Forecasting Hotel Room Sales within Online Travel Agencies by Combining Multiple Feature Sets

Gizem Aras¹, Gülşah Ayhan¹, Mehmet Ali Sarikaya¹, A. Aylin Tokuç¹ and C. Okan Sakar²

¹Data Science Department, Cerebro Software Services Inc., Istanbul, Turkey ²Computer Engineering Department, Bahçeşehir University, Istanbul, Turkey

Keywords: Sales Forecasting, Data Enrichment, XGboost, Online Travel Agency (OTA), Advanced Bookings Model.

Abstract: Hotel Room Sales prediction using previous booking data is a prominent research topic for the online travel agency (OTA) sector. Various approaches have been proposed to predict hotel room sales for different prediction horizons, such as yearly demand or daily number of reservations. An OTA website includes offers of many companies for the same hotel, and the position of the company's offer in OTA website depends on the bid amount given for each click by the company. Therefore, the accurate prediction of the sales amount for a given bid is a crucial need in revenue and cost management for the companies in the sector. In this paper, we forecast the next day's sales amount in order to provide an estimate of daily revenue generated per hotel. An important contribution of our study is to use an enriched dataset constructed by combining the most informative features proposed in various related studies for hotel sales prediction. Moreover, we enrich this dataset with a set of OTA specific features that possess information about the relative position of the company's offers to that of its competitors in a travel metasearch engine website. We provide a real application on the hotel room sales data of a large OTA in Turkey. The comparative results show that enrichment of the input representation with the OTA-specific additional features increases the generalization ability of the prediction models, and tree-based boosting algorithms perform the best results on this task.

1 INTRODUCTION

A few decades ago, the idea of booking a hotel just with a few clicks would have been unthinkable. Nowadays, it is becoming the norm to make hotel reservations online. According to an online travel industry report from 2016, about 180 million people visited online travel sites in a month that is a 27 percent increase from the year-earlier period (Nasr, 2015). This increase in online search for hotel reservations reflects the growth of hotel bookings made through online travel agencies (OTA). OTAs simplify the process of searching and selecting hotel rooms for consumers. Instead of going on a few individual hotel pages, people can go to OTA websites and browse many hotels in a specific place for a specific date at once. Due to the popularity of online research, nowadays hotel marketers are very dependent on OTAs. With the help of intermediary companies such as booking.com, expedia.com, hostelworld.com, and kayak.com, online hotel booking becomes widely popular in the hospitality industry. This area is in recent years for live practitioners and hotel marketing of utmost importance due to the increasing share obtained from these platforms.

The stochastic nature of hotel bookings (in terms of metrics such as number of nights, number of rooms, type of room, fare class.) needs to stochastic programming and simulations. Despite the fact that daily hotel booking predictions are more practical for short-term cost calculations for players in the OTA industry, a realistic model for the market demand needs to be more complex and should offer innovative and differentiated solutions. Forecasting hotel room sales has proven to be a challenging task because of the dynamics and complexity of the booking process. Bookings are influenced by many factors such as seasonality, group bookings, events, hotel types, and hotel properties. Capturing such factors properly is essential for the accuracy of the forecast.

In this paper, we propose a novel forecasting framework on hotel room reservation that uses booking data, hotel properties, and OTA information. Our model is based on the comparison of various machine learning models. As an application, we used 4-monthlong dataset collected by one of the largest OTAs in

Aras, G., Ayhan, G., Sarikaya, M., Tokuç, A. and Sakar, C.

In Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Pattern Recognition Applications and Methods (ICPRAM 2019), pages 565-573 ISBN: 978-989-758-351-3

Copyright © 2019 by SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, Lda. All rights reserved

Forecasting Hotel Room Sales within Online Travel Agencies by Combining Multiple Feature Sets. DOI: 10.5220/0007383205650573

