

# Machine Learning For Robotics Assignment 1

Maha Oaiser 22i-2348

## → Purpose

Using various audio features and metadata provided in the dataset, understand which features contribute most to a song's popularity and create a regression model that can effectively predict how popular a song will be.

#### → Dataset

Domain: Music

Target variable: Popularity (in percentage)

Number of features: 15

Number of records: 1,001,373 (1 million+)

Type of problem: Regression

Link: <a href="mailto:kaggle.com/datasets/amitanshjoshi/spotify-1million-tracks">kaggle.com/datasets/amitanshjoshi/spotify-1million-tracks</a>

#### → Features

- i. Year: the year the song was released.
- ii. **Genre**: category or style of the music.
- iii. Danceability: measure of how suitable the song is for dancing.
  - iv. **Energy**: measure of the intensity of the song.
  - v. **Key**: musical key the song is in.
- vi. Loudness: overall loudness in decibels.
- vii. Mode: indicates major or minor tonality of the song.
- viii. Speechiness: presence of spoken words.
  - ix. Acousticness: measure of whether the song is acoustic.
  - x. Instrumentalness: whether the song contains no vocals.
  - xi. Liveness: detects audience presence in the song.
- xii. Valence: measure of the song's positivity.
- xiii. **Tempo**: speed of the song in beats per minute.
- xiv. **Duration**: length of the song in milliseconds.
- xv. **Time signature**: number of beats per bar in the song's rhythm.

\*Note: I did not consider these columns from the dataset: Unnamed: 0, artist\_name, track\_name, track\_id because they do not contain useful numerical or categorical data that could improve any model's predicting performance.

#### → Numerical Features

- i. Year
- ii. Danceability
- iii. Energy
  - iv. Loudness
  - v. Speechiness
- vi. Acousticness
- vii. Instrumentalness
- viii. Liveness
  - ix. Valence
  - x. Tempo
  - xi. Duration

# → Categorical Features

- i. Genre (Text)
- ii. Kev
- iii. Mode
  - iv. Time Signature

## → Exploratory Data Analysis Summary

- Removed rows where popularity was 0, as these were negatively impacting the dataset. This reduced the dataset from 1,159,764 to 1,001,373 rows.
- Created histograms for numerical features to understand their distributions. Normal distribution: Danceability and Tempo, while others were skewed.
- Created scatter plots and a correlation matrix alongside a heatmap to identify relationships between features, focusing on the correlation with the target variable Popularity.
- Created boxplots to identify outliers in the dataset, and later identified them using the interguartile range method.
- No missing values were found in the dataset,
- Important features:

- Year: Moderate positive correlation with Popularity. More recent songs tend to be more popular.
- Danceability: Weak positive correlation with Popularity.
   Danceable songs may be more engaging than others.
- Loudness: Weak positive correlation with Popularity.
   Loudness is often associated with energetic music but does not determine popularity alone.

# → Preprocessing Steps

- Data cleaning: Removed rows with popularity equal to 0.
- Dropped unnecessary columns: Unnamed: 0, artist\_name, track\_name, track\_name
- Feature engineering:
  - Numerical features: popularity, year, danceability, energy, loudness, speechiness, acousticness, instrumentalness, liveness, valence, tempo, and duration\_ms.
  - Categorical features: genre, key, mode, and time\_signature
- Applied One-Hot Encoding to genre, key, and time\_signature. Mode was already in binary format.
- Scaled numerical features:
  - MinMax Scaling: danceability and tempo
  - Standard Scaling: year, energy, loudness, speechiness, acousticness, instrumentalness, liveness, valence, and duration ms
- Balanced classes: Created equal-sized groups to avoid the issue of imbalanced classes, which can lead to biased model performance.
- Data splitting: split the data to 80% training and 20% testing to use for model training.

# $\rightarrow$ Model Selection and Training

- Stratified sampling with 80% training and 20% testing.
- Used root mean squared error and r squared score for evaluating model performance.
- Linear Regression: instant and just solves a linear system.
- Decision Tree: fast and splits the data.
- Gradient Boosting: Slow and boosts trees sequentially so it's hard to parallelise.

# → Fine-Tuning Process

- Used Grid Search to find the optimal hyperparameters for the best-performing models.
- Applied k-fold cross-validation to ensure that the model's performance was consistent across different parts of the data.

### → Model Performance

	Linear Regressor	Gradient Boosting Regressor	Decision Tree Regressor
RMSE	10.5688338011316	11.2046240736166	13.2384891169579
	3	23	2
R <sup>2</sup> score	0.51448719282618	0.45431610849272	0.23823081794803
	49	72	447
Cross-validation RMSE scores	[10.55110509 10.54402386 10.55616398 10.58633664 10.57200746]	[11.17603868 11.21105139 11.22150792 11.21567148 11.21107242]	[13.25975972 13.28330248 13.27733165 13.32871496 13.26773917]
Mean RMSE	10.5619274060588	11.2070683777768	13.2833695965321
	97	53	45
Std Dev of RMSE	0.01528590666549	0.01598281922568	0.02405992412771
	9801	2843	8714

#### → Final Conclusions and Best Model

- The best model was the Linear Regressor.
- Features contributing more to popularity than others were: year, danceability, and loudness.
- This model can be used by music platforms to predict the popularity of new songs and market them accordingly.

\*Final Note: Due to RAM limitations on both my laptop and Colab, I am only able to train two models instead of three at one time. So the code for the third model is commented out. I hope this will be sufficient for evaluation. Thank you! :D