

Diabetes Prediction Based on Machine Learning Techniques: A Review

Agnishwar Raychaudhuri^{1*}, Khushi Singh^{1*}, Geetika Agrawal^{2*}
Jagriti Singh^{2*} and Dr. Vikas Upadhyaya^{3*}

¹Data Science, NIIT University, Neemrana, 301705, Rajasthan, India.

²Computer Science, NIIT University, Neemrana, 301705, Rajasthan,
India.

³Department of ECE, NIIT University, Neemrana, 301705, Rajasthan,
India.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

agnishwar.raychaudhuri22@st.niituniversity.in;
khushi.singh22@st.niituniversity.in; geetika.agrawal22@st.niituniversity.in;
jagriti.singh22@st.niituniversity.in; vikas.upadhyaya@niituniversity.in;

Abstract. Early and precise diabetes diagnosis is vital for efficient disease regulation and complication prevention. The emerging role of Machine Learning (ML) in healthcare has given impetus to researchers who have explored various predictive models to enhance diagnostic precision. This review critically examines Tree Based Methods, Probabilistic and Distance-Based Approaches and Neural Networks Techniques, evaluating their performance based on various metrics. Our analysis indicates that ensemble learning approaches, particularly random forests with gradient boosting, along with Artificial Neural Network, consistently outperform traditional models, exhibiting superior predictive capabilities. These outcomes emphasize the potential of ML in the betterment of diabetes detection by identifying complex patterns in patient data. Integrating advanced predictive algorithms into diabetes screening can enhance early detection and enable timely medical interventions. With machine learning models continuing to evolve, their application in medical diagnostics holds significant promise for bettering diabetes detection and assisting healthcare professionals in selecting the most effective predictive models for clinical use.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Diabetes Prediction, Deep Learning, Healthcare, Machine Learning, Tree-Ensemble

1 Introduction

Diabetes Mellitus is a complex disorder which has emerged as a pressing health challenge in the 21st century [38]. This chronic metabolic disorder also known as diabetes is caused by hyperglycemia wherein the body is unable to produce insulin effectively. The β -cells of the pancreas are responsible for the production of insulin whose main role is to regulate blood sugar by allowing absorption of glucose into cells for energy production. When this process is harmed, there is an accumulation of glucose in the bloodstream that leads to various health complications affecting most vital organs and quality of life. [29] The sweet tasting symptoms first documented by ancient Egyptian physicians to the recent findings by modern researchers in order to discover new treatments, diabetes has piqued the curiosity of medical professionals for centuries.

Types of Diabetes: A Comprehensive Overview

Some of the most prevalent types of diabetes are:

1. Type 1 Diabetes (T1D)

The immune mediated damage of β -cells leads to T1D or insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus (IDDM). This causes suppression of the body's ability to produce insulin thus leading to insulin deficiency in the body.

2. Type 2 Diabetes (T2D)

[14] A complex combination of genetic susceptibility and environmental factors lead to T2D or non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus (IDDM), which affects approximately 90% of all diabetes instances

3. Gestational Diabetes (GDM)

The diabetes that emerges during pregnancies because of placental hormones create an insulin-resistance which poses a challenge to the ability of the body of the mother to maintain normal blood glucose level. This is called Gestational Diabetes or GDM.

2 Machine Learning Methodologies for Diabetes Prediction

Machine learning algorithms for prognosis of diabetes can be broadly categorized into:

1. Tree Based Methods, which creates hierarchical structures that make decisions allowing effective classification of the risk factor that diabetes poses. These methods are mainly used for handling relationships that are not linear that occur in medical data
2. Probabilistic and Distance-Based Approaches offer additional strength by excelling at identifying complicated boundaries between diabetic and non-diabetic cases.
3. Neural Networks Techniques have demonstrated outstanding capability to capture detailed patterns in physiological and geographic data. The field increasingly favors ensemble and hybrid methods that strategically combine multiple algorithms to leverage their respective strengths, thereby enhancing predictive performance.

Having established this classification of machine learning methodologies, we now turn to a comprehensive literature review examining how these techniques have been implemented for diabetes prediction across different research contexts.




Fig. 1: Classification of Methodologies for Predicting Diabetes

3 Literature Review

This review offers an extensive synopsis of the existing research and breakthroughs in the domain of AI and ML to predict diabetes, highlighting key methodologies, datasets, features and results. The paper [43] explores the application of SVM modelling in order to predict diabetes and pre-diabetes using data from the NHANES. The study identifies key predictive variables such as family history, BMI, age, waist circumference, and hypertension, achieving an AUC of 83.5% and 73.2% for the two schemes, respectively. A notable strength of this work is its use of simple, non-invasive clinical variables, making it applicable for large-scale screening. Additionally, the study develops a web-based tool, Diabetes Classifier, demonstrating real-world usability. However, limitations include the exclusion of laboratory tests, which may enhance predictive accuracy, and the challenge of generalizing results beyond the NHANES dataset.