Turkey. The forecast is updated with daily incoming booking information, and the model predicts the bookings for the next day. Most existing work on forecasting for OTAs use only a single point forecast (past reservation information). Our work differs from previous studies as we combine booking data, hotel facility properties, hotel prices, and OTA report data which includes information about the click, bid and impression values for hotels. Our hypothesis was that this enrichment would improve sales forecasting. The model is used as a real application for daily booking forecasting by a company that offers daily bids for many hotels in a large OTA.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In section II, a comprehensive literature review about hotel sales prediction is given. In section III, the methodology of the experiments is presented, and implementation details of these methods are given in section IV. Finally, in section V, conclusions and potential future works are given.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Reviewing the literature, we observed that there are different approaches for forecasting hotel room sales. We present some of this work briefly in this section. In a recent related study, Tse and Poon (Tse and Poon, 2015) used one year long reservation data provided by Hotel ICON in Hong Kong. They observed certain trends in data and developed a regression model using a second order equation. Their proposed system predicts hotel reservations using reservation curves from the past data. To predict a specific day's reservation, they use a 90-day window. Authors do daily and weekly predictions, and observe that their model performs better on weekly predictions. This result makes sense, as daily changes in reservations smooth out when looking at weekly cumulative data.

A study by Cezar and Ögüt (Cezar and Ögüt, 2016) examines the impact of consumer feedback, suggestion systems and ranking on search listings for hotels. For 1037 hotels in Paris and 540 hotels in Barcelona; they collect data about the number of online reservations, average hotel price per night, number of stars, number of customer comments, average customer rating and supply, number of employees, service, facility, cleanliness, comfort, money and location. Their data range between April 2012 and June 2012 and is obtained from Booking.com. Authors use two fractional models: a quasi-maximum likelihood estimation model and a regression model with beta distribution. They find that high ratings, high number of recommendations and high ranks in search listings have a significant positive effect on conversion rates. Furthermore, they observe that high number of recommendations increases reservations even with low ranks in search listings. Their findings show that enriching data with recommendation or user-basedranking features can also be used to improve our model's performance as a future direction.

Ellero and Pelegrini (Ellero and Pellegrini, 2014) assess the performance of different widely-adopted models from literature to forecast Italian hotel occupancy. They find that exponential smoothing, advanced pick-up, and moving average models show the best success in the compared models. They create their models using historical data on occupancy rates for five Italian hotels between 2007 and 2010. Their studies conclude that even with the best models, the predictions were unsatisfactory (average MAPE of 20%). Their findings imply that hotel occupancy prediction is a hard problem and that it may be difficult to get satisfactory results in this domain.

The demand for hotel rooms in the hotel industry in Turkey between the years 2002-2013 is estimated using ARIMA by Efendioglu and Bulkan in a recent study (Efendioğlu and Bulkan, 2017). In their studies, they determine the hotel room capacity according to the costs of the unsold rooms and the ARIMA distribution. They also report that the hotel room demands in the country could be affected by political crises and warnings about terrorism. This result is another example of the non-deterministic nature of hotel room sales, as it shows how unpredictable factors can affect the demand for hotels.

In another study, Shenoy et al.(Shenoy et al., 2017) demonstrate their estimation of reservation information based on user activity and search results using the data provided by Expedia. Their studies show that acquisition of significant results becomes possible through clustering and ensemble operations.

Lee(Lee, 2018) aims to predict the hotel room demand using the basic characteristics of the reservation. This study examines the time varying demand rates, the high variability in the recent demands and the positive correlations between the demands at different time intervals. Three Poisson mixture models (Poisson, Negative Binomial, Negative Multinomial) are investigated to obtain the characteristics of reservations. The study reports that the dynamic updating method that utilizes inter-temporal correlations significantly improves the short-term predictability of hotel room demands.

Xie and Lee investigate the relationship between search, click and reservation(Xie and Lee, 2015). They use data obtained from 39,574 search queries that include 81,648 distinct hotels. Their data comes from Expedia, which is a major online travel agency (OTA) website. The study shows that ranking high in hotel features (search results - position, quality indicators, incentives, and brand link) improves bookings significantly.

3 DATA PREPARATION

3.1 Dataset Descriptions

In this section, we describe the dataset used to construct our model. We worked with Company X, an OTA that sells hotels online. Company X sells hotels through a travel metasearch engine as well as other channels. We built our sales model to predict sales that company X would do through this travel metasearch engine. Our datasets were provided by Company X and daily predictions of our model were shared with Company X. From hereafter, we refer to company X as the OTA and the intermediary OTA website that Company X was using as a channel to sell its hotels as the travel metasearch engine. Features were chosen from the datasets based on their correlations with the target variable, and according to their importance in a simple regression. Then, additional features were extracted from these columns following a time-delay approach.

The first dataset contains sales-related information about the hotels. This dataset can be distinguished from the other datasets as it has the target variable of the model, so called the 'net total cost'. The features extracted from the provided raw dataset can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: The descriptions of features obtained from reservation data of company X.

