

Wrangling Report

After assessing the WeRateDogs Twitter data, I identified the following wrangling tasks. This report contains a brief description of the wrangling work for each task.

Quality

WeRateDogs Twitter archive (df_tw_archive)

1. **Statuses where retweeted_status_id or in_reply_to_status_id are not null, are not original ratings.**

One of the wrangling requirements was to only include statuses that are original ratings. I used the pandas “notna” method to remove statuses that were retweets and replies.

2. **Timestamp column should be datetime data type. Also, data in the floofer column should be boolean data type.**

I used the pandas “to_datetime” method to cast the timestamp column as a datetime object.

Values for the floofer column are “floofer” or “None.” Since there are only two values, a boolean data type is appropriate. I used pandas “.loc” notation to define a new column called “is_floofer.” Its value is either True for floofers, or False for non-floofers.

3. **When the status has other numbers separated by slashes, these are incorrectly captured as the rating. Tweet ID's where this happened: 740373189193256964, 682962037429899265, 666287406224695296, 810984652412424192.**

Visual assessment showed unusual values for rating_numerator for these tweets. I checked the statuses and used pandas “.loc” notation to set the correct value for the rating.

4. **When the status uses a float for the rating, the rating_numerator is captured incorrectly. Tweet ID's where this happened: 778027034220126208, 680494726643068929, 786709082849828864.**

Similar to the wrangling task above, visual assessment revealed incorrect ratings if the rating was a float. Pandas “.loc” notation was used to set the correct rating.

5. **Tweets with a rating_denominator greater than 10 are for statuses with multiple dogs.**

I used the pandas “query” method to filter on statuses with a rating_denominator less than or equal to 10. This way, all remaining statuses are for a single dog. This will make it easier to do analysis.

Tweet image predictions (df_tw_img_preds)

6. **img_num column should be category data type.**

Img_num only has 4 different values, so the category data type is appropriate here. I used the pandas “astype” method to cast this column as a category.

7. **If p1_dog, p2_dog, or p3_dog are False, the predicted dog breed is invalid for our analysis.**

I filtered on rows with invalid dog breed names using pandas “.loc” notation. Breed name was replaced with NaN here, using the numpy “nan” method.

8. p1, p2, and p3 columns have inconsistent capitalization.

For easier readability, I replaced underscores with spaces with the pandas “str.replace” method. Then, I capitalized the first letter of each word using the “str.title” method.

Tidiness

WeRateDogs Twitter archive (df_tw_archive)

1. Pupper, puppo, and doggo info in separate columns.

The original columns each indicate the stage of a dog’s life. To meet the requirement for tidy data, I reorganized this data into one column called “dog_stage.” At first I used the pandas “melt” method. However, this resulted in extra rows, as some dogs were classified as a doggo and either puppo or pupper. Instead, I combined the contents of doggo, pupper, and puppo using string concatenation. Then I removed the “None” part with pandas “str.replace.”

Twitter API data (df_tw_api)

2. The data in df_tw_api should be in df_tw_archive.

The Twitter API data contained favorite_count and retweet_count. This extends the data for each status from the WeRateDogs Twitter archive, so it made sense to combine these dataframes. I used the pandas “merge” method for this.

Image predictions (df_tw_img_preds)

3. The data in df_tw_img_preds should also be in df_tw_archive.

The image predictions have a row for each tweet_id, so they are part of the same observational unit as the other dataframes. As with the task above, I used the pandas “merge” method to add the image prediction data to the master dataframe.