AIBD Final Project Results and Insights

# Handling missing values

**First Iteration**

The first iteration focused on addressing missing values systematically based on the characteristics of each feature. The following approaches were applied:

1. **Numeric Columns**:
   * **Count-related Columns** (e.g., numReviews\_pastYear, numReservedDays\_pastYear): Missing values were filled with 0 because the absence of reviews or reservations likely indicates no activity.
   * **Average/Mean Columns** (e.g., rating\_ave\_pastYear, available\_days\_aveListedPrice): Missing values were replaced with the **mean** of the column. This maintains the central tendency of the data while reducing distortion.
   * **Price/Revenue Columns** (e.g., prev\_Nightly Rate, revenue): Missing values were replaced with the **median** to handle potential skewness in monetary values.
2. **Categorical Columns**:
   * **Critical Categorical Features** (e.g., City, Property Type, Neighborhood): Missing values were replaced with the **mode** (most frequent value) to preserve data integrity.
   * **Other Categorical Columns**: Missing values were replaced with 'Unknown' as a placeholder to ensure no data was lost.
3. **Binary Columns**:
   * Binary columns (e.g., host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period) were filled with the **mode** because the most frequent value often aligns with the data's characteristics.
4. **Dropping Irrelevant Columns**:
   * The Integrated Property Manager column was dropped as it was deemed unnecessary for analysis.
5. **Critical Date Columns**:
   * Rows with missing values in critical date-related columns (e.g., Created Date) were dropped since such information is often essential for analysis.

**Outcome of the First Iteration**

While this approach reduced a significant number of missing values, certain features still had missing values due to their unique nature or insufficient data to impute values meaningfully. Examples include:

* Bedrooms, Bathrooms, and Number of Photos are often incomplete due to hosts not specifying these details.
* Activity-dependent metrics like booked\_days or prev\_available\_days had missing values for listings that were inactive during certain periods.

**Second Iteration**

The second iteration aimed to ensure the dataset contained no missing values, prioritizing data quality over retaining every row. Here's what was done:

**1. Dropping Rows for Certain Features**

Columns with fewer than 50 missing values were treated as critical for maintaining data integrity. These include:

* Bedrooms, Bathrooms, Max Guests, Minimum Stay, Number of Photos, and Number of Reviews.
* Missing values in these columns were dropped because:
  + The low number of missing values made it feasible to drop the corresponding rows without significantly reducing the dataset size.
  + Imputation in these columns (e.g., using mean or mode) could introduce inaccuracies because these features directly impact listing characteristics and guest experiences.

**2. Imputation for Remaining Features**

For features with higher numbers of missing values, reasonable imputation methods were applied:

* **Activity-based Metrics** (e.g., booked\_days, available\_days):
  + Missing values likely indicate inactivity, so these were imputed with 0.
* **Proportion-related Features** (e.g., prop\_5\_StarReviews\_pastYear):
  + These were also filled with 0 as the absence of reviews logically results in no proportion being calculable.
* **Price/Revenue Metrics** (e.g., prev\_Nightly Rate, prev\_booked\_days\_avePrice):
  + Imputed with the **median** to account for the skewed nature of price and revenue data.
* **Rating Metrics** (e.g., Rating Overall):
  + Missing values were imputed with the **mean** to retain the central tendency of ratings across listings.

**3. Final Verification**

After handling the missing values, the dataset was checked to ensure no columns had any remaining NaN values. This was done to ensure the dataset was ready for analysis.

**Outcome of the Second Iteration**

* The dataset was free of missing values.
* Rows with incomplete critical information (e.g., Bedrooms, Bathrooms) were removed, preserving data quality.
* Imputation strategies were applied for remaining columns based on their context and logical consistency.

