

DSA210 Project Presentation

Name: Alp Bartu

Surname: Utar

1. Introduction and Motivation

The goal of this study is to understand how weather (temperature and precipitation) and time-of-day affect hourly coffee-shop customer traffic. By combining cleaned point-of-sale data with local weather records for January 2025, we aim to:

- Quantify the relationship between temperature, rain, and check counts.
- Identify daily and hourly patterns in customer visits.
- Provide actionable insights for staffing and promotions.

2. Data Description

Traffic Data (`cleaned_coffee_shop_data.csv`):

Using raw data t“simpra-saatlik-yogunluk-raporu-01-01-2025-31-01-2025-1739387506.xlsx” after cleaning ,stripping and renaming the columns of the csv file .

- **Columns:** `hour` (0–23), `check_count` (number of customer checks per hour).
- **Rows:** 20 aggregated hourly observations (no dates).

Weather Data (`weather_df.csv`):

- **Columns:** `date` (YYYY-MM-DD), `hour` (0–23), `temp` (°C), `precip` (0/1).
- **Range:** 2025-01-01 to 2025-01-31 (744 hourly records).

3. Methodology

Given the lack of date information in the traffic file, we used the **aggregated per-hour** pipeline:

1. **Merge** average weather by hour (mean temp, mean precip) with the 20 hourly `check_count` values.
2. **Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression:**

4. Results

4.1 Regression (Aggregated per-hour)

OLS Regression Results

Dep. Variable:	check_count	R-squared:	0.531
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.475

```
-----  
---  
const          70.8265 (p=0.437)  
temp_mean      32.1302 (p=0.002)  ← positive and significant  
precip_mean    2462.1834 (p<0.001) ← strong effect of rain
```

- **Interpretation:**
 - A 1 °C increase in temperature is associated with ~32 additional checks per hour (p=0.002).
 - Rainy hours see ~2462 more checks (p<0.001) — likely an artifact of rain coinciding with peak business hours in our small sample.

4.2 Hourly Profile

Bar chart shows peak traffic around **14:00–15:00** and a trough at **03:00–06:00**, consistent with typical business hours.

(In the full date×hour pipeline, we would see):

- **Weekday-hour heatmap** revealing higher weekday midday traffic.
- **Correlations** between weather and traffic, varying by hour.

4.3 Machine Learning Methods on Dataset

1. Overview

I trained two supervised regression models—Linear Regression and Random Forest—on the merged coffee-shop traffic + weather dataset to predict hourly check counts.

2. Data & Preprocessing

- **Dataset:** `df_full` with 744 hourly rows (Jan 1–31, 2025), featuring
 - **Features:**
 - `hour` → one-hot dummies (23 columns after drop-first)
 - `temp` (°C), `precip` (0/1)
 - **Target:** `check_count` (integer)
 - **Train/Test Split:**
 - **Training:** 595 samples (80%)
 - **Test:** 149 samples (20%)
-

3. Modeling Approach

1. **Feature Encoding:** One-hot encode `hour` (drop the first category to avoid collinearity).
 2. **Models:**
 - **LinearRegression** (ordinary least squares)
 - **RandomForestRegressor** (100 trees)
 3. **Validation:** 5-fold cross-validation on the training set for R^2 assessment.
 4. **Evaluation:** R^2 and RMSE on the hold-out test set.
-

4. Performance Metrics

Model	CV R^2 Mean	CV R^2 Std	Test R^2	Test RMSE
LinearRegression	1.000	0.000	1.000	9.66×10^{-13}
RandomForestRegressor	0.999898	0.000174	0.999997	0.4767

- **Linear Regression** achieves a mathematically “perfect” fit ($R^2=1$, $\text{RMSE} \approx 0$), indicating the model has memorized the data.
 - **Random Forest** is almost as perfect (Test $R^2 \approx 0.999997$, $\text{RMSE} \approx 0.48$), with minimal variance across CV folds.
-

5. Feature Importance (Random Forest Top 5)

Feature Importance Score

hour_20 0.1080
hour_21 0.0875
hour_15 0.0749
hour_16 0.0744
hour_14 0.0731

The highest-weight features correspond to afternoon/evening hours—peak business periods in January.

6. Interpretation & Implications

- **Time-of-Day Dominance**
The dummy variables for `hour` explain virtually all variance in `check_count`. Weather features (`temp`, `precip`) contribute almost nothing once the model “knows” the hour.
- **Overfitting Warning**
The near-perfect scores reflect that the model is simply reproducing the known hourly pattern, not uncovering subtle weather effects.
- **Actionable Insight**
While the model nails your hourly rhythm, it doesn’t meaningfully quantify how temperature or rain shifts traffic.

5. Discussion

- **Temperature:** Moderate significant effect; warmer temperatures encourage footfall.
- **Precipitation:** Positive coefficient likely conflates rain with rush periods (requires more granular data).
- **Limitations:**
 - Traffic data lacks date stamps; synthetic replication can distort temporal inference.
 - Small sample (20 hours) limits generalizability.
 - Potential multicollinearity if full dummies used—mitigated by dropping one dummy.