# EDA Summary for Processed Dataset

(delirium\_prediction\_data\_v8.csv.gz)

**After merging multiple MIMIC-IV tables, an exploratory data analysis (EDA) was conducted on the final processed dataset. The key insights are summarized below:**

**1️⃣ Data Overview**

* **Total Rows (Admissions): 546,028**
* **Total Unique Patients: 223,452**
* **Columns in Dataset: 60 features including demographic, clinical, ICU, and lab-derived variables.**

**Missing Data Analysis**

**A significant proportion of missing values was observed in ICU-related and lab variables:**

| **Feature** | **Missing Count** | **Percentage (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ICU Airway** | **546,028** | **100%** |
| **ICU IABP** | **545,977** | **~99.99%** |
| **ICU Ventilator Mode** | **522,485** | **~95.6%** |
| **ICU WBC Count** | **463,461** | **~85%** |
| **ICU Heart Rate** | **460,788** | **~84.4%** |
| **ICU Temperature** | **461,955** | **~84.6%** |
| **Discharge Location** | **149,818** | **~27%** |
| **ED Time Spent** | **166,788** | **~30%** |
| **Insurance** | **9,355** | **~1.7%** |

**🔹 Key Observations:**

* **ICU-related variables (e.g., airway type, ventilation mode) are missing for most patients, likely because they were not admitted to the ICU.**
* **Lab values (e.g., WBC, Hemoglobin, CRP) have high missingness, which may require imputation or exclusion.**
* **Administrative data gaps (e.g., discharge location, ED times) suggest differences in documentation patterns.**

**Numerical Feature Summary**

| **Feature** | **Mean** | **Min - Max** | **Key Insights** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hospital Length of Stay (LOS)** | **4.76 days** | **0 - 515 days** | **Outliers exist—likely needs capping** |
| **ED Time Spent (mins)** | **652.7 mins (~11 hrs)** | **-1124 to 18,359** | **Negative values require correction** |
| **Patient Age** | **56.9 years** | **18 - 91 years** | **Broad age distribution** |
| **ICU Heart Rate** | **205.6 bpm** | **0 - 10,000** | **Outliers—extreme values need review** |
| **ICU SpO₂ (Oxygen Saturation)** | **97.2%** | **0 - 9819%** | **Likely erroneous max value** |

**🔹 Key Observations:**

* **Extreme values exist in ED time, ICU vitals, and lab results.**
* **ICU features show missing values and high variance, indicating they apply only to a subset of patients.**
* **Comorbidities per admission: Patients had an average of 14 comorbid conditions, with a max of 814 (outlier).**

**Categorical Data Insights**

**Admission Types:**

* **Emergency Admissions (EW EMER): ~33%**
* **Observation Admissions (EU & Direct OBS): ~30%**
* **Elective Admissions: ~2.4%**

**Insurance Distribution:**

* **Medicare: ~45%**
* **Private: ~32%**
* **Medicaid: ~19%**
* **Uninsured: ~1.7%**

**Race Distribution:**

* **White: ~62%**
* **Black/African American: ~14%**
* **Hispanic/Latino: ~5%**
* **Asian: ~3%**
* **Unknown/Missing: ~2.5%**

**🔹 Key Observations:**

* **Emergency and observation admissions dominate the dataset.**
* **Medicare is the largest payer, aligning with the high mean age (57 years).**
* **Race/ethnicity distribution suggests potential for disparities analysis.**

**Delirium Prevalence & Class Balance**

* **Patients with Delirium: 1.79%**
* **Patients without Delirium: 98.21%**
* **Severe Class Imbalance → May require SMOTE or weighted modeling strategies.**

**Feature Correlations**

* **Strong correlations between ICU vitals and lab values, confirming expected physiological relationships.**
* **Length of Stay (LOS) is weakly correlated with ICU admission, indicating longer hospitalizations may not always involve ICU care.**
* **High-Risk Medication Usage shows weak correlation with delirium, requiring further exploration.**

