# COEN 242 Big Data

# Project 1

# Movie Reviews in MapReduce and Hive

Immanuel Amirtharaj
Jackson Beadle

# **Methodology**

## Hive

#### **Importing Tables**

One consideration we had to make when importing tables was making sure that the movie ratings were not integers. Therefore we imported the ratings as floats along with all other fields being integers. In addition, some of the movie titles contained commas causing Hive to incorrectly parse some lines in the CSV file. Our tables were defined with Hive SerDe properties to ignore these commas and to remove any double-quotes that padded the beginning or end of each data field.

### Part 1 Query

```
SELECT COUNT(*) C, title
FROM imdb_bigdata17.movies_large M, imdb_bigdata17.reviews_large R
WHERE M.movieId = R.movieId
GROUP BY M.title
ORDER BY C ASC, title ASC;
```

## Part 2 Query

```
SELECT title, AVG(rating) A, COUNT(*) reviews
FROM imdb_bigdata17.movies_large M, imdb_bigdata17.reviews_large R
WHERE M.movieid = R.movieid
GROUP BY M.title
HAVING A > 4 AND reviews > 10
ORDER BY A ASC, title ASC;
```

# **MapReduce**

#### Query 1

This part consisted of two Hadoop jobs - Popularity Calculator and Popularity Sorter. The first job had two mappers and one reducer. The second job had one mapper and one reducer.

#### **Popularity Calculator Job**

The first two mappers MapForPopularity() and MapForTitle() were used to read the reviews.csv and movies.csv file respectively. To make sure the reviews and movie title were grouped together in the intermediate values, we set our output key for both as the movieid. The output value for MapForPopularity() was the string "pop 1" to denote that it was a review and the output value for MapForTitle() was the string "title <movie\_name>" which we would later on parse out in the reduce stage.

In the reduce stage ReduceForPopularity() we receive in a key (movieid) and an iterable of values in a format similar to this.

```
["title "War of the Worlds"", "pop 1", "pop 1", "pop 1"];
```

We iterate through this array and split the string by the first tab. If the first element in the resulting array is "title", we set our output value to be the second element. Otherwise we increment our running count by 1. The output key is then set to the running count.

Our output will now be a text file in the format [count, title] where the output is not ordered.

```
10 War of the Worlds30 Terminator 25 Citizen Kane
```

#### **Popularity Sorter Job**

The second mapper DumbMapper() reads from the output file of the previous Hadoop job. Each line comes in the format of [count, title] as shown:

```
10 War of the Worlds
```

We then split the string to extract the movie title. We set the output value to the movie title and the output key to the original line in order to ensure that all generated keys are unique.

```
("10 War of the Worlds", "War of the Worlds");
```

To sort the intermediate results, we then overload the **Writable** Comparable class to sort the keys by both review count and movie title. This ensures two movies with the same review count, such as all the movies with only 1 review, do not get grouped together. If two keys have the same review count, the keys are sorted by the title in ascending order.

In the reducer stage we split the key to extract the review count and extract the title from the iterable. We then just write both of those values to file.

#### Query 2

For this part, we took a similar approach as Part 1, where we had two Hadoop jobs, Review Calculator and Review Sorter.

#### **Review Calculator Job**

The first two mappers MapForReview() and MapForTitle() were used to read the reviews.csv and movies.csv file respectively. They are written to the reducer the same way as Part 1, except the value for MapForReview() is the rating.

In the reducer stage, we count up all the reviews similarly to Part 1. We receive a key (movieid) and an iterable of values like this format.

```
["title "War of the Worlds"", "pop 3.0", "pop 3.5", "pop 4.0"];
```

We extract the review and add that to our running total score and increment our review count. We then check if the number of reviews is greater than 10 and if the average rating is greater than 4.0. If so, we write the result to the file. The output value is in the format "<movie\_title> <average\_rating> <review\_count>".

War of the Worlds 4.125 11

#### **Review Reducer Job**

This job is the exact same implementation as the **Popularity Sorter Job** in Part 1, except the Comparator function sorts the intermediate results by average rating then movie title in ascending order. The final output is a list of values, sorted by average review.