**Justification of Steps**

1. **Dropping Rows for Critical Features**:
   * The columns chosen for row drops had fewer than 50 missing values. Dropping these rows ensures data integrity for features like Bedrooms, Bathrooms, or Number of Reviews, which are pivotal for listing quality and analysis.
   * Retaining these rows with imputed values could introduce bias, as these features directly influence user experience and listing performance.
2. **Imputation for Remaining Features**:
   * Features with activity-dependent metrics or monetary values were filled with logical substitutes (e.g., 0 or median) to maintain the dataset's usability without introducing unrealistic data.
3. **Ensuring No Missing Data**:
   * A clean dataset with no missing values ensures compatibility with most analytical and machine learning models, avoiding potential errors.

Correlation Analysis
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# Cluster Analysis
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**Cluster 1 (High Superhost Success Cluster)**

* **Characteristics**:
  + High superhost rate (0.906).
  + Highest average rating (4.88).
  + Good number of reviews per year (88.56) with a very high proportion of 5-star reviews (0.90).
  + Moderate nightly rate ($122.29), balanced revenue ($2615.91), and good occupancy (16%).
* **Business Insights**:
  + **Archetype**: Listings with consistent superhost status, high ratings, and balanced pricing.
  + **Strategy**: Encourage hosts to maintain superhost status by offering training or incentives (e.g., discounts on platform fees for high ratings and responsiveness).
  + Market listings in this cluster as "premium value for money" properties.

**Cluster 2 (Luxury or Premium Listings)**

* **Characteristics**:
  + Moderate superhost rate (0.289).
  + High nightly rate ($453.60).
  + Highest revenue ($7644.62) despite moderate occupancy (12.7%).
  + High review count (88.18) and a strong proportion of 5-star reviews (0.83).
* **Business Insights**:
  + **Archetype**: High-end luxury or unique properties that attract affluent customers.
  + **Strategy**:
    - Enhance marketing by emphasizing exclusivity and luxury.
    - Provide analytics to help hosts optimize pricing further during peak seasons.
    - Encourage hosts to improve guest experiences to increase superhost rates, potentially boosting occupancy.

**Cluster 4 (Popular Mid-Range Listings)**

* **Characteristics**:
  + Moderate superhost rate (0.262).
  + Good average rating (4.74).
  + Highest review count (136.48) and excellent number of 5-star reviews (107.57).
  + Moderate nightly rate ($216.69), leading to high revenue ($3702.31).
* **Business Insights**:
  + **Archetype**: Popular and reliable mid-range properties with strong guest satisfaction.
  + **Strategy**:
    - Position these listings as "family-friendly" or "group-friendly" options.
    - Highlight guest reviews to drive more bookings.
    - Offer tools to streamline host operations, as higher booking frequency may result in higher workload.

**Cluster 0 and Cluster 3 (Economical Listings)**

* **Characteristics**:
  + Low superhost rates (0.23 for Cluster 0, 0.094 for Cluster 3).
  + Lower ratings (4.63 and 4.70), fewer reviews, and lower revenue.
  + Low nightly rates ($95.56 and $127.06).
  + Marginally lower occupancy compared to other clusters.
* **Business Insights**:
  + **Archetype**: Budget-friendly or less optimized listings.
  + **Strategy**:
    - Provide hosts with insights to improve quality, such as hosting tips and pricing recommendations.
    - Offer promotional incentives (e.g., discounts for first-time guests).
    - Introduce neighborhood guides to improve guest satisfaction and ratings.

**General Observations and Recommendations:**

1. **Superhost Impact**: Superhost status is strongly correlated with higher ratings and revenue. Encourage new hosts to achieve superhost status quickly through training and clear guidelines.
2. **Targeting High-Value Clusters**: Clusters 1, 2, and 4 perform significantly better in terms of revenue and guest satisfaction. Promote these listings on the platform more prominently (e.g., in search results).
3. **Revenue vs. Occupancy**: Cluster 2 shows that a high nightly rate can offset low occupancy. Educate hosts on pricing strategies to maximize revenue, particularly for luxury listings.
4. **Marketing Opportunities**: Use cluster-specific campaigns:
   * Promote luxury properties (Cluster 2) as aspirational stays.
   * Highlight the reliability and popularity of mid-range listings (Cluster 4).
   * Market economical options (Clusters 0 and 3) to budget-conscious travelers.
5. **Feedback Loops**: Help underperforming clusters improve by identifying their weaknesses (e.g., ratings or reviews) and providing actionable feedback through host dashboards.