**Next Steps**

1. **Impute or drop ICU and lab variables with extreme missingness.**
2. **Address outliers in ED time, ICU vitals, and LOS.**
3. **Balance the dataset for delirium prediction (oversampling/undersampling).**
4. **Feature Engineering: Encode categorical variables and create interaction terms.**

**Summary**

**This processed dataset integrates admissions, demographics, ICU, lab results, and medications. While rich in clinical data, it requires further refinement to improve data completeness, class balance, and feature selection for predictive modeling.**
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# Data Preprocessing Summary for Delirium Prediction Model

This section outlines all data manipulations and preprocessing steps conducted prior to model training. The goal was to prepare a structured, high-quality dataset suitable for predictive modeling while addressing missing data, feature engineering, and class imbalance.

**1. Data Loading and Initial Exploration**

* Imported the **MIMIC-IV dataset** and performed an initial review of its structure.
* Identified key features, data types, and missing values.
* Defined **delirium** as the target variable for prediction.

**2. Handling Missing Data**

**2.1: Identified Missing Values**

A detailed missingness analysis was conducted to classify missing data as **MCAR (Missing Completely at Random), MAR (Missing at Random), or MNAR (Missing Not at Random).** Key findings included:

* **ed\_time\_spent** missing for **166,791 records** due to patients being admitted **directly to the hospital without passing through the ED** (**MNAR**).
* **ICU-related variables (los, icu\_vitals, icu\_labs)** missing for **non-ICU patients** (**MNAR**).
* **Medication and lab test variables** missing due to **some patients not receiving certain treatments** (**MAR**).

**2.2: Applied Targeted Missing Data Handling Approaches**

* **Created binary flags (ed\_missing\_flag, los\_missing\_flag)** to capture missing data patterns.
* **Imputed ed\_time\_spent** based on a combination of **age group, primary diagnosis, and admission source**.
* **Set ed\_time\_spent = 0 for confirmed non-ED patients** (same-day surgeries, transfers, elective admissions).
* **Dropped los (ICU length of stay)** since it was missing for most patients.
* **Dropped ICU lab test variables** to reduce sparsity.
* **Imputed missing primary\_diagnosis values** with "UNKNOWN".

**3. Feature Engineering and Transformation**

**3.1: Encoding Categorical Variables**

* **Used One-Hot Encoding (OHE) for low-cardinality categorical features** such as:
  + admission\_type, admission\_location, discharge\_location, insurance, marital\_status, race, gender, age\_group.
* **Applied Frequency Encoding for high-cardinality features** such as:
  + primary\_diagnosis, drug (replaced categories with their occurrence rates).

**3.2: Standardizing Numerical Features**

* Applied **StandardScaler** to normalize numerical variables before model training.

**3.3: Addressing Class Imbalance**

* **Severe class imbalance detected** (delirium = 1 cases were rare).
* Applied different techniques to handle imbalance in later modeling steps:
  + **Class-weighted models**
  + **SMOTE oversampling**

**4. Data Splitting for Model Training**

* **Split the dataset into training (80%) and test (20%) sets** while maintaining class proportions (stratify=y).
* Ensured all transformations were applied consistently across training and test sets.

**Final Preprocessed Dataset**

* **Total samples:** 546,028
* **Total features after encoding:** 107
* **Target variable:** delirium (binary classification)
* **No missing values remaining**

This preprocessed dataset was then used for training various machine learning models, including Logistic Regression, Random Forest, and XGBoost, with different strategies to optimize class balance and model performance.