War of the Worlds	4.125	11
Citizen Kane	4.2593	30
Terminator 2	4.6667	15

# Results

### **Hive**

#### **Small Dataset Part 1**

#### **Small Dataset Part 1**

```
One Flees Over the Cucko's Instit CUSPS 4.59994444444444 144  

| Common Flees of the Cusp of the Cus
```

For the small dataset, we got an expected 9064 rows for the first query. For the second query, we got a total of 287 rows. We also verified that the information was in ascending order.

## **Large Dataset Part 1**

```
| See | See
```

## **Large Dataset Part 2**

```
Rect (2004) 4,12077-2000023 (2005) 4,135943511458 (2005) 1774
Chitacher (1276) 4,135745260023 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458 (2005) 4,13744511458
```

For the small dataset, we got an expected 45069 rows for the first query. For the second query, we got a total of 381 rows. We also verified that the information was in ascending order.

# **MapReduce**

# **Small Dataset Part 1**

```
Simall Dataset Part 1

151 Die Hord (1988)
153 Mes. Doubtfire (1993)
153 Mes. Doubtfire (1993)
154 Mesk., The (1994)
155 Mesk., The (1995)
155 Mesk., The (1996)
156 Mesk., The (1996)
167 Mesk., The (1996)
168 Princess Bride, the (1987)
168 E.T. the Extra-Terrestrial (1982)
168 E.T. the Extra-Terrestrial (1982)
161 Gladiator (2080)
163 Princess Bride, the (1987)
165 Grounding Day (1993)
165 Grounding Day (1993)
165 Grounding Day (1993)
165 Mession: Impossible (1996)
174 Sarok (2081)
175 Ace Ventura: Pet Detective (1994)
176 Beauty and the Beast (1991)
176 Beauty and the Beast (1991)
176 Beauty and the Beast (1991)
178 Beauty of the Rings: The Return of the King, The (2003)
188 Mession: Beate (a. i. a. MB) (1997)
191 Soving Private Ryan (1998)
192 Soving Private Ryan (1998)
193 Sixth Sense, The (1999)
195 Beatan (1989)
196 The Lee Monkeys (a.k.a. 12 Mankeys) (1995)
198 True Lies (1994)
199 Color of the Rings: The Fallowship of the Ring, The (2001)
198 True Lies (1994)
200 Lion King, The (1994)
201 Lion King, The (1994)
202 Lion King, The (1995)
203 Beard (a.k.a. Serien) (1995)
204 Bearloss He Molives (1980)
205 Eright (Lie (1999)
215 Figitive, The (1993)
215 Aladdin (1992)
217 Star Mars: Episade VI - Return of the Jedi (1983)
218 Independence Day (a.k.a. 104) (1996)
220 Aerican Beauty (1998)
221 Star Mors: Episade VI - Return of the Jedi (1983)
222 Bearican Beauty (1998)
223 Return (1998)
224 Schindler's List (1999)
225 Schindler's List (1999)
226 Scale of the Lost Ark (Indiana Jones and the Raiders of the Lost Ark) (1981)
226 Scale of the Lost Ark (Indiana Jones and the Raiders of the Lost Ark) (1981)
227 Fargo (1996)
228 Raiders (1989)
229 Star Mens: Episade VI - Return of the Jedi (1980)
224 Schindler's List (1999)
225 Scale Raiders (1984)
226 Raiders (1984)
227 Star Mers: Episade VI - New Hope (1977)
228 Lion Mers: Episade VI - A New Hope (1977)
228 Lion Mers: Episade VI - A New Hope (1977)
231 Star Mers: Episade VI - A New Hope (1977)
231 Star Mers: Episade VI - A New Hope (1977)
231 Star Mers: Episade VI -
```

#### **Small Dataset Part 2**

For the small dataset, we got 9066 rows for the first query and 287 for the second.

# **Large Dataset Part 1**

```
I Morty Python and the Holy Grait (1975)
Good Mill Hunting (1997)
Dork Knight, the (2088)
Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade (1989)
One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest (1975)
Terminator, The (1984)
Die Hards Mitch o Vengemenc (1995)
Process Bridg, The (1987)
Process Bridg, The (1987)
Rendy and the Beast (1991)
Men in Black (a.k.a. NIB) (1997)
Titunic (1997)
Sreak (2081)
Mission: Impossibile (1996)
Ace Ventura: Pet Detective (1994)
Lion King, The (1994)
Stath Sense, The (1994)
Stath Sense, The (1994)
Stath Sense, The (1999)
Time Lies (1994)
Sandy Private Ryan (1998)
Denoes with Nobuse (1990)
Lord of the Rings: The Return of the King, The (2003)
Lord of the Rings: The Rot Tomers, The (2002)
Forgo (1996)
Sewer (a.k.a. Seren) (1995)
Talle Workeys (a.k.a. 12 Mankeys) (1995)
Bathan (1998)
Back to the Future (1995)
Togistive, The (1995)
Talle Holy (1995)
Togistive, The (1995)
Talle (1995)
Stath (1995
```

