**Idea 1: How public speech effect the price of bitcoin.**

From our dataset, we can extract all the quotes which contain words like “crypto currency”,” bitcoin”, “digital money” and other words referred to other cryptocurrencies as they entail the bitcoin too. These quotes must be distinguished to negative and positive. Every positive or negative quote about bitcoin must be multiplied with a coefficient which determines the impact that the speaker has ton the public. One way to find this, could be to measure the frequency of the name of the speaker. Therefore, a new variable can be created which describe the (potential) influence on the bitcoin price. Finally, this variable can be plotted with the real bitcoin price for observation.

**Idea 2: Create a network model representing the connections between the speakers.**

It is very common for speakers, to refer to each other using positive or negative speech. We can extract the names of the people who referred in the quotes, and they are speakers too. Then we can create a network model in which the speakers will be represented by circles, where the size of the circle will be determined by the popularity of the person and the thickness of the connection between the circles will represent the frequency of referring a speaker of the other speaker. The positive and the negative quotes can be represented with blue of red lines of connection. The color of each circle may represent the identity of the person (politician, banker, journalist, etc..). This network model can be limited to the most popular speakers as there too many and it’s impossible to be presented in one map.

**Idea 3: Rank the speakers by the quality of their speech.**

The quality of the speech needs identification and theoretical research itself. At first glance, we can observe some characteristics which determines high or low quality of a quote. For example, a defending quote such as “I didn’t take any money” or a hateful quote can both determine a low quality of speech. On the other hand, high quality of speech can be a useful information, a new idea, or an encouragement for something good. After the characterization of a quote as high or low quality, we see who of the speakers have really something to say and who say useless things repeatedly.

Feedback: **Needs improvements**

First idea: Very creative idea, I like it! I think there is a space on how to estimate speaker popularity, frequence is a good start. You will also need to label some part of the quotes as negative/positive in order to train a model that will give you this information or find possibly existing solutions on the Internet for this issue

Second idea: Interesting approach but I struggle to find a use case for it. Speakers might also talk about people in a different manner depending on the occasion or topic so the model seems to me like it might not be able to capture all these details

Third idea: It is unclear to me why a defending quote determines a low quality speech. In fact, it is hard for me to define "low quality speech". I think maybe it would be better to focus on one type of speech (as you mentioned for example hateful speech) and proceed with that. You could also explore other options other than identifying the speakers that are often connected with hateful speech  
Best,  
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