3055. Top Percentile Fraud

Description

Table: `Fraud`

```
+-------------+---------+
\| Column Name \| Type    \|
+-------------+---------+
\| policy_id   \| int     \|
\| state       \| varchar \|
\| fraud_score \| int     \|
+-------------+---------+
policy_id is column of unique values for this table.
This table contains policy id, state, and fraud score.
```

The Leetcode Insurance Corp has developed an ML-driven **predictive model** to detect the **likelihood** of fraudulent claims. Consequently, they allocate their most seasoned claim adjusters to address the top `5%` of **claims** **flagged** by this model.

Write a solution to find the top `5` **percentile** of claims from **each state**.

Return *the result table ordered by* `state` *in* ***ascending*** *order,* `fraud_score` *in* ***descending*** *order, and* `policy_id` *in* ***ascending*** *order.*

The result format is in the following example.

Example 1:

```
 Input:
Fraud table:
+-----------+------------+-------------+
\| policy_id \| state      \| fraud_score \|
+-----------+------------+-------------+
\| 1         \| California \| 0.92        \|
\| 2         \| California \| 0.68        \|
\| 3         \| California \| 0.17        \|
\| 4         \| New York   \| 0.94        \|
\| 5         \| New York   \| 0.81        \|
\| 6         \| New York   \| 0.77        \|
\| 7         \| Texas      \| 0.98        \|
\| 8         \| Texas      \| 0.97        \|
\| 9         \| Texas      \| 0.96        \|
\| 10        \| Florida    \| 0.97        \|
\| 11        \| Florida    \| 0.98        \|
\| 12        \| Florida    \| 0.78        \|
\| 13        \| Florida    \| 0.88        \|
\| 14        \| Florida    \| 0.66        \|
+-----------+------------+-------------+
 Output:
+-----------+------------+-------------+
\| policy_id \| state      \| fraud_score \|
+-----------+------------+-------------+
\| 1         \| California \| 0.92        \|
\| 11        \| Florida    \| 0.98        \|
\| 4         \| New York   \| 0.94        \|
\| 7         \| Texas      \| 0.98        \|
+-----------+------------+-------------+
 Explanation
- For the state of California, only policy ID 1, with a fraud score of 0.92, falls within the top 5 percentile for this state.
- For the state of Florida, only policy ID 11, with a fraud score of 0.98, falls within the top 5 percentile for this state.
- For the state of New York, only policy ID 4, with a fraud score of 0.94, falls within the top 5 percentile for this state.
- For the state of Texas, only policy ID 7, with a fraud score of 0.98, falls within the top 5 percentile for this state.
Output table is ordered by state in ascending order, fraud score in descending order, and policy ID in ascending order.
```