### **Large Dataset Part 2**

```
### 10.00007_AstanicitarUnitite ### 10.000007_AstanicitarUnitite ### 10.00007_AstanicitarUnitite #### 10.00007_AstanicitarUnitite #### 10.00007_AstanicitarUnitite #### 10.00007_AstanicitarUn
```

For the large dataset we got 45112 for the first query and 381 rows for the second.

## **Discrepancies in Row Counts and Explanation**

	Dataset	# Rows Query 1	# Rows Query 2
Small Dataset	Hive	9064	287
	MapReduce	9066	287
Large Dataset	Hive	45069	381
	MapReduce	45112	381

As shown, the number of rows created matched for Query 2. However the number of rows for Query 1 differed between Hive and MapReduce. Upon further analysis we found out that that this is due to the differences in implementation for our Hadoop jobs and the Hive query.

Two movies, Hamlet (2000) and War of the Worlds (2005) in the small dataset that had two different movie ids. Out MapReduce job groups by movie id which creates two extra rows, while the Hive groups by title leading to all Hamlet and all War of the Worlds rows being correctly group. We can modify our MapReduce job to group by movie id to fix this.

# **Discussion (Part 3)**

#### **Results for the first Query (Default)**

	Dataset	Jobs	Total mappers	Total reducers	Time Taken (s)
MapReduce	Small	2	2/96 => 98	96/1 => 97	147.550
	Large	2	7/96 => 103	96/1 => 97	343.130
Hive	Small	2	1/1 => 2	1/1 => 2	8.520
	Large	2	6/7 => 13	11/1 => 12	210.270

For time taken, we decided to use CPU time as our metric. We chose CPU time over other metrics because it has the best real-world application as it is experienced by the programmer. The Hive queries outperformed the MapReduce queries. We believe that this had to do with the difference in number of mappers and reducers allocated. For example, for the small dataset, the Hive query outperformed the MapReduce dataset by 139.03 seconds and executed 191 fewer tasks.

In the MapReduce code, we explicitly set the number of reduce tasks for the second job to 1, regardless of the dataset size. This guarantees the final output is always sorted. This behavior is also automatically set by Hive at compile time. There are a minimum of two mappers for the first job because we have two input paths. The rest is left to the JobSubmitter to decide. The number of reduces in the first job is equal to the number of mappers in the second job and by default is set to 96 for both the small and large dataset. The large dataset also used more mappers, as configured by the JobSubmitter.

#### **Results for the second Query**

	Dataset	Jobs	Total mappers	Total reducers	Time Taken (s)
MapReduce	Small	2	2/96 => 98	96/1 => 97	146.960
	Large	2	7/96 => 103	96/1 => 97	305.740
Hive	Small	2	1/1 => 2	1/1 => 2	7.470
	Large	2	6/4 => 10	11/1 => 12	196.060

Like the first query, the Hive queries significantly outperformed the MapReduce code. By default: the MapReduce code runs 96 reduce tasks in the first job and 96 map tasks in the second job.

#### **Observations**

With such a large difference in the number of tasks being run per job, compared to the number of tasks used in each Hive query, it is unsurprising the MapReduce jobs perform so much slower. Having so many tasks increases the memory and execution overhead. As will be seen and discussed in Part 4, specifying the number of reducers the MapReduce code uses significantly improves the performance of the programs.

# **Discussion (Part 4)**

Since the Hive queries performed so much better, we decided to try optimizing the MapReduce jobs to minimize the performance gap. We decided to test using the Part 2 query.

We ran the Reviews program on all four datasets provided. The only setting we altered was the number of reduce tasks performed in the first job. The second job has an equal number of mappers since there is always one mapper for each reducer in the first job. The number of mappers for the first job is fixed, dictated by the JobSubmitter, and there is only ever 1 reducer in the second job to ensure sorted order of the final output.

