAXLZU12903D05F94 |
| **34** | year | int | song release year from MusicBrainz or 0 | 1987 |

**Table 1:** Million Song Data Constructed Metadata

# Implementation Approach

## Development Environment

The team adopted a collaborative development approach by hosting Scala source code, analysis artefacts and the report itself on the Queen Mary EECS Enterprise Github. The project repository is available here: <https://github.research.its.qmul.ac.uk/ec15541/million-song>

Whilst a Maven build was provided, the team favoured a Scala Build Tool (SBT) build process. The team developed their own SBT build, including dependencies to support the specific development and testing requirements. In particular, the Breeze library was used for matrix and vector operations to support regression based machine learning whilst ScalaTest was used for unit/integration testing. The project dependencies are listed below:

**val** *mockitoAll* = "org.mockito" % "mockito-all" % Version.*mockito***val** *scalaTest* = "org.scalatest" %% "scalatest" % Version.*scalaTest***val** *sparkCore* = "org.apache.spark" % "spark-core\_2.10" % Version.*sparkCore* //% "provided"  
**val** *breezeCore* = "org.scalanlp" %% "breeze" % Version.*breeze***val** *breezeNative* = "org.scalanlp" %% "breeze-natives" % Version.*breeze***val** *breezeViz* = "org.scalanlp" %% "breeze-viz" % Version.*breeze*

### Testing

The team believed in a principled approach to testing the Spark drivers and relied on a ScalaTest library for unit testing and local Spark cluster integration testing. This allowed the team to develop and test against a real subset of the million song dataset containing 2000 tracks hosted in RDDs on a local (single node) Spark cluster without adversely effective the moonshot cluster. This allowed driver and all supporting functionality to be developed and tested in isolation before being promoted and executed on the Moonshot cluster against the entire dataset.

The test tracks were loaded from /src/test/resources/TestTracks.csv by the BaseDriverSpec class which provided common functions to all descendent unit test suites.

## A Framework for Spark Analysis of MSD

* Discussion of Track encapsulation and companion object
* Discussion of Model trait and classification/regression models
* tracks, objects, how was the data cleaned\normalized in the framework etc
* Pattern for Spark driver objects
* Collaborative working
* Code and making into generic class
* Key design principles – e.g. raw tracks into object structure,
* Data cleansing strategy
* Unit Testing

# Data Analysis and Results

## Feature Correlation Analysis

There are a number of numeric features within the Million Song Dataset that we expected would demonstrate some correlation. To explore this hypothesis we developed a correlation calculation based on the Spearman approach which makes no assumption about the distribution of the the dataset. This is a single value between -1 and 1 where a value near either limit shows a correlation: as one feature value increases, so does the other (or decreases). A value close to 0 indicates no correlation.

### Tracks

[AP] Can we populate something like this?? Needs a couple more correlation runs on different features Correlation matrix of track feature (with heat map – higher correlation is greener)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Tempo** | **Song Hotness** | **Loudness** | **Year** | **Key** |
| **Tempo** | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| **Song Hotness** |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| **Loudness** |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| **Year** |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| **Key** |  |  |  |  | 1 |

The first relationship we chose was between song tempo and song “hotness”.

An initial Scala object called “BasicCorrelations” was coded [without much consideration for performance] which performed the following:

1. Load RDD from Million Song Dataset mapped to named 'Track' features (see Track.scala)
2. Map an RDD of non-zero tempos as a tuple of track id and tempo (track7IDd , tempo)
3. Map an RDD of non-zero hotnesses as a tuple of track id and hotness (track7Id, songHotness)
4. Create an RDD join of tempo and hotness by track id -> (track7ID, (tempo,songHotness))
5. Persist this RDD
6. Project the RDD several times to collect numeric values for calculations (e.g. sum of tempo \* hotness)
7. Calculate the Spearman correlation and print to console

(No result data was required to be saved back to HDFS)

This was later improved by a re-write that employed an accumulator to aggregate the column values per RDD partition and then combine each to a single summed set of values. This removed the need for the intermediate RDDs and proved to be much faster. In tests, the first correlation job completed in 319146 milliseconds from the original track mapping to completion whereas the second job using accumulators completed in just 63020 milliseconds.

To gain these metrics, a simple grab of “System.currentTimeMillis” was employed.

Unfortunately, the actual result of the correlation shows almost zero correlation between song hotness and tempo:

15/12/16 10:24:09 INFO DAGScheduler: Job 0 finished: aggregate at MusicAnalysisDriver.scala:16, took 62.879617 s

x Sum: 3099003.3770000003 y Sum: 11724.045227214388 xy Sum: 1415465.9601804437 x^2 Sum: 3.99648266890797E8 y^2 Sum: 6042.533619811499 n: 25733

#DancingDads : Spearman correlation, r(tempo, hotness) = **0.026070182686774128** in 63020 milliseconds

A later correlation between year and hotness was explored but this again showed nothing exciting:

15/12/16 10:25:16 INFO DAGScheduler: Job 1 finished: aggregate at MusicAnalysisDriver.scala:16, took 66.069942 s

x Sum: 6.12517079E8 y Sum: 149218.0803419707 xy Sum: 2.98441064890428E8 x^2 Sum: 1.224905289423E12 y^2 Sum: 80221.64677558048 n: 306298

#DancingDads : Spearman correlation, r(year, hotness) = **0.09286060647056213**

…but wait!

