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# Methodology

## Business understanding

The data will be analyzed using the CRISP-DM. The data consists of visits to a hospital due to cardiovascular complications. The model being developed will be used to identify patents that are at risk, and therefore there are significant ramifications if the model is malformed therefore false negatives must be avoided when selecting a model. Data protection is also a significant concern however as we only have access to numerical identifiers and therefore identifying individuals would be extremely difficult. The model itself will be used to classify patients to risk or no risk depending on a variety of features, this however may have to be overseen by a trained medical professional due to regulations in the industry.

## Data understanding

Reading the data description gave the data scientist insight into the domains of the columns and suggested. Comments were also provided specifying what each column means along with non-clinical descriptions. This allowed the data scientist to research how certain features could affect risk. Certain medical were harder to decipher such as ischemic and contralateral. Contralateral means opposite side of the body and Ischemic is defined as lack of oxygen leading to necrosis or cell death. Therefore, this means IPSI and Contra are the percentage of oxygen lacking lesions for each side of the body, and the closer they are to 100% the more risk that is involved. This would be verified with a medical professional or the data owner however this is one of the issues working with legacy data.

Looking at the data types and using the describe function in pandas allows the data scientist to get a good overview. Session ID did not seem to be provided and random seemed to have duplicates which did not match the data description which implied that either the data description or data is wrong. The unique values per column showed that many columns contained invalid values as many columns could only have binary values or certain other sets as is the case for the Indication feature.

## Data prep

Due to the data containing invalid or incomplete values, cleaning was required. Removing or imputing these data values would allow for more consistent and accurate visualizing and models.

Using the data description as a guide to ensure data integrity, the data scientist checked the data types as this would aid with finding the domain of the columns, allowing him/her to spot and invalid values.

Firstly, the entire random column seemed to be to contain duplicates, therefore having a closer look at these data points suggested that these we not identical patents as they had varying features even if random was identical.

Setting an Index would be useful to call individual records so the data scientist can pull records by ID and could review them individually. ID was chosen as it was already unique and therefore could also be integrated into other legacy systems when deployed.

Contra was detected as an object, this made numerical analysis of the feature difficult. Forcing the column to numeric would make invalid values into NaN values which could be then be imputed or dropped.

Checking each feature’s unique values showed ‘Unknown’ in the label column, as the model being trained would rely on the label column keeping these records would be meaningless. ASX had 2 variants and with further research it was found there was only one ASX and therefore the capitalization was fixed to be inline with the other indication values.

Listing all the null values allowed the data analyst to decide whether to impute or drop the records containing null values. However, there were only 20 null records in total which made up only 1.32% of all the data and therefore removing them would not be detrimental to the models.

Random and ID did not affect the label and therefore was dropped as this would just interferer with the model training process.

### Visualization

This not a part of crisp - DM however visualization would be helpful in identifying key features that affect risk and spot any outliers that may significantly affect model training. However, since Contra and IPSI were the only numeric features only these could be theology visualized.

Encoding binary values to numbers allowed the models to be trained more effectively as machine understand 1 and 0 better than yes or no. This was due using label encoder as this would replace values as opposed to creating new columns like get\_dummies. Converting these to numeric allowed the data scientist to look at the correlation heat map and find that indication had a very weak correlation. Therefore, visualizing this feature was necessary to examine if the data was relevant to risk. There was a strong relation that TIA was an indication you are likely to be not risk and therefore a valid indicator of risk inline with the other features so it was decided it would not be removed.

## Models

### Logistic Regression

Logistic regression is used for classification models and therefore was chosen over linear regression. Initially contra was chosen as this showed a strong correlation the visualization section. This had an accuracy of 84% however as all the features had a correlation to label adding the other features would increase accuracy further however would limit our ability to visualize the data.

Combining the features improved accuracy dramatically however due to the indication being grater than 1 the class weight had to be balanced as there wasn’t a strong correlation between label and indication. The solver by default is lbfgs however this is used for multi class classification, therefore this was substituted by liblinear, as this is designed for smaller datasets and binary classification. This did cause convergence issues therefore max iterations were increased to 300 iterations. The penalty value by default it l2, however l1 seem to have performed better as each feature was not equal and l1 has built in feature selection making it more robust than l2. This resulted in much higher accuracy, however overfitting was a concern and therefore the data analyst did cross validation with the model, this also resulted in the same and therefore we can conclude that overfitting did not occur and therefore the model has formed correctly.

### Decision Tree

A decision tree is a very transparent model where it can solve both regression and classification problems and the data does not have to be normalized however normalization of the data tends to produce better accuracy and therefore it was generated with normalized data. A max depth could have been set to prevent overfitting as decision tree did not have regulation penalty like logistic regression, however running cross validation on the model suggested it was not over fitting and produced the one of the most accurate models at 99% with cross validation suggesting the model had 99% accuracy. However, issues are caused if retrained with different data as this may produce an entirely different structure. This has significant ramifications when deployed as the model may be retrained with new data.

### Neural net

The data scientist used a Multilayer perceptron classifier as this was a classification problem. The sdg solver allowed for the data scientist to control the learning rate as this was a hyperparameter. A constant learning rate performed poorly as each feature did not have equal weighting that contributed to the result and therefore an adaptive learning rate was the best fit however this was outperformed by other solvers. The default solver was adam however due to the small size of the dataset, lbfgs was a better fit and the batch size also had to be lowered to 10 this boosted accuracy by 4% to 98% and cross validation confirming a higher than average variance. A random state had to be set as the training results would otherwise be inconsistent.

### Random Forest

Random forest is an ensemble learning method for classification as this creates multiple decision tree models and averages them for a theoretically better score. As the binary tree was the best scoring model replicating this seemed to
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# Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Logistic Reg  (n = 375) | Predicted No Risk | Predicted Risk |  |
| Actual No Risk | 236 | 7 | 243 |
| Actual Risk | 4 | 128 | 132 |
|  | 240 | 135 |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Decision tree  (n = 375) | Predicted No Risk | Predicted Risk |  |
| Actual No Risk | 241 | 2 | 243 |
| Actual Risk | 2 | 130 | 132 |
|  | 243 | 132 |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Neural net  (n = 375) | Predicted No Risk | Predicted Risk |  |
| Actual No Risk | 240 | 3 | 243 |
| Actual Risk | 3 | 129 | 132 |
|  | 243 | 132 |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Random forest  (n = 375) | Predicted No Risk | Predicted Risk |  |
| Actual No Risk | 239 | 4 | 243 |
| Actual Risk | 2 | 130 | 132 |
|  | 241 | 134 |  |
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# 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?
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