# Why superhosts?

## Results

Superhost vs Non-Superhost Comparison

-------------------------------------

revenue: Superhosts mean=3249.55, Non-Superhosts mean=2693.40

occupancy\_rate: Superhosts mean=0.16, Non-Superhosts mean=0.12

rating\_ave\_pastYear: Superhosts mean=4.88, Non-Superhosts mean=4.68

booked\_days: Superhosts mean=26.51, Non-Superhosts mean=25.01

Nightly\_Rate: Superhosts mean=150.43, Non-Superhosts mean=164.50

T-Test for Revenue: t=21.75, p=0.0000

T-Test for Occupancy Rate: t=39.19, p=0.0000

Regression Model Summary (Predicting Revenue):

OLS Regression Results

==============================================================================

Dep. Variable: revenue R-squared: 0.277

Model: OLS Adj. R-squared: 0.277

Method: Least Squares F-statistic: 9203.

Date: Fri, 06 Dec 2024 Prob (F-statistic): 0.00

Time: 19:27:46 Log-Likelihood: -1.1452e+06

No. Observations: 120124 AIC: 2.291e+06

Df Residuals: 120118 BIC: 2.291e+06

Df Model: 5

Covariance Type: nonrobust

===============================================================================================

coef std err t P>|t| [0.025 0.975]

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Intercept 237.0924 175.724 1.349 0.177 -107.324 581.509

host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period 389.3478 22.708 17.146 0.000 344.840 433.856

rating\_ave\_pastYear -52.3960 37.508 -1.397 0.162 -125.912 21.120

Number\_of\_Reviews 1.0783 0.200 5.402 0.000 0.687 1.469

Nightly\_Rate 11.1060 0.063 175.688 0.000 10.982 11.230

occupancy\_rate 7263.1556 56.784 127.908 0.000 7151.859 7374.452

==============================================================================

Omnibus: 151180.516 Durbin-Watson: 1.390

Prob(Omnibus): 0.000 Jarque-Bera (JB): 70967045.944

Skew: 6.526 Prob(JB): 0.00

Kurtosis: 121.357 Cond. No. 4.16e+03

==============================================================================

Notes:

[1] Standard Errors assume that the covariance matrix of the errors is correctly specified.

[2] The condition number is large, 4.16e+03. This might indicate that there are

strong multicollinearity or other numerical problems.

Regression Model Summary (Predicting Occupancy Rate):

OLS Regression Results

==============================================================================

Dep. Variable: occupancy\_rate R-squared: 1.000

Model: OLS Adj. R-squared: 1.000

Method: Least Squares F-statistic: 3.209e+30

Date: Fri, 06 Dec 2024 Prob (F-statistic): 0.00

Time: 19:27:47 Log-Likelihood: 3.6534e+06

No. Observations: 120124 AIC: -7.307e+06

Df Residuals: 120118 BIC: -7.307e+06

Df Model: 5

Covariance Type: nonrobust

===============================================================================================

coef std err t P>|t| [0.025 0.975]