Feature	Description	Range	
Total	The staying total night of a	(1.542)	
night hotel		(1,542)	
Total	The purchasing total rooms of	(1.60)	
rooms	a hotel	(1,00)	
Dancan	The number of person who stays	(1.09)	
Person	in a hotel	(1,96)	
Net The net sale amount of a hotel		(0,3608.08)	
total cost in terms of Turkish Liras			
Counting	The number of	(0.16)	
Count pre	pre-reservations made for a hotel	(0,10)	
Count avaata	The number of	(1.44)	
Count exacts	definite reservations made for a hotel	(1,44)	
Count concele	The number of	(0.0)	
Count cancels	cancelled reservations made for a hotel.	(0,9)	

The first dataset is enriched with the report dataset which is provided by the travel metasearch engine to each company that gives daily bids in order to be demonstrated online in the travel metasearch engine website. The daily report gives information about how the OTA is performing in terms of appearing in search results and getting bookings, based on the bid OTA gives per hotel. The features of the report dataset consist of clicks, bid, average booking value, gross revenue, top position share, hotel impression, opportunity cost per click, region, stars, rating and hotel types. These features are listed in Table 2 along with their descriptions. Some of these features, such as the number of clicks received per hotel or how much bid is needed to guarantee the first position are online evaluation metrics that are commonly used in ecommerce.

Table 2: The descriptions of features obtained from daily report provided by the travel metasearch engine.

Feature	Description	Range	
	The daily amount of clicks		
Clicks	received for a hotel	(0,1618)	
	in the metasearch engine.		
Bid	Given bid from OTA	(0.009.0.56)	
Did	to travel metasearch engine	(0.000)	
	The given value of each hotel		
Average booking value	regarding their bookings	(0, 131534)	
/	by travel metasearch engine		
Gross Bayanya	The obtained gross revenue of hotels	(0, 121524)	
Gloss Revenue	in terms of Turkish Liras	(0, 151554)	
Top position share	The ratio of being in the first position	(0.1)	
Top position share	of a hotel	(0,1)	
Hotel impression	Number	(0,28418)	
rioter impression	of daily pageviews of a hotel		
Opportunity Cost	The bid amount recommended	ONS	
Bar Click	by the travel metasearch engine	(0,1)	
Fei Click	to appear first on hotel listings.		
Cost	Total cost per click of a hotel.	(0,244.63)	
Region	The region where the hotel is located	7 Class	
Region	The region where the noter is located.	Categorical values	
Stars	The star number of a hotel.	(0,5)	
Pating	The rating of a hotel given	(0.96.17)	
Rating	by the travel metasearch engine's users	(0,90.17)	
Hotel Types	The binary variable that indicates	2 Class	
rioter Types	if a hotel is a summer or winter hotel.	Categorical Values	

The third dataset provided by the OTA includes price and position information of all the companies offering in travel metasearch engine along with their hotel Ids', starting date of reservation and ending date of reservation. The bulk features of the data given by OTA can be seen in Table 3. As there are many companies that give offers in the metasearch engine, we organized this data and extracted the daily prices and the daily positions of each hotel offered by our OTA. Besides, the minimum price of a hotel in the travel metasearch website and the minimum price of a hotel which is in the top 4 online demonstrated order was taken regardless of which company made the offer. Here we took top 4, as the travel metasearch website shows prices for four hotels initially. In this way, we had the knowledge of competitor companies' prices for the hotels that OTA offers in that particular day. We summarized the information from this dataset with the following columns; my price, my position, top4 min price and total min price. The created features from price and position data are given in Table 4.

Table 3: The descriptions of features obtained from the price and position data.

Feature	Description	Range
Price	Price of a hotel	(26, 57399)
Position	The display ranking of a hotel	$(1 \ 244)$
POSITION	in the travel metasearch website	(1, 244)

Table 4: The descriptions of features enriched from price and position data.

Feature	Description	Range
My price	The price of a hotel which OTA offers.	(30, 27037)
My position	The position of the OTA's hotel on the	(1.200)
wry position	metasearch engine listings.	(1, 200)
	Minimum price of a hotel	
Total min price	offered by any company	(28, 27037)
	in the metasearch engine listings.	
	Minimum price of a hotel	
Top 4 min price	belonging to the top 4 position	(28, 24094)
	demonstrated in travel metasearch website.	

