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# 1. Summary/Abstract

A product review typically contains a rating and a description. The rating is categorical, or sometimes ordinal, but it is always subjective. The description allows the reviewer a more free-form way to express their experiences and feelings about the product.

Can a machine predict the rating based on the description?

# 2. Introduction

## 2.1 General Background Information

Commentary has become a staple on the Internet. Youtube videos, news articles, and posts/replies on social media are the tip of the iceberg that seek, and receive, feedback from a community transcending language and culture.

Product reviews are practically as old as products themselves. People tend to value their own opinion and tend to want others to agree with them. Some firms rely on extensive (and expensive) market research to assess the viability of a potential product. However, consumers prefer much simpler schemes to make purchasing decisions. Who can forget the Siskel and Ebert method of reviewing movies with a declaration of “Thumbs up!” or “Thumbs down!”?

The amalgamation of the human desire to express and influence with the exponential growth of information dissemination facilitated by the Internet has yielded an immense volume of online product reviews.

## 2.2 Description of data and data source

The data is user-contributed product reviews posted to Amazon and collected by McAuley Lab. The data contains control information, such as a product ID number and a reviewer ID, plus a rating, a title, and a description.

There are a staggering 571.1M product reviews in total, so there is a possibility the criteria for inclusion may become more specific: attrition resultant from data cleaning may be insufficient to reduce the data to a manageable size.

The data will be retreived from: https://amazon-reviews-2023.github.io/

## 2.3 Questions/Hypotheses to be addressed

It is an expectation that a “positive vocabulary”, “negative vocabulary”, and perhaps a “neutral vocabulary” can be extracted from the content of the reviews.

Can machines predict ratings based on review content?

Do humans tend to exaggerate the polarity of their ratings based on the content of their review?

To cite other work (important everywhere, but likely happens first in introduction), make sure your references are in the bibtex file specified in the YAML header above and have the right bibtex key. Then you can include like this:

Examples of reproducible research projects can for instance be found in (McKay, Ebell, Billings, et al., 2020; McKay, Ebell, Dale, Shen, & Handel, 2020).

# 3. Methods

*Describe your methods. That should describe the data, the cleaning processes, and the analysis approaches. You might want to provide a shorter description here and all the details in the supplement.*

## 3.1 Schematic of workflow

Sometimes you might want to show a schematic diagram/figure that was not created with code (if you can do it with code, do it). [Figure 1](#fig-schematic) is an example of some - completely random/unrelated - schematic that was generated with Biorender. We store those figures in the assets folder.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 1: A figure that is manually generated and shows some overview/schematic. This has nothing to do with the data, it’s just a random one from one of our projects I found and placed here. |

## 3.2 Data aquisition

*As applicable, explain where and how you got the data. If you directly import the data from an online source, you can combine this section with the next.*

## 3.3 Data import and cleaning

*Write code that reads in the file and cleans it so it’s ready for analysis. Since this will be fairly long code for most datasets, it might be a good idea to have it in one or several R scripts. If that is the case, explain here briefly what kind of cleaning/processing you do, and provide more details and well documented code somewhere (e.g. as supplement in a paper). All materials, including files that contain code, should be commented well so everyone can follow along.*

## 3.4 Statistical analysis

*Explain anything related to your statistical analyses.*

# 4. Results

## 4.1 Exploratory/Descriptive analysis

*Use a combination of text/tables/figures to explore and describe your data. Show the most important descriptive results here. Additional ones should go in the supplement. Even more can be in the R and Quarto files that are part of your project.*

[Table 1](#tbl-summarytable) shows a summary of the data.

Note the loading of the data providing a **relative** path using the ../../ notation. (Two dots means a folder up). You never want to specify an **absolute** path like C:\ahandel\myproject\results\ because if you share this with someone, it won’t work for them since they don’t have that path. You can also use the here R package to create paths. See examples of that below. I generally recommend the here package.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: Data summary table.   | skim\_type | skim\_variable | n\_missing | complete\_rate | factor.ordered | factor.n\_unique | factor.top\_counts | numeric.mean | numeric.sd | numeric.p0 | numeric.p25 | numeric.p50 | numeric.p75 | numeric.p100 | numeric.hist | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | factor | Gender | 0 | 1 | FALSE | 3 | M: 4, F: 3, O: 2 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | | numeric | Height | 0 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 165.66667 | 15.97655 | 133 | 156 | 166 | 178 | 183 | ▂▁▃▃▇ | | numeric | Weight | 0 | 1 | NA | NA | NA | 70.11111 | 21.24526 | 45 | 55 | 70 | 80 | 110 | ▇▂▃▂▂ | |

## 4.2 Basic statistical analysis

*To get some further insight into your data, if reasonable you could compute simple statistics (e.g. simple models with 1 predictor) to look for associations between your outcome(s) and each individual predictor variable. Though note that unless you pre-specified the outcome and main exposure, any “p<0.05 means statistical significance” interpretation is not valid.*

[Figure 2](#fig-result) shows a scatterplot figure produced by one of the R scripts.

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 2: Height and weight stratified by gender. |

## 4.3 Full analysis

*Use one or several suitable statistical/machine learning methods to analyze your data and to produce meaningful figures, tables, etc. This might again be code that is best placed in one or several separate R scripts that need to be well documented. You want the code to produce figures and data ready for display as tables, and save those. Then you load them here.*

Example [Table 2](#tbl-resulttable2) shows a summary of a linear model fit.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2: Linear model fit table.   | term | estimate | std.error | statistic | p.value | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | (Intercept) | 149.2726967 | 23.3823360 | 6.3839942 | 0.0013962 | | Weight | 0.2623972 | 0.3512436 | 0.7470519 | 0.4886517 | | GenderM | -2.1244913 | 15.5488953 | -0.1366329 | 0.8966520 | | GenderO | -4.7644739 | 19.0114155 | -0.2506112 | 0.8120871 | |

# 5. Discussion

## 5.1 Summary and Interpretation

*Summarize what you did, what you found and what it means.*

## 5.2 Strengths and Limitations

*Discuss what you perceive as strengths and limitations of your analysis.*

## 5.3 Conclusions

*What are the main take-home messages?*

*Include citations in your Rmd file using bibtex, the list of references will automatically be placed at the end*

This paper (Leek & Peng, 2015) discusses types of analyses.

These papers (McKay, Ebell, Billings, et al., 2020; McKay, Ebell, Dale, et al., 2020) are good examples of papers published using a fully reproducible setup similar to the one shown in this template.

Note that this cited reference will show up at the end of the document, the reference formatting is determined by the CSL file specified in the YAML header. Many more style files for almost any journal [are available](https://www.zotero.org/styles). You also specify the location of your bibtex reference file in the YAML. You can call your reference file anything you like.
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