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Intercept -3.678e-16 7.87e-16 -0.467 0.640 -1.91e-15 1.17e-15

host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period 1.862e-17 1.02e-16 0.183 0.855 -1.81e-16 2.18e-16

rating\_ave\_pastYear 6.288e-17 1.68e-16 0.374 0.708 -2.66e-16 3.92e-16

Number\_of\_Reviews -2.557e-16 8.94e-19 -286.139 0.000 -2.57e-16 -2.54e-16

Nightly\_Rate 2.513e-17 2.83e-19 88.791 0.000 2.46e-17 2.57e-17

occupancy\_rate 1.0000 2.54e-16 3.93e+15 0.000 1.000 1.000

==============================================================================

Omnibus: 67016.199 Durbin-Watson: 0.249

Prob(Omnibus): 0.000 Jarque-Bera (JB): 736244.775

Skew: 2.494 Prob(JB): 0.00

Kurtosis: 14.055 Cond. No. 4.16e+03

==============================================================================

## Interpretation of the Results:

1. **Descriptive Statistics (Mean Values):**
   * **Revenue:** Superhosts earn a higher average revenue (about $3,249.55) compared to non-superhosts ($2,693.40). This suggests that superhosts are more successful at generating income.
   * **Occupancy Rate:** Superhosts have a higher mean occupancy rate (0.16) than non-superhosts (0.12). Even this relatively small difference is meaningful in percentage terms, indicating superhosts are booked more frequently.
   * **Rating Average (Past Year):** Superhosts have a higher average rating (4.88 vs. 4.68), implying better guest satisfaction or service quality.
   * **Booked Days:** Superhosts have slightly more booked days on average (26.51 vs. 25.01), reinforcing the observation that their listings are in higher demand.
   * **Nightly Rate:** Interestingly, superhosts charge a somewhat lower nightly rate ($150.43) compared to non-superhosts ($164.50). This could mean superhosts use more competitive pricing strategies, leading to more frequent bookings and ultimately higher revenue.

From these descriptive statistics, superhosts appear to achieve better overall performance and guest satisfaction, resulting in higher total earnings despite slightly lower nightly prices.

1. **Statistical Significance (T-Tests):**
   * **Revenue T-Test:** The t-value (21.75) and extremely low p-value (0.0000) indicate a statistically significant difference in revenue between superhosts and non-superhosts. This is not a random fluctuation; superhosts genuinely earn more on average.
   * **Occupancy Rate T-Test:** Similarly, the t-value (39.19) and p-value (0.0000) for occupancy rate confirm that superhosts significantly outperform non-superhosts in terms of how often their listings are booked.

These tests confirm that the observed differences in revenue and occupancy rate are both real and reliable, not just due to chance.

1. **Regression Model (Predicting Revenue):**  
   The revenue regression model explains about 27.7% (R² = 0.277) of the variation in revenue using several predictors, including superhost status, rating, number of reviews, nightly rate, and occupancy rate. Key points:
   * **Superhost Status:** Being a superhost is associated with an additional $389.35 in revenue, holding other factors constant. This effect is statistically significant.
   * **Occupancy Rate:** Occupancy rate has a very strong positive association with revenue. Increased occupancy leads to substantial revenue gains.
   * **Nightly Rate:** Increasing the nightly rate also raises revenue, although in practice this must be balanced with demand, as higher prices can reduce occupancy if not managed carefully.
   * **Number of Reviews:** While significant, the number of reviews has a modest effect on revenue.
   * **Rating Average (Past Year):** Interestingly, the rating is not statistically significant in this model once other factors are controlled for, suggesting that while ratings are higher for superhosts, the direct impact on revenue in this model may be overshadowed by occupancy and pricing factors.

The positive, significant coefficient for superhost status in the revenue model confirms that even after controlling for other variables, superhosts still outperform non-superhosts in revenue.

1. **Regression Model (Predicting Occupancy Rate):**  
   The second regression model incorrectly includes occupancy\_rate as both a dependent variable and a predictor. This results in an unrealistic R² of 1.000, meaning the model is perfectly predicting occupancy\_rate because it is essentially predicting itself. This model should be disregarded as it’s specified incorrectly. The key takeaway is we should not include the dependent variable as a predictor.