Finally, the fourth dataset used to construct the model is called the facility dataset. It contains a set of features that determine the success of the hotels regarding some evaluation criteria. The features with their descriptions from this dataset can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5: The descriptions of features obtained from facility dataset.

Feature	Descriptions	Range
Score	Online Reputation	(-110, 5780)
Survey Score	Customer Satisfaction	(0,100)
Total Points	Total of The Scores	(0,316)
Total Votes	Total Votes by The Public	(0,4)

3.2 Preprocessing

After collecting data under the four subsets mentioned above, a combining process was required. While the reservation dataset includes only the hotels that were selling, the other three datasets contain all hotels of the OTA that are displayed in the travel metasearch engine. Therefore, merging these four subsets resulted in a final dataset containing 375000 rows with 91% of target variable being 0. This meant there were not confirmed reservations for 91% of data that came from daily metasearch engine report dataset.

Considering that we need to predict the next day's sales amount, the sliding window approach could be applied to construct a time-delay based machine learning model. For this purpose, additional features that are able to capture the temporal aspects were created. These features are obtained by computing the moving averages and standard deviations of 3, 7, 15, 30 and 45 days of the original features. Furthermore, daily sliding windows approach was implemented for only the features which were correlated with the target variable. The most correlated feature to the target variable was the target variable itself, as represented in the past days' sliding windows columns. Findings support the fact that total nights and rooms are directly related to sales amount. These features were adjusted as sliding windows parameters and the values were added as columns to the dataset from the day before the current day to eleven days before the current day. In order to acquire the optimal window size in terms of days, we observed different sizes in the data along with XGBoost Cross Validation algorithm and deduced the optimal size as 10. The obtained results can be seen in Fig. 1. Hence, 10 days for each daily prediction of each hotel is used to capture seasonal trends. Additional features were added to the dataset with their 10 days daily moving values. These features are 10 days daily sliding values of opportunity cost per click, clicks, average booking value, bid, cost, gross revenue, and person, i.e., number of people who stayed in the hotel, respectively. Besides, profit value was calculated by subtracting the multiplication of bid and clicks from the net total cost. The moving sums of tracking 3, 7, 15, 30, 45 days are integrated into the dataset. Sliding operation implemented based on correlations is shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 1: Window size effect on XGboost Cross Validation.

Moreover, we were able to obtain the number of definite reservations, pre-reservations and canceled reservations from the reservation data. These counts were added to data with their moving averages and standard deviations in 3, 7, 15, 30 and 45 days peri-

ods. Since the dependency of definite reservations in sales amount was higher than the other types of reservations, daily sliding values of definite reservations were also added to the dataset.

In addition to these features, as the target variable had a high amount of zeros, we inserted a new feature representing the number of days the hotel has not been sold in a specific period. Thus, we aim to improve the success of the model in distinguishing the selling and non-selling hotels. Apart from these, the cumulative sums of net total cost, total night, total rooms, my price, total min-price, clicks, hotel impression, and the number of different types of reservations, which are definite, pre, and canceled, were added to the dataset.

Last but not least, some features related to date considered to be important in online travel agencies sector were integrated to the model. These were the day information, the number of days left to the closest public holiday and the length of the closest holiday in terms of days. Hence, all the columns were determined and the enriched dataset was obtained. Yet, the dataset required additional pre-processing steps to handle with missing and categorical values. Missing values of features other than standard deviation features were filled with 0's. The missing values in the standard deviation columns were filled with average values of the related column.

Another pre-processing operation applied on the dataset is to encode the categorical features using onehot-encoding. Once we completed the pre-processing steps, the features that belong to time t + 1 (next day), for which sales prediction will be made have been extracted from the dataset to avoid bias about the sales value at time t + 1 which is the target variable of the regression problem. After all these steps, the enriched dataset was obtained which contains 375000 rows and 315 columns belonging to the dates between 1 February 2018 and 1 July 2018.

4 MODELLING

Sales prediction is a regression problem in which the sales amount of each hotel for the next day is aimed to be predicted. As described in the previous section, hotel reservation data has high variance. There exists seasonal trends, weekly trends, different patterns for summer and city hotels, increases in bookings independent of seasonal trends due to marketing strategies, etc. Furthermore, approximately a third of all reservations get canceled. Due to this high variance in data, we focused on non-linear prediction methods and creating relevant features with a time-delay data pre-processing approach.