We then looked at an R scatter plot of Artist familiarity against Song hotness and saw a vague-looking linear relationship so gave that one a spin around the block:

#DancingDads : Spearman correlation, r(year, hotness) = 0.09286060647056213

x Sum: 274383.26998428203 y Sum: 206820.31099832949 xy Sum: 128645.07662091119 x^2 Sum: 171702.14476174267 y^2 Sum: 105582.98066524208 n: 456258

#DancingDads : Spearman correlation, r(familiarity, hotness) = **0.47956310486659387**

Thus we see almost half-way to a decent, positive correlation between how familiar and artist is and their song “hotness”.

### Song Tempo and Song 'Hotness' Heat Map

The table below is a binned scatterplot between song hotness (x, columns) and song tempo (y, rows)

Barry, to give some input on the code functionality and provide the results

|  | **Song Hotness** | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Song Tempo** |  | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.3** | **0.4** | **0.5** | **0.6** | **0.7** | **0.8** | **0.9** | **1** |
| **15** | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **30** | 0 | 2 | 57 | 42 | 45 | 32 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| **45** | 0 | 14 | 435 | 322 | 353 | 283 | 145 | 65 | 22 | 1 |
| **60** | 0 | 38 | 908 | 720 | 760 | 651 | 345 | 158 | 46 | 4 |
| **75** | 0 | 106 | 3332 | 2538 | 2939 | 2336 | 1505 | 605 | 176 | 33 |
| **90** | 0 | 341 | 9938 | 8512 | 9892 | 8658 | 5472 | 2464 | 741 | 131 |
| **105** | 0 | 487 | 16438 | 13889 | 16646 | 14444 | 9414 | 4052 | 1191 | 204 |
| **120** | 0 | 521 | 14612 | 12362 | 14908 | 12752 | 8185 | 3877 | 1119 | 203 |
| **135** | 0 | 750 | 18108 | 15856 | 18340 | 15441 | 10119 | 4764 | 1417 | 233 |
| **150** | 0 | 437 | 11887 | 10541 | 12440 | 10786 | 7195 | 3423 | 978 | 146 |
| **165** | 0 | 306 | 8468 | 7549 | 9180 | 8327 | 5537 | 2580 | 815 | 144 |
| **180** | 0 | 216 | 5228 | 4596 | 5909 | 5168 | 3332 | 1558 | 407 | 59 |
| **195** | 0 | 118 | 3226 | 2994 | 3609 | 3193 | 2154 | 887 | 200 | 31 |
| **210** | 0 | 58 | 1755 | 1596 | 2014 | 1861 | 1216 | 545 | 117 | 23 |
| **225** | 0 | 32 | 863 | 807 | 1103 | 1006 | 647 | 273 | 70 | 12 |
| **240** | 0 | 16 | 411 | 394 | 477 | 491 | 272 | 119 | 35 | 3 |
| **255** | 0 | 11 | 203 | 171 | 179 | 178 | 84 | 50 | 7 | 1 |
| **270** | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **285** | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **300** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **315** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 2:** Tempo vs Hotness Heatmap

### Artists

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Hotness** | **Familiarity** | **∑Song Hotness** | **Tracks** | **Avg. Year** |
| **Hotness** | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| **Familiarity** |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| **∑Song Hotness** |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| **Tracks** |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| **Avg Year** |  |  |  |  | 1 |

## Linear Regression

Basic objective is to minimize the r*esidual sum of squares* (RSS) between predicated and actual values.

Training using N test instance with m features. Train cost

Gradient descent, for I iterations, attempt to move the weights (regression coefficients) toward the minima (where the differentiated cost function = 0) using a gradient descent approach

Ian, Austin, to give some input on the code functionality and provide the results

# **5. Summary and Conclusions**

This group exercise has been challenging on a number of fronts. Essentially, the collaboration has worked well with each member being able to contribute to the project. Most of the team were inexperienced in the use of GitHub and so this has been a valuable skill to acquire along with an increased awareness of Apache Spark and the Scala language. We have also used SBT and have learned of its importance in a Scala development environment.

Some lessons have been learned with regards to the performance aspects of running jobs in a Spark cluster environment. Whilst RDDs provide a useful abstraction from the underlying parallelism, the method of processing large data sets still needs to be considered. In particular, the initial correlation task where many RDDs were created and an expensive join performed, highlight the need to look for ways to derive intermediate and final data in more efficient ways (in our case through accumulators).

The Million Song Dataset has proved to be reluctant to give up its secrets. The validity of features such as “hotness” are brought into question and musical data perhaps requires more domain knowledge than any of the group possess. Regression exercises too have shown the data to be a difficult beast for predicting continuous data. This may sound a bit depressing but it must be re-stated that in general, the learning outcomes of the project outweigh the disappointments in data analysis. We all now have an appreciation of code-control, collaboration tools, IDEs and understand the potential of Scala, SBT and Apache Spark.

Key observations:

* It is easy to “slay” a Spark cluster
* Agree on a development environment (IDEs, build tools, unit-test) as early as possible and make sure everyone is up-to-speed on the technology
* Data is Data; make sure you can turn it into information in spite of gaps and inconsistencies
* Background knowledge in parallel processing is essential
* If you’re a hot artist, your songs are likely to be hot too

Directions for future efforts (given more time):

* Investigate the Geospatial aspect of the data (we started on this but ran out of time)
* More effort on filling in the gaps (for example extrapolating coordinates from artist location text)
* Classification exercises (can we predict the year or cluster by genre)
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