Comparison With the Previous Study

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Previous Study | | | Proposed Methods | | |
| Ref. | Methods | Dataset | Methods | Testing | Cross-Validation |
| [10] | SVM – 98.57%  KNN – 97.14% | WBC | SVM  KNN | 100%  97.143% | 98.00%  98.872% |
| [2] | DT – SVM – 91% | WBC | DT  SVM | 97.143%  100% | 95.714%  98.00% |
| [5] | NB – 94.73  KNN – 95.61 | WBCD | NB  KNN | 96.49%  96.49% | 95%  93.07% |
| [14] | SVM (RBF) - 96.28 | WBC | SVM(RBF) | 100% | 96.503% |

Table- XVI represents the comparison with the previous study. Some previous studies do not mention that this accuracy is train, test or validation. For that we do not mention their accuracy, we compare their result with our proposed study and we see that [10] testing accuracy 100% but validation accuracy 98% which is less than their accuracy. However, our proposed methods outperform than others previous study.