During modelling, we used train/test split crossvalidation approach for model training and validation. We created training and test sets by including 66% of data belonging to hotel in the training set and 33% in the test set, in order to have samples from each hotel in the training set. We did 5fold cross-validated (again, hotel-based random split) random search (Bergstra and Bengio, 2012) to tune the hyper-parameters using a part of the training set as validation set. Three different evaluation metrics were used; R Squared (RSQ or coefficient of determination), Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE). We considered all of these three evaluation metrics to determine the best model. RSQ is a well-known evaluation metric used in regression problems, and it is defined as the proportion of the variance in the target variable that is predictable from the explanatory variables. It measures the goodness of fit of prediction values to the real values. RMSE is the standard deviation of the actual target variable from the predicted target variable. It measures the error between the set of observed and predicted values. MAE is another error metric used in regression problems which measures the average magnitude of the error between the set of actual and predicted target values.

We have used a different type of non-parametric machine learning algorithms to validate the contribution of the data-enrichment process in sales prediction. One of these approaches is the tree-based algorithms which combine multiple weak learners to obtain a single generalizable model. Extreme gradient boosting (XGBoost) (Chen and Guestrin, 2016) is a technique that recently became popular among data scientists, based on its popularity on many machine learning challenges (Mangal and Kumar, 2016; Hengl et al., 2017; Zhou and Feng, 2017). Gradient boosting combines the gradient descent algorithm with boosting to minimize overfitting when creating ensembles of trees. In XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin, 2016), there are additional regularization parameters that control the size and shape of trees, which makes predictions more robust and the algorithm more generally applicable. Finally, random forest, gradient boosting, and extreme gradient-boosting (XGBoost) algorithms from tree-based algorithms were chosen to be applied in our study, as they have been shown to perform high accuracies on various regression tasks (Breiman, 2001; Geurts et al., 2006; Friedman, 2001).

In addition to the above-mentioned tree-based algorithms, we have also used a deep neural network which has more than one hidden layer to cope with the highly complex nature of the underlying model. Each



hidden layer in the deep neural network increases both the selectivity and the invariance of the representation. A deep neural network system can implement extremely intricate functions of its inputs that are simultaneously sensitive for correlations and insensitive to large irrelevant variations(Candel et al., 2016). We have also applied a generalized linear model (GLM) as a simpler baseline model. GLM is a generalization of standard linear regression used to predict responses both for dependent variables with discrete distributions and for those which are nonlinearly related to the predictors(Nykodym et al., 2016). The results obtained with XGBoost, random forest, gradient boosting, deep neural network and generalized linear model algorithms are presented in the next section.

4.1 Environment Settings

All experiments were ran on a remote Linux (Ubuntu 17.10) server with 32-seed CPU. Algorithms were implemented using open source libraries. The XGBoost algorithm was used in Python with its Scikit-Learn wrapping (Chen and Guestrin, 2016). H2O (H2O.ai, 2018) implementations of gradient boosting, random forest, deep neural network, and generalized linear model algorithms were used in R. The H2O web interface was used from 54321 port of localhost once it was initialized.

5 RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The most successful model obtained from reservation dataset was gradient boosting as seen in Tables 6 and 8. On the other hand, XGBoost gave the highest RSQ in the enriched dataset both on validation and test sets (see Tables 7 and 9). In the reservation dataset, the difference between the top two performing models is not significant, as ranking of the models differ when different evaluation metrics are used. Similarly, in the enriched dataset, r-squared errors of the top three models cover each others' ranges. Therefore, it is difficult to conclude that one model performs significantly better than the other ones. We should also note that as seen in 8 the tree-based models performed better than generalized linear and deep neural network models on the enriched dataset. We should note that different platforms were used to train different models. For instance, gradient boosting model was taken from the H2O Library, and implemented in R. H2O also had its own implementation of XGBoost, but we preferred to use the native library in Python. Having tried these models in other platforms might have lead to slightly different results but not significant changes.