**Business Implications for Airbnb:**

* The data strongly suggests that superhosts generate significantly more revenue and maintain higher occupancy rates.
* The superhost program appears to be associated with higher listing performance. This may be due to increased trust and visibility that comes with the superhost badge, as well as better hosting practices that lead to more bookings.
* Although superhosts charge slightly less per night, the higher occupancy and total revenue indicate that their listings are in greater demand, potentially due to their enhanced reputation and service quality.
* The statistically significant difference in revenue and occupancy rates, as well as the positive coefficient for superhost status in the revenue regression, strongly supports the idea that investing in or incentivizing the superhost program could yield substantial benefits.
* Airbnb management could justify incentivizing hosts to achieve or maintain superhost status, as it likely leads to higher overall platform revenue and guest satisfaction.

**Conclusion:**  
Superhost status is positively and significantly associated with better financial and operational performance metrics. The evidence supports the viability and success of the superhost program in Chicago, indicating that continuing or even enhancing incentives for superhosts may be a worthwhile strategy for Airbnb.
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# Occupancy rate forecasting

**Interpretation of the Results:**

1. **Model Performance (R² and RMSE):**
   * **R² = 0.7577:** The model explains about 76% of the variability in occupancy rate using the selected features. This is reasonably strong, indicating that the chosen variables have substantial predictive power for occupancy.
   * **RMSE = 0.0856:** On average, the model’s predictions are off by about 0.0856 in terms of occupancy rate (which typically ranges from 0 to 1). This level of error is moderate and suggests the model is decently calibrated, though there’s still room for improvement.
2. **Top Influential Features:**
   * **Revenue (Top Feature):** Revenue’s high importance suggests that properties generating more revenue tend to have higher occupancy. This relationship likely arises because revenue is influenced by both price and demand—listings that book more frequently (higher occupancy) and/or at favorable rates earn more revenue. However, it’s also a bit circular, as higher occupancy often leads to higher revenue, so revenue might be acting as a proxy for underlying demand factors.
   * **Booked\_days\_avePrice:** The average price of booked days is critical. This indicates that how a property is priced on days it actually gets booked strongly influences future occupancy trends. This could reflect a host’s pricing strategy success—competitive prices on booked days may attract more guests and improve occupancy rates over time.
   * **Prev\_available\_days & Prev\_available\_days\_aveListedPrice:** Historical availability and pricing patterns matter. If a property was frequently available in the past (and at what listed price), it might signal seasonal trends, pricing strategy effectiveness, or demand fluctuations that affect current occupancy.
   * **Scraped Date\_month (Seasonality):** The month during which data was scraped shows up as important, suggesting seasonal trends in bookings. Certain months may bring more demand, thus affecting occupancy rates.
   * **Prev\_occupancy\_rate, Prev\_Instantbook Enabled, and Number of Reviews:** Historical performance and booking convenience also influence occupancy. If a property had higher occupancy in the past or had instant booking enabled, it may continue attracting guests. Reviews also help build credibility, although they are less influential than pricing and availability factors.
   * **Listing Attributes (Minimum Stay, Listing Type, Bedrooms):** Specific listing characteristics, such as the minimum stay requirement, the type of listing (entire home, private room, etc.), and the number of bedrooms, play a role. Properties that better match travelers’ preferences and constraints may enjoy higher occupancy.
3. **Business Insights:**
   * **Pricing Strategy is Key:** Features related to revenue, booked day prices, and nightly rate appear critical. This suggests that getting the price right—balancing it against competition and seasonality—is essential to maintaining a high occupancy rate.
   * **Historical Trends & Management Practices:** Prior occupancy and availability patterns, as well as enabling convenient booking methods, matter. Hosts who learn from historical booking patterns and adjust their calendar, pricing, and policies accordingly can enhance their occupancy.
   * **Seasonality & Listing Characteristics:** The importance of the month and certain listing attributes indicates that external factors (like seasonal demand) and intrinsic property features (e.g., bedrooms, minimum stay) also contribute to occupancy.
4. **Conclusion:** The model’s performance is good but not perfect, and the most important predictors revolve around revenue and pricing strategies, historical availability, and seasonality. This highlights that to improve occupancy rates, Airbnb hosts (or Airbnb itself) should focus on dynamic pricing strategies, carefully managing availability, leveraging seasonal demand, and ensuring convenient booking options. The results provide actionable insights for optimizing pricing and listing policies to enhance occupancy.
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# “survival” time until a host loses Superhost status, identifying factors that contribute to longer “spans” as a Superhost.