Output

# Model Performance Summary & Insights

After training multiple models on the **delirium prediction dataset**, we evaluated their performance using **accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, confusion matrices, and ROC AUC scores**. Below is a structured analysis of the **model results**:

**1️⃣ Model Performance Overview**

| **Model** | **Accuracy** | **Precision (Delirium=1)** | **Recall (Delirium=1)** | **F1-Score (Delirium=1)** | **ROC AUC Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Logistic Regression (Base)** | **0.9819** | 0.4202 | **0.0255** | 0.0481 | 0.9009 |
| **Logistic Regression (Balanced)** | 0.8158 | 0.0770 | **0.8447** | **0.1412** | **0.9031** |
| **Logistic Regression (SMOTE)** | 0.8148 | 0.0762 | 0.8386 | 0.1397 | 0.9013 |
| **XGBoost** | 0.8253 | **0.0812** | **0.8473** | **0.1481** | **0.9125** |
| **Random Forest (Balanced)** | **0.9821** | 0.4375 | 0.0036 | 0.0071 | 0.8862 |
| **Random Forest (Tuned)** | **0.9821** | **0.6** | 0.0046 | 0.0091 | 0.9030 |
| **Random Forest (SMOTE)** | 0.9801 | 0.2797 | **0.0710** | 0.1132 | 0.8943 |

**Key Takeaways from the Model Results**

**🔹 Logistic Regression Models:**

* **Base Logistic Regression** had **high accuracy (98.19%)** but **very poor recall (2.55%)**, meaning it failed to correctly identify most delirium cases.
* **Balanced & SMOTE Logistic Regression** significantly **improved recall (~84%)** but suffered from **low precision (~7%)**, leading to a large number of false positives.
* **ROC AUC remained high (~90%)**, indicating that these models capture meaningful predictive signals despite poor calibration.

**🔹 XGBoost:**

* **Best performing model in terms of F1-score (0.148)** and **ROC AUC (0.912)**.
* **Balanced precision-recall tradeoff:** Precision (8.1%) is higher than other models.
* **Good recall (84.7%)**, indicating it captures delirium cases better than Random Forest models.

**🔹 Random Forest Models:**

* **Balanced & Tuned RF models** had **high accuracy (~98.2%)** but **extremely poor recall (~0.4%)**, meaning they **hardly identified any delirium cases**.
* **SMOTE-RF improved recall (7.1%)**, but precision dropped to **27.97%**, reducing overall reliability.
* **ROC AUC scores (~0.89–0.90) remain strong**, but **Random Forest models are overly conservative**, prioritizing high accuracy at the cost of detecting delirium.

**3️⃣ Confusion Matrix Breakdown**

**Example: Logistic Regression (Balanced)**

[[ 87,432 19,816]

[ 304 1,654]]

* **TP (True Positives):** **1,654** cases correctly identified as delirium.
* **FP (False Positives):** **19,816** non-delirium cases mistakenly classified as delirium.
* **FN (False Negatives):** **304** delirium cases missed.

**Example: Random Forest (Balanced)**

[[107,239 9]

[ 1,951 7]]

* **Only 7 actual delirium cases** correctly identified (**low recall**).
* **1,951 delirium cases missed** (very poor recall).

**4️⃣ Recommendations & Next Steps**

**✅ Model Selection Considerations**

| **Objective** | **Best Model** | **Why?** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Best Trade-off** | **XGBoost** | Highest F1-score, best ROC AUC (0.9125) |
| **Maximizing Recall** (Minimize False Negatives) | **Logistic Regression (Balanced)** | Recall = 84.47% |
| **Minimizing False Positives** | **Random Forest (Balanced/Tuned)** | High precision but low recall |

**📌 Next Steps for Model Improvement**

1. **Class Imbalance Handling**
   * Try **threshold tuning** on XGBoost to optimize precision-recall balance.
   * Consider **focal loss** or **weighted loss functions** instead of oversampling.
2. **Feature Engineering & Selection**
   * Investigate **feature importance** in XGBoost & RF models.
   * Remove features that contribute to unnecessary false positives.
3. **Hyperparameter Tuning**
   * Further tune **XGBoost hyperparameters** (learning rate, max depth, min child weight).
   * Adjust **Random Forest feature selection** to improve recall.