The obtained results show that the machine learning algorithm performs better on the enriched dataset. It is seen in Table 9 that the RSQ obtained with XG-Boost increased from 0.269 to 0.574 on the test set, a difference of 0.305. In cross validation results, the

Model	RSQ	MSE	MAE	
eXtreme Gradient	0.254 . / 0.02	2612 52 1/ 159 11	20.15.1.0.49	
Boosting	0.234 +/- 0.03	3012.33 +/- 138.11	20.13 +/- 0.48	
Gradient Boosting	0.270 1/ 0.04	2402 20 1/ 172 01	20.06 1/ 0.47	
Machines	0.279 +/- 0.04	3492.20 +/- 173.91	20.06 +/- 0.4/	
Random	0.288 1/ 0.02	2727.01 1/ 400.02	20.44 1/ 0.44	
Forest	0.288 +/- 0.02	3737.91 +7- 400.95	20.44 +/- 0.44	
Generalized Linear	0.210 ./ 0.05	2618.00 1/ 240.44	10.82 . / 0.25	
Models	0.510 +/- 0.05	3018.99 +/- 240.44	19.82 +/- 0.23	
Deep Neural	0.286 1/ 0.06	2754 05 1/ 450 26	10.00 1/ 1.27	
Network	0.200 +/- 0.00	5754.25 +7- 450.50	19.90 +/- 1.57	

Table 6: Cross Validation Results for the ReservationDataset.

Table 7: Cross Validation Results for the Enriched Dataset.

Model	RSQ	MSE	MAE	
eXtreme Gradient	0.611 ±/- 0.02	1600 18 ±/- 251 76	8 70 ±/- 0 29	
Boosting	0.011 17- 0.02	1000.10 17- 251.70	8.70 +7- 0.29	
Gradient Boosting	0.585 ±/ 0.03	2088 06 ±/ 413 04	0 12 ±/ 0 30	
Machines	0.585 +7- 0.05	2000.90 +/- 413.94	9.42 +/- 0.39	
Random	0.582 +/ 0.02	2105.05 ±/ 245.04	9.42 ± 0.15	
Forest	0.562 17- 0.02	2105.75 17-245.74	9.42 47- 0.15	
Generalized Linear	0.450 ±/ 0.04	2754 66 ±/ 133 55	16 16 1/ 0.38	
Models	0.430 +/- 0.04	2754.00 +/- 155.55	10.10 +/- 0.38	
Deep Neural	0.517 . / 0.04	2426 28 1/ 248 02	14.86 1/ 1.20	
Network	0.517 +/- 0.04	2420.36 +/- 248.03	14.80 +/- 1.20	

Model	RSQ	MSE	MAE
eXtreme Gradient	0.260	2884 67	10.83
Boosting	0.209	3884.07	19.03
Gradient Boosting	0.280	3877 75	10.01
Machines	0.280	5621.25	19.91
Random	0.202	2571 57	20.17
Forest	0.203	5571.57	20.17
Generalized Linear	0.228	3415 74	10.60
Models	0.238	3413.74	19.00
Deep Neural	0.216	2516.00	20.38
Network	0.210	5510.00	20.38

Table 8: Test Results for the Reservation Dataset.

difference was even slightly larger: 0.357. These results show that the additional features integrated during data preparation step detailed in Section 3.1 carry important information in capturing the trend observed in the net total cost. Fig. 3 shows the top ten features ranked according to their feature importance level in XGBoost model. Feature importance in this graph are calculated using the average coverage of splits, which is defined as the number of samples affected by the split (xgboost developers, 2018). As seen in Fig. 3, three of the top ten features are not from the initial

rucie », rest results for the Emitened Dutaset
--

Model	RSQ	MSE	MAE
eXtreme Gradient	0.574	2267 02	0.45
Boosting	0.374	2207.02	9.45
Gradient Boosting	0.564	2150.08	0.54
Machines	0.504	2139.90	9.54
Random	0.572	2121 13	0.40
Forest	0.372	2121.13	9.40
Generalized Linear	0.443	2760.80	16.18
Models	0.443	2700.00	10.10
Deep Neural	0 507	21/2 08	15 15
Network	0.307	2442.90	15.15

reservation dataset. The gross revenue and profit related features were obtained from the OTA's report dataset. Net total cost is actually the daily revenue generated per hotel by company X. So, the actual revenue is naturally related to profit and gross revenue values calculated in the OTA's report. The important features that are from the reservation dataset represent information about past net total costs and bookings. From this observation, we can suggest that with appropriate representation of past information, it is possible to capture relevant trends, even in hotel bookings data, which has notably high variability and noise.

The actual and predicted plots of the target variable (net total cost) can be seen in Figure 4. It is observed that the actual net total costs with comparably lower values are predicted better as they accumulated a relatively narrow range around the line. Since there are slightly more points under the line than the above, it is seen that the predictions generated by the model are lower than the actual values. The sales amounts higher than 1000 can be considered as the minority group in data, and the predictions are becoming less accurate after this point. Furthermore, the sales amount after 1500-2000 range can be interpreted as outliers for our dataset, and it can be seen that the model does not produce accurate predictions for values around this range.



