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# Methodology

Provide details on the methodology applied towards the data mining analysis undertaken, providing rationale for these steps.

This should detail how you went from the raw data provided to the chosen model(s), choice of model, and how this methodology helps address the problem domain.

Evidence to support the following of this methodology should be presented, especially any cases which required moving backwards in the process to readdress issues.

A large set of legacy data from a domain of cardio-vascular medicine has been provided to be understood and handled using industry tooling.

CRISP-DM methodology has been used to complete this task by filtering, cleaning, and transforming the data as appropriate such that it can be used to produce optimal classification for patient risk of dying.

### Business Understanding

The first step completed was to gain a business understanding of the data. However due to the lack of a client within the domain, gaining an accurate business understanding proves difficult. Therefore, predictions were created using external knowledge of the domain and assumed as correct.

It is assumed that the main objective is to produce a system which can predict and aid medical professionals in determining a patient’s mortality risk based on entered patient data.

### Data Understanding

The next step was to generate an understanding of the data present. Usually, using the business understanding, only the appropriate data attributes will be collected and used for a system such as this. However, due to the lack of a client to provide any additional data or information, this project will rely fully on the provided data.

Below is a description of the data and sample can be seen in section 1.0 of the code.

The data provided consists of over 1500 patient records each containing 11 attributes describing factors of the patient’s health and numerical data such as ID. The first attribute ‘Random’ displays a unique randomly generated number. This is used to help in randomly sorting the data. Next is the ‘ID’ column which is a unique identifier for each patient. The third attribute ‘Indication’ is a nominal value expressing the cardiovascular event which triggered the hospitalisation. The values included in this attribute should only be one of the following: “A-F”, “ASX”, “CVA” or “TIA”.

There is then a series of Yes or No features depicting factors of each patient including whether the patient suffers from Diabetes, IHD (Ischemic Heart Disease or otherwise known as CHD (Coronary heart disease)), Hypertension, Arrhythmia or if the patient has a history of cardiovascular interventions.

The next two attributes ‘IPSI’ and ‘Contra’ both display integers indicating the percentage figure for cerebral ischemic lesions and contralateral cerebral ischemic lesions accordingly.

Finally, the last attribute ‘label’ indicates the patient’s mortality risk, indicated by “RISK” or “NORISK”.

### Data Filtering and Cleaning

Once a reasonable understanding of the problem was created, the next step was to go through the entirety of the data, filter it and clean it. This involves removing any erroneous errors, transforming data from one format to another and removing irrelevant data. It was found that the best way of doing this was to go through each attribute individually, inspect its data members and compare it to the data understanding. This can be seen in section 2.0.

Before checking each attribute, the number of NaN values is counted to check how complete the data is. Within the data, only 17 NaN values were present, so it was decided that these records would be dropped as attempting to fill them could carry any present errors forwards.

From the data understanding it is known that the attribute ‘Random’ should contain a unique random number for each patient so that all patients can be ordered randomly. However, after inspecting the data in section 2.2 it can be seen that certain values of Random are repeated up to 4 times. This means the attribute does not perform as its supposed to and regards it useless. A possible reason of this could be that when a professional enters their patient’s data into the system, this record isn’t immediately shared with all other professionals, and therefore another doctor could generate the same random number.

After inspecting column ‘Id’ in section 2.4 it can be seen that no duplicates are present and that each value is truly unique. It can also be seen that there seems to be no order with the Id and therefore is essentially random further proving that the attribute ‘Random’ has no use in this system. From these findings it was decided that both attributes ‘Random’ and ‘Id’ are to be dropped from our data set.

The next attribute to look at is the ‘Indication’ attribute. As seen in section 2.5 there are 5 different values present for Indication in the data. This does not match what is stated in data understanding. By looking at the values present we can see we have two repeating values, “ASx” and “Asx”. Using the data understand it can be assumed that these values are identical but have been entered into the system with different capitilisation. Therefore, all these values were combines to one value.

MODELING

AFTER THESE MODELS, GO BACK, LOOK AT DATA AGAIN AND CHANGE

# Results

Results should include tables showing model performance with appropriately selected metrics. No rationale should be provided for this section - simply results of evaluative processes.

If using modified variants of the dataset, these should be clearly identified in the tables with appropriate naming. The justification and description of modification is not for this section.

Additional figures may be used as appropriate, in support of discussion points in the Evaluation & Discussion section, or as evidence for methodology following above.

# Evaluation & Discussion

Evaluation methodology used for generating the results provided in the previous section. How were these evaluated? Why was this selected? What metrics were used and why?

Discussion of the results should be presented with appropriate evidence and rationale. E.g Which is the best model, and why?

Consider each stage in the methodology, and reflect on any improvements which could have been made. Could any techniques have been used which may have improved performance? Why?

No client, so Business understanding may not have been accurate.

# References

Any references used throughout the report should be included here in Hull Harvard Style. If no references used, remove this section.