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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 [2]: \%matplotlib inline
plt.hist(movies["Metacritic_norm_round"]);


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 [5]: plt.scatter(movies["Fandango_Stars"], movies["Metacritic_norm_round"]);


```
In [6]: movies["fm_diff"] = np.abs(movies["Metacritic_norm_round"]
    - movies["Fandango_Stars"])
```

In [7]: movies.sort_values(by="fm_diff", ascending=False).head(5)

```
Out [7]:
    FILM RottenTomatoes RottenTomatoes_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
        1 3 4 \text { The Longest Ride (2015) 31 73}
        Metacritic_User IMDB Fandango_Stars Fandango_Ratingvalue 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 4.5 4.1 0.85
    134 4.8 7.2 4.5 4.5 1.55
        RT_user_norm ... RT_norm_round RT_user_norm_round \
        3.20 1.0 4.0
        85 4.05 ... 1.0 4.0
        47 3.05 \cdots 1.5 3.0
        19 2.70 1.0 2.5
        134 3.65 .. 1.5 3.5
        Metacritic_norm_round Metacritic_user_norm_round IMDB_norm_round \
            1.0 2.5 2.5
            1.5 3.0 3.5
            1.5 2.5 2.5
            1.5 2.5 3.0
            1.5 2.5 3.5
            Metacritic_user_vote_count IMDB_user_vote_count Fandango_votes \
                    31 3136 1793
            38 5927 811
            108 19222 6835
    19 246 19521 3886
    134 49 25214 2603
\begin{tabular}{rrr} 
Fandango_Difference & fm_diff \\
0.5 & 4.0 \\
0.2 & 3.0 \\
0.3 & 3.0 \\
0.4 & 3.0 \\
0.0 & 3.0
\end{tabular}
[5 rows x 23 columns]
In [8]: r_value, p_value = pearsonr(movies["Fandango_Stars"], movies["Metacritic_nc r_value
```


## 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.

```
In [9]: slope, intercept, r_value, p_value, stderr_slope = linregress(
    movies["Metacritic_norm_round"], movies["Fandango_Stars"])
pred_1 = 1 * slope + intercept
pred_5 = 5 * slope + intercept
plt.scatter(movies["Metacritic_norm_round"], movies["Fandango_Stars"])
plt.plot([1,5],[pred_1,pred_5])
plt.xlim(1,5)
plt.show()
```