The paper [22] explores the feasibility of forecasting Type 2 diabetes (T2D) risk using EMR data and ML methods. It evaluates various classifiers, including SVM, Random Forest, Decision Trees and Naïve Bayes achieving an AUC of over 0.8 for predictions made 180 to 365 days before diagnosis. The study excels in its use of real-world EMR data, making the model practical for clinical integration and early intervention. Additionally, the study employs feature selection techniques to enhance predictive accuracy. However, the result of the study includes a relatively low positive predictive value (~0.24), attributed to class imbalance, and the exclusion of significant risk factors like family history and genetic markers.

The paper [1] presents a boosting ensemble modeling approach for predicting diabetes mellitus using personal and clinical data. The study uses a combination of AdaBoostM1 algorithm and random committee classifier which was tested on a dataset of 100 entries resulting in 81% accuracy using 10-fold cross-validation in. Integration into a “cloud-based clinical decision support system” (CDSS) was identified as a key plus-point. Moreover, use of techniques like ensemble methods resulted in improved prediction performance over single classifiers. The use of small dataset poses to be a limitation in their work.

The paper [2] uses the data from the “Henry Ford Exercise Testing (FIT) project”, which contains a total of 32,555 patients over a span of 5 years follow up. The researchers overcame class imbalance by applying ensemble machine learning techniques with SMOTE. The ensemble method, incorporating Naïve Bayes, RF, and Logistic Model, gained a high prediction accuracy of 0.92. A major strong point of this study is the effective use of feature selection strategy to identify clinically relevant predictors. Additionally, the application of SMOTE significantly improved model performance in handling imbalanced data. However, limitations include reliance on a specific cohort

(patients undergoing exercise stress testing) and potential challenges in generalizing findings to broader populations.

The paper [23] presents a DL approach to predict glucose level in the body of diabetic subjects based on CGM data. Unlike traditional methods, this study employs a generalized approach, using data from a subset of patients for training and testing on the remaining patients, enhancing its adaptability. The proposed deep neural network, structured hierarchically, outperforms shallow networks and Tikhonov regularization in accuracy, particularly in hypoglycemic and euglycemic ranges, as assessed by the PRED-EGA metric. A key strength of the work is its structured design, which incorporates domain knowledge for feature selection and diffusion geometry techniques to enhance learning. However, limitations include the use of a relatively small dataset (25 patients) and potential challenges in generalizing the model to broader populations, particularly in handling hyperglycemic spikes.

Three supervised machine learning algorithms—ANN, SVM, LR were compared by the authors of [13] to predict diabetes. The algorithms used the following features: age, diabetes, skinfold thickness, BMI, blood pressure, insulin levels, and diabetes spectrum function. SVM was demonstrated to be particularly good for binary classification tasks because of its capability to produce optimal hyperplanes, but LR produced easy-to-understand outcomes for binary result prediction. Because neural networks follow the patterns of the brain in forming networks, combining all these patterns proved to increase accuracy.

In [27] the authors use a DBN system for screening of diabetes, demonstrating superior performance compared to traditional classifiers through a three-phase methodology incorporating pre-processing, pre-training DBN. But the study limited itself to just the PIMA dataset. Other weaknesses included lack of cross-validation results, and absence of hyperparameter optimization discussion. The model's architecture contains input layer, three hidden layers [500 500 1000], and output layers, utilizing ReLU and sigmoid activations, for 10 epochs and Gaussian Distribution weight initialization, processing 8 input attributes and implementing neural network classification with a [500 500 1000 2] topology, SGD, and specific parameters (0.01 learning rate, 0.5 momentum). Performance metrics show DBN achieving superior results compared to other methods including Naïve Bayes, RBF-NN, DT, LR, RF and SVM.

The authors of [11] analyzed various techniques for diabetes mellitus prediction, putting emphasis on early detection, while acknowledging challenges in model interpretability and dataset limitations. The study utilized a dataset of 200 patients from Chittagong, Bangladesh, with 16 attributes and implemented four algorithms with varying performance metrics: C4.5 Decision Tree performed best, followed by SVM, KNN and Naive Bayes.

[40] demonstrates the effectiveness of Kernel-based Support Vector Machines (SVM) for diabetes classification, implementing linear, polynomial, and radial kernels to handle various data distributions, while emphasizing the importance of early detection and diagnosis; however, it faced challenges in model interpretability and dataset generalizability limitations. Linear Kernel SVM outstood Radial Kernel SVM and Polynomial Kernel SVM.

