Dear Manager,

Thanks, for providing us with the 3 datasets attached from Sprocket Central Pty Ltd:

* Customer Demographic
* Customer Addresses
* Transaction data in the past three months

We analyzed the data sets and provided the summary of the whole in a count with the table below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| s.no | Table Name | No.Of.Records | Date on data recieved |
| 1. | Customer Demographic | 4000 | 22/02/2022 |
| 2. | Customer Addresses | 3999 | 22/02/2022 |
| 3. | Transaction data | 20000 | 22/02/2022 |

Remarkable data quality issues that we were encountered during the analysis of the data sets and the steps to mitigate those issues are listed out below as per our understandings. Furthermore , idea has given to improve the accuracy , tuple or object completeness. The data duplication has more reduced and could blotter with the uniqueness in the data sets, more or less the consistency is made throughout.

* Additional customer\_ids in the ‘Transactions table’ and ‘Customer Address table’ but not in ‘Customer Master (Customer Demographic)’ Mitigation: Please ensure that all tables are from the same period. Only customers in the Customer Master list will be used as a training set for our model. This indicates that the data received may not be in sync with each other which may skew the analysis results if there are missing data records. Please refer to excel file ‘data\_outliers.xlsx’ for the list of outliers between tables.
* Various columns, such as the brand of a purchase, or job title, have empty values in certain records Mitigation: If only a small number of rows are empty, filter out the record entirely from the training set for prediction. Else, if it is a core field, impute based on distribution in the training dataset. For key datasets, such as transactions, less than 1% of transactions (totalling less than 0.1% of revenue) have missing fields. These records have been removed from the training dataset.
* Inconsistent values for the same attribute (e.g., Victoria being represented as “V”, “Vic” and “Victoria”) Mitigation: Use regular expression to replaced
* extended values into abbreviations to ensure consistency across addresses. Recommendation: Enforce a drop-down list for the user entering the data rather than a free text field. In order to construct meaningful variables for the model, the data has been cleaned to avoid multiple representations of the same value. Additionally, gender records where ‘U’ have been replaced based on the distribution from the training dataset.
* Inconsistent data type for the same attribute (e.g., numeric values for some fields and strings for others) Mitigation: Convert selected records in characters to numeric. Remove non-numeric characters from string. Recommendation: Ensure that fact tables in the given database have constraints on data types. Having different data types for a given field make it difficult to interpret results at the later stage. Therefore, appropriate data transformations are made to ensure consistent data types for a given field.

Note: The data and information in this document is reflective of a hypothetical situation and client. This document is to be used for KPMG Virtual Internship purposes only. Moving forward, the team will continue with the data cleaning, standardisation and transformation process for the purpose of model analysis. Questions will be raised along the way and assumptions documented.

After we have completed this, it would be great to spend some time with your data SME to ensure that all assumptions are aligned with Sprocket Central’s understanding.

Kind regards,

Roseline Dilani