For each iteration of the test, three time counters were recorded for each job: total CPU time spent for all map tasks; total CPU time spent for all reduce tasks; and the elapsed CPU time. The first time in each table field is for job 1, the second for job 2. We can use these two times to see how altering reducers affects job 1 and altering mappers affects job 2.

#### **Small Dataset**

There are two mappers used in the first job for each iteration of the test.

Reducers	Total Mapper Time (s)	Total Reducer Time (s)	CPU Time (s)
1	12.909+2.790=15.699	6.163+3.239=9.402	5.190+1.340=6.530
2	7.987+9.992=17.979	6.925+2.670=9.622	5.120+1.960=7.080
4	7.145+15.098=22.243	19.990+2.490=22.480	10.330+3.020=13.350
8	11.613+33.855=45.468	38.503+2.738=41.241	17.220+4.760=21.980
16	6.461+72.746=79.207	85.795+2.031=87.826	27.120+8.820=35.940

### **50MB Dataset**

There are two mappers used in the first job for each iteration of the test.

Reducers	Total Mapper Time (s)	Total Reducer Time (s)	CPU Time (s)
1	13.446+2.772=16.218	4.562+2.951=7.513	9.710+1.350=11.060
2	8.520+8.960=17.480	8.671+7.841=16.512	10.400+1.870=12.270
4	18.872+16.895=35.767	29.705+7.815=37.520	13.280+3.200=16.480
8	9.149+34.897=44.046	55.868+2.750=58.618	20.410+5.120=25.530
16	8.725+75.147=83.872	92.315+2.416=94.731	36.010+8.740=44.750

### 300MB Dataset

There are four mappers used in the first job for each iteration of the test.

Reducers	Total Mapper Time (s)	Total Reducer Time (s)	CPU Time (s)
1	35.336+2.751=38.087	11.855+2.731=14.586	35.030+1.330=36.360
2	36.454+6.032=42.486	18.006+2.282=20.288	38.670+1.950=40.620
4	42.622+22.856=65.478	38.017+2.826=40.843	47.850+3.270=51.120
8	37.354+29.200=66.554	69.656+2.253=71.909	56.300+5.200=61.500
16	52.651+89.927=142.578	100.182+4.545=104.727	68.520+10.360=78.880

# **Large Dataset**

There are seven mappers used in the first job for each iteration of the test.

Reducers	Total Mapper Time (s)	Total Reducer Time (s)	CPU Time (s)
1	75.386+4.201=79.587	23.939+3.252=27.191	66.450+1.280=67.730
2	101.909+6.369=108.278	26.582+2.003=28.585	88.570+1.920=90.490
4	66.441+16.013=82.454	57.006+2.781=59.787	75.200+2.990=78.190
8	89.167+36.379=125.546	64.210+2.928=67.138	102.520+5.240=107.760
16	69.888+72.649=142.537	93.113+2.941=96.054	104.280+8.950=113.230

#### **Observations**

With the exception of using 4 reducers on the large dataset, an increase in reducers causes n increase in execution time. In most iterations of the test, all three time counters significantly increased with the increase in tasks. We believe this to be due to a dramatic increase in overhead. With more reducers in the first job, more time is spent initiating reduce tasks and on I/O operations since more files are written. With more output files, the NameNode also has an increased workload. The same observations can be made about the increase in mappers in the second job. There is more time spent on I/O operations, network delays, and task initiation.

In all four datasets, the reducer time for the second job was always pretty low since there was only every one reducer. We believed it was not necessary to test with more reducers since having only one reducer was always the quickest configuration. With only one reducer, our MapReduce code begins to perform almost as well as our Hive queries.

# **Commands to Execute**

Our datasets are stored in Hadoop in the folder structure suggested in the project description. Each MapReduce program takes four parameters: movies CSV file path; reviews CSV file path; output directory path for the intermediate results; and the output directory path for the final sorted results. Example commands are below.

```
> Hadoop jar Popularity.jar <movies.csv> <reviews.csv> <output_folder>
<output_sorted_folder>
```

```
> Hadoop jar Popularity.jar ./dataset/movies/movies.csv
./dataset/reviews/reviews.csv ./output1_small ./output1_small_sorted
```

```
> Hadoop jar Reviews.jar ./dataset/movies/movies.csv
./dataset/reviews/reviews.csv ./output1 small ./output1 small sorted
```