In [20] the authors study multiple ML algorithms to predict diabetes with KNN resulting in the highest accuracy succeeded by SVM, Naïve Bayes and other methods. It was seen that DT and RF showed similar results.

The authors of [6] indicated a move toward the implementation of DL models in the prediction of diabetes. This study used continuous oscillation deep neural networks to reduce overfitting and improve the prediction by achieving an accuracy of 98.07% with its CNN model, compared to DT model which gave an accuracy of 96.62%, ANN that

yielded accuracy of 90.34% and Naïve Bayes' resulted in an accuracy of 76.33%.

The study [44] used KNN, DT, Naive Bayes, and RF on the PIMA dataset after a series of thorough preprocessing that included handling incomplete data and standardization. RF showed the best results with 86% accuracy and was found to be very well performing with noise and missing data. This study also proposed a cross of ML models with concurrent data collection from IoT devices for better healthcare applications.

The study [32] showed significant results obtained by comparing five groups, namely Naïve Bayes, RF, NN, SVM, and SVM, using the PIMA dataset. LR showed the most exceptional performance with 77.2% accuracy, in classifying binary tasks, and showed that preliminary techniques such as process control hold utter importance.

The authors of [25] presented a correlative analysis of ML strategies on PIDD. While this study demonstrates strong potential for early diabetes diagnosis and treatment planning through clear data visualizations and correlation analysis, it faces limitations including limited dataset size, lack of feature importance discussion, absence of cross-validation results, and no external validation dataset. The comparative results show Random Forest achieving the highest accuracy at 78.57%, marginally outperforming Linear SVM and K-NN, though the research acknowledges the need for addressing class imbalance and improving model interpretability for practical implementation.

To address the use of an ensemble model, the paper [42] highlighted the exceptional performance of Random Forest in diabetes prediction, emphasizing its ability to handle complex healthcare data. A key characteristic of the work was the intensive preprocessing performed by the authors for improving the results.

In [30] the authors investigated incipient diabetes mellitus risk assessment using ML techniques on the PIMA dataset, focusing on a hybrid stacking model. Individual algorithm performances were evaluated, with accuracies ranging from 77.27% (Naive Bayes) to 88.31% (KNN). The proposed hybrid model, combining KNN, SVM, and Decision Tree with Logistic Regression as a meta-learner, achieved a superior accuracy of 90.62%, outperforming all individual models. However, the study is limited by its reliance on a single dataset, lack of external validation, and absence of discussions on overfitting mitigation, feature importance, and comparisons with deep learning approaches.

The authors of the study [7] used three supervised ML approaches on PIDD, particularly LR, RF, and DT. Through this study, the authors showcased that logistic regression performed best as it was able to handle the binary distribution function followed by Random Forest (RF) which being robust was able to represent numerous relationships.

In [21], the authors used a dataset of 520 individuals from a hospital in Sylhet a province in Bangladesh, for studying the performance LR and RF with 10-fold cross validation. In this study RF surpassed LR with the accuracy of 99.03%. Despite the high accuracy, the geographical constraint of the dataset proved to be a challenge to generalize the findings.

The work [39] focused on evaluating various ML algorithms on the PIDD dataset. Models like SVM and DT showed nearly perfect results (such perfect results warrant further investigation) followed by LR with a 98.16% accuracy. The other models like RF and KNN also resulted in noteworthy accuracies. While the models demonstrated high accuracy the dataset is geographically restricted.

The study [5] used data from NIDDK. The authors pre-processed the data with dummy variables and PCA, and DNN achieved the best accuracy score of 89%, exceeding SVM and RFC. Despite emphasizing the significance of data pre-processing, this study identified various gaps, such as the limited exploration of ensemble techniques

and relies on a single dataset, which may not fully represent the diverse population varying in demographics, lifestyle factors, and healthcare access to individuals.

This research paper [18] used ML on a large dataset of seventy thousand clinical records, and PIDD. The study implemented LR, RF, SVM, and KNN, emphasizing on the importance of early detection of the disorder. The strategy included data preprocessing, training, succeeded by performance evaluation using various metrics. However, the interpretability of complex models and the reliance on specific datasets pose limitations to generalizability. RF achieved the best accuracy at 79%, followed by SVM, Logistic Regression, and KNN. On the PIMA dataset, RF again functioned superiorly with 80% accuracy, accompanied by SVM (77%), and LR and KNN both at 73%.

The review paper [37] examined directed and autonomous learning techniques for diabetes risk stratification, detailing the KDD process and comparing it with various algorithms. The authors highlight the potential of combining supervised and unsupervised methods, such as SVM with K-means, to enhance prediction accuracy. However, the study's reliance on datasets like the PIMