Reviews_Exploration

October 16, 2017

```
In [1]: import pandas as pd
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import numpy as np
from scipy.stats import pearsonr, linregress
file = "fandango_score_comparison.csv"
movies = pd.read_csv(file)
```



In [3]: plt.hist(movies["Fandango_Stars"]);



1 Fandango vs. Metacritic Reviews

Reviewss for Fandango is 3.0 and above with reviews being centered around 4.0 and 4.50 stars. On the other hand, reviews for Metacritic spans from 0.0 stars to 4.5 stars with reviews being centered around 3.0 and 3.5.

```
In [4]: FS_mean = movies["Fandango_Stars"].mean()
        MC_mean = movies["Metacritic_norm_round"].mean()
        FS_med = movies["Fandango_Stars"].median()
        MC_med = movies["Metacritic_norm_round"].median()
        FS_std = np.std(movies["Fandango_Stars"])
        MC_std = np.std(movies["Metacritic_norm_round"])
        print("Mean of Fandango is:", FS_mean)
        print("Mean of Metacritic is:", MC_mean)
        print("Median of Fandango is:", FS_med)
        print("Median of Metacritic is:", MC_med)
        print("Standard Deviation of Fandango is:", FS_std)
        print("Standard Deviation of Metacritic is:", MC_std)
Mean of Fandango is: 4.089041095890411
Mean of Metacritic is: 2.9726027397260273
Median of Fandango is: 4.0
Median of Metacritic is: 3.0
Standard Deviation of Fandango is: 0.5385321612699531
```

2 Fandango and Metacritic's Methodology

Metacritic's methodologies were very transparent and they wait until they have four critic's ratings before the aggregate the ratings to get a final score. Fandango, on the other hand, isn't transparent about their aggregation at all. Furthermore, Fandango said the error was due to a software bug when asked about their ratings.

3 Fandango and Metacritic's Number Differences

The low median of Metacritic can be attributed to a number of very low movie ratings decrease the median. The high mean of Fandango can be attributed to a number of very high movie ratings increase the mean.

Fandango's low standard deviation is due to their ratings being clustered between 3 and 5 and not as spread out as Metacritic's (whose numbers range from 0.0 to 5.0

In general, Fandango reviews seem to be higher than Metacritic. There does seeem to be some studio influence for Fandango ratings. Although, one can only speculate as their aggregation technique is unknown.





In [7]:	movi	es.sort_values(by	="fm_di	ff", ascending	= False) .head	(5)		
Out[7]:			FILM	I RottenTomato	es RottenTor	natoes_User	Metacrit	
	3	Do You Believe?	(2015)		18	84		
	85	Little Boy	(2015)	:	20	81		
	47	Annie	(2014)	:	27	61		
	19	Pixels	(2015)		17	54		
	134	The Longest Ride	(2015)	:	31	73		
		Metacritic_User	IMDB	Fandango_Stars	Fandango_Ra	atingvalue	RT_norm	
	3	4.7	5.4	5.0		4.5	0.90	
	85	5.9	7.4	4.5		4.3	1.00	
	47	4.8	5.2	4.5		4.2	1.35	
	19	5.3	5.6	4.5		4.1	0.85	
	134	4.8	7.2	4.5		4.5	1.55	
		RT_user_norm .	••	RT_norm_round	RT_user_norr	n_round $\$		
	3	4.20 .	••	1.0		4.0		
	85	4.05 .	••	1.0		4.0		
	47	3.05 .	••	1.5		3.0		
	19	2.70 .	••	1.0		2.5		
	134	3.65 .	••	1.5		3.5		
		Metacritic_norm_	round	Metacritic_use:	r_norm_round	IMDB_norm	_round \setminus	
	3		1.0		2.5		2.5	
	85		1.5		3.0		3.5	
	47		1.5		2.5		2.5	
	19		1.5		2.5		3.0	
	134		1.5		2.5		3.5	
		Metacritic_user_	vote_cc	ount IMDB_user_	_vote_count	Fandango_v	otes \	
	3			31	3136		1793	
	85			38	5927		811	
	47			108	19222		6835	
	19			246	19521		3886	
	134			49	25214		2603	
	Fandango_Difference fr		u_diff					
	3		0.5	4.0				
	85		0.2	3.0				
	47		0.3	3.0				
	19		0.4	3.0				
	134		0.0	3.0				
	[5 rows x 23 columns]							
In [8]:	r_va	<pre>r_value, p_value = pearsonr(movies["Fandango_Stars"], movies["Metacritic r</pre>						

r_value

Out[8]: 0.17844919073895918

4 Fandango and Metacritic Correlation

The low correlation between Fandango and Metacritic signifies Fandango's ratings aren't just inflated, they're fundamentally different. It also appears that Fandango inflates scores overall, and inflates scores depending on the movie.