## Results:

Most Significant Covariates (p < 0.05):

coef exp(coef) p \

covariate

prev\_host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period 0.709826 2.033637 0.000000e+00

superhost\_change 2.103670 8.196194 0.000000e+00

host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period -0.537747 0.584063 1.542099e-216

superhost\_change\_gain\_superhost -0.561828 0.570166 7.869023e-75

tract\_prev\_superhosts\_ratio 0.505703 1.658151 2.248696e-36

prev\_host\_is\_superhost1 0.228931 1.257255 5.332031e-36

tract\_superhosts\_ratio -0.332739 0.716958 7.248755e-17

prev\_time\_to\_date\_mean -0.002355 0.997648 1.068293e-14

booked\_days -0.003502 0.996504 4.297385e-13

prev\_host\_is\_superhost2 0.110840 1.117217 1.065751e-08

prev\_rating\_ave\_pastYear 0.164812 1.179171 1.109190e-06

prev\_numCancel\_pastYear -0.028764 0.971646 2.191741e-06

prev\_hostResponseAverage\_pastYear 0.003969 1.003977 1.215197e-04

revenue -0.000007 0.999993 8.061376e-04

prop\_5\_StarReviews\_pastYear -0.168325 0.845079 1.254033e-03

occupancy\_rate -0.134591 0.874074 3.436520e-03

hostResponseAverage\_pastYear 0.002611 1.002615 5.889861e-03

superhost\_period\_all 0.004714 1.004725 7.073595e-03

booked\_days\_avePrice -0.000180 0.999820 1.406693e-02

hostResponseNumber\_pastYear 0.000279 1.000279 2.533064e-02

exp(coef) lower 95% exp(coef) upper 95%

covariate

prev\_host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period 1.964872 2.104809

superhost\_change 7.850681 8.556912

host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period 0.564789 0.603994

superhost\_change\_gain\_superhost 0.536874 0.605522

tract\_prev\_superhosts\_ratio 1.532666 1.793910

prev\_host\_is\_superhost1 1.213018 1.303105

tract\_superhosts\_ratio 0.663048 0.775250

prev\_time\_to\_date\_mean 0.997052 0.998244

booked\_days 0.995560 0.997448

prev\_host\_is\_superhost2 1.075580 1.160465

prev\_rating\_ave\_pastYear 1.103513 1.260017

prev\_numCancel\_pastYear 0.960145 0.983284

prev\_hostResponseAverage\_pastYear 1.001947 1.006012

revenue 0.999989 0.999997

prop\_5\_StarReviews\_pastYear 0.762935 0.936067

occupancy\_rate 0.798713 0.956545

hostResponseAverage\_pastYear 1.000753 1.004480

superhost\_period\_all 1.001284 1.008178

booked\_days\_avePrice 0.999676 0.999964

hostResponseNumber\_pastYear 1.000034 1.000524

## Interpretation:

This Cox proportional hazards model estimates the relationship between various factors (covariates) and the hazard (or risk) of a host losing their Superhost status over time. The event of interest is the **loss of Superhost status**, and the model describes how different variables are associated with the timing of that event.

* **Hazard Ratio (exp(coef)):**
  + A hazard ratio > 1 means that the factor is associated with **increased hazard** (faster loss of Superhost status).
  + A hazard ratio < 1 means that the factor is associated with **decreased hazard** (slower loss, thus longer "survival" as a Superhost).
* **Statistical Significance:**  
  All listed covariates are statistically significant (p < 0.05), indicating strong evidence that these factors influence how long a host remains a Superhost.