Figure 3: Top 10 Features from Extreme Gradient Boosting Model with the Enriched Dataset.



Figure 4: XGboost Model's Predictions Plotted Against Real Sales.

6 CONCLUSION & FUTURE WORK

In this study, we investigated the performance of some machine learning techniques on a baseline and enriched dataset hotel sales prediction. For this purpose, different prediction algorithms including Gradient boosting, XGboost, random forest, generalized linear model and deep neural network were applied to predict next day's sales using the historical data. The obtained results demonstrated that feature enrichment was crucial for solving the complex problem of hotel sales prediction. Compared to the studies in literature, the nature of our problem was different. To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first one that aims to predict net total cost in the future, which is a real value related to price for hotel sales. We improved our models by using features that can summarize the trends in the target variable well. The results also showed that algorithms that used ensembles of trees, especially boosting algorithms, overwhelmed other methods. We should also note that boosting algorithms i.e., XGboost and gradient boosting, gave comparable results.

In future work, data can be enriched further by adding consumer-generated recommendation and comments data. Some studies in the literature showed that consumer-generated ratings and the number of recommendations are important features for hotel reservations (e.g., (Cezar and Ögüt, 2016)). We can integrate this information into our prediction framework to obtain more generalizable models. For this purpose, natural language processing techniques such as sentiment analysis can be used to extract features from consumer-generated text data and the summarized information obtained from this module can be combined with the features used in this study.

REFERENCES

- Bergstra, J. and Bengio, Y. (2012). Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Feb):281–305.
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45(1):5–32.
- Candel, A., Parmar, V., LeDell, E., and Arora, A. (2016). Deep learning with h20. *H2O. ai Inc.*
- Cezar, A. and Ögüt, H. (2016). Analyzing conversion rates in online hotel booking: the role of customer reviews, recommendations and rank order in search listings. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(2):286–304.
- Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd acm* sigkdd international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, pages 785–794. ACM.
- Efendioğlu, D. and Bulkan, S. (2017). Capacity management in hotel industry for turkey. In *Handbook of Research on Holistic Optimization Techniques in the Hospitality, Tourism, and Travel Industry*, pages 286– 304. IGI Global.
- Ellero, A. and Pellegrini, P. (2014). Are traditional forecasting models suitable for hotels in italian cities? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(3):383–400.
- Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1189–1232.
- Geurts, P., Ernst, D., and Wehenkel, L. (2006). Extremely randomized trees. *Machine learning*, 63(1):3–42.
- H2O.ai (2018). R Interface for H2O. version 3.20.0.3.
- Hengl, T., de Jesus, J. M., Heuvelink, G. B., Gonzalez, M. R., Kilibarda, M., Blagotić, A., Shangguan, W., Wright, M. N., Geng, X., Bauer-Marschallinger, B., et al. (2017). Soilgrids250m: Global gridded soil information based on machine learning. *PLoS one*, 12(2):e0169748.
- Lee, M. (2018). Modeling and forecasting hotel room demand based on advance booking information. *Tourism Management*, 66:62–71.
- Mangal, A. and Kumar, N. (2016). Using big data to enhance the bosch production line performance: A kaggle challenge. In *Big Data (Big Data), 2016 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 2029–2035. IEEE.
- Nasr, R. (2015). Online travel industry is booming: Report. *Retrieved July*, 6:2016.
- Nykodym, T., Kraljevic, T., Hussami, N., Rao, A., and Wang, A. (2016). Generalized linear modeling with h2o. *Published by H2O. ai, Inc.*
- Shenoy, G. G., Wagle, M. A., and Shaikh, A. (2017). Kaggle competition: Expedia hotel recommendations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.02915.
- Tse, T. S. M. and Poon, Y. T. (2015). Analyzing the use of an advance booking curve in forecasting hotel reservations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(7):852–869.
- xgboost developers (2018). Python API Reference for XG-Boost.

- Xie, K. and Lee, Y.-J. (2015). Hotels at our fingertips: Understanding consumer conversion from search, clickthrough, to book.
- Zhou, Z.-H. and Feng, J. (2017). Deep forest: Towards an alternative to deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08835*.