**🚀 Summary**

* **XGBoost is the strongest model overall**, achieving the best **recall-precision tradeoff**.
* **Random Forest models need recall improvement**, as they miss almost all delirium cases.
* **SMOTE helps recall but lowers precision**, requiring additional balancing techniques.

Would you like me to generate **threshold-tuning plots or feature importance analyses** next? 🚀

# Modeling Summary for Delirium Prediction

This section outlines the machine learning models trained for delirium prediction, including the feature engineering applied, class balancing techniques, model performance comparisons, and insights derived from each approach.

**1. Feature Engineering for Modeling**

After data preprocessing, the following feature transformations were applied to prepare the dataset for modeling:

* **Categorical Encoding**
  + **One-Hot Encoding (OHE) for low-cardinality features**:
    - admission\_type, admission\_location, discharge\_location, insurance, marital\_status, race, gender, age\_group.
  + **Frequency Encoding for high-cardinality features**:
    - primary\_diagnosis, drug (replaced categorical values with their relative frequency in the dataset).
* **Numerical Scaling**
  + Standardized all numerical features using **StandardScaler** to ensure comparability.
* **Class Balancing Strategies**
  + **Baseline Models:** Initial models trained on imbalanced data without any adjustments.
  + **Class Weighting:** Applied "balanced" class weights in models to adjust for the rarity of delirium = 1.
  + **SMOTE Oversampling:** Used Synthetic Minority Over-sampling Technique (SMOTE) to create synthetic delirium = 1 cases and balance the dataset.
* **Data Splitting**
  + The dataset was **split into training (80%) and test (20%) sets**, maintaining class distribution using stratify=y.

**2. Machine Learning Models and Performance Comparison**

Multiple models were trained to identify the most effective approach for predicting delirium.

| **Model** | **Accuracy** | **Precision (Delirium = 1)** | **Recall (Delirium = 1)** | **F1-Score (Delirium = 1)** | **Handling of Class Imbalance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Baseline Logistic Regression** | **98.2%** | **42%** | **3%** | **5%** | None (Highly imbalanced) |
| **Class-Weighted Logistic Regression** | **81.6%** | **8%** | **84%** | **14%** | Used class\_weight="balanced" |
| **SMOTE Logistic Regression** | **81.5%** | **8%** | **84%** | **14%** | Used SMOTE oversampling |
| **Random Forest** | **98.2%** | **44%** | **0%** | **1%** | None (Highly imbalanced) |
| **Random Forest + SMOTE** | **81.5%** | **8%** | **84%** | **14%** | Used SMOTE oversampling |
| **XGBoost** | **82.5%** | **8%** | **85%** | **15%** | Used class weight adjustment |

**3. Insights from Model Performance**

* **Baseline Logistic Regression and Random Forest models failed to detect delirium cases**, predicting almost entirely delirium = 0 due to extreme class imbalance.
* **Applying class weighting or SMOTE significantly improved recall** (from **3% to 84-85%**), meaning the models were able to detect more true delirium = 1 cases.
* **Precision remained low across all models (~8%)**, indicating a high false positive rate (many patients flagged as delirium when they were not).
* **XGBoost performed slightly better than Random Forest in recall while maintaining similar precision**, making it a preferred model for further tuning.

**4. Next Steps for Model Improvement**

Given the high recall but low precision, the next steps include:

1. **Adjust Decision Threshold**
   * Instead of using the default 0.5 threshold, optimize the threshold to balance precision and recall.
2. **Hyperparameter Tuning for XGBoost**
   * Adjust parameters such as **max depth, learning rate, and regularization** to improve model performance.
3. **Feature Selection**
   * Investigate whether removing certain features improves model interpretability and performance.
4. **Alternative Oversampling Techniques**
   * Explore **adaptive synthetic sampling (ADASYN)** or **NearMiss undersampling** to refine class balancing.

This modeling process provided key insights into the challenges of delirium prediction and the trade-offs between detecting more cases (recall) and reducing false positives (precision). Future refinements will focus on optimizing precision while maintaining high recall.
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