**Key Findings:**

1. **Factors Increasing the Hazard (Making Loss More Likely Sooner):**
   * **prev\_host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period (HR ≈ 2.03):**  
     Hosts who were Superhosts in the previous period face about twice the hazard of losing status. This may seem counterintuitive, but it could indicate that sustaining Superhost criteria over multiple periods is challenging, making subsequent loss more probable.
   * **superhost\_change (HR ≈ 8.20):**  
     Changes in Superhost status (e.g., fluctuations) dramatically increase the hazard of losing it. If a host’s status is not stable, they are more likely to lose it sooner.
   * **tract\_prev\_superhosts\_ratio (HR ≈ 1.66):**  
     Operating in a neighborhood with a high ratio of previous Superhosts increases the hazard. Perhaps tougher competition or higher local expectations increase the likelihood of losing Superhost status quickly.
   * **prev\_host\_is\_superhost1 (HR ≈ 1.26) and prev\_host\_is\_superhost2 (HR ≈ 1.12):**  
     Being a Superhost in certain prior evaluations also slightly increases the hazard, reinforcing the idea that maintaining Superhost criteria consistently is challenging.
   * **Some performance metrics with HR just above 1:**  
     Higher previous host response averages or longer superhost\_period\_all are associated with a small increase in hazard, possibly reflecting complexity in the hosting environment or diminishing returns of these factors over time.
2. **Factors Decreasing the Hazard (Prolonging Superhost Tenure):**
   * **host\_is\_superhost\_in\_period (HR ≈ 0.58):**  
     Currently being a Superhost in the given period is strongly protective. Hosts who actively maintain the criteria have a lower risk of losing their status soon.
   * **superhost\_change\_gain\_superhost (HR ≈ 0.57):**  
     Gaining Superhost status at some point is associated with a reduced hazard, suggesting that once earned, achieving that threshold is linked to some improved practices that help maintain it longer.
   * **Performance and Quality Indicators (less than 1.0 HR):**
     + **High occupancy\_rate (HR ≈ 0.87)**: More frequent bookings lower the hazard.
     + **Higher prop\_5\_StarReviews\_pastYear (HR ≈ 0.85)**: Quality service, indicated by excellent reviews, helps sustain Superhost status.
     + **Revenue (HR ≈ 0.999993), booked\_days (HR ≈ 0.9965), and booked\_days\_avePrice (HR ≈ 0.99982):**  
       Although the effects are subtle, generating more revenue and having more booked days slightly decrease the risk of losing status. More booked days and stable pricing strategies likely reflect consistent demand and guest satisfaction.
   * **prev\_numCancel\_pastYear (HR ≈ 0.97):**  
     Interestingly, more past-year cancellations slightly reduce the hazard. This could indicate that some cancellations occur strategically (perhaps less detrimental to the host’s metrics than other factors), or it’s capturing a nuanced aspect of host management style.
3. **Interpretation of Subtle Effects:** Some covariates have hazard ratios very close to 1.0, indicating a minor effect. For example, improvements in host response metrics slightly increase or decrease hazard, potentially reflecting a trade-off or complexity in host response behavior and other criteria.

**Overall Narrative:**

* **Strong Positive Predictors (HR > 1):** Conditions indicating instability or pressure, such as previous Superhost status cycles and changes, lead to a higher risk of losing status sooner.
* **Strong Negative Predictors (HR < 1):** Indicators of good hosting performance—maintaining Superhost status in the present, achieving a stable base of bookings, garnering high-quality reviews, and generating revenue—prolong the Superhost tenure.

**Conclusion:** The Cox model suggests that **hosts who maintain strong performance metrics (occupancy, positive reviews, steady revenue) and currently hold Superhost status are more likely to retain it longer**, effectively "surviving" as a Superhost. On the other hand, hosts who experience changes in their status or operate in highly competitive environments face a higher hazard of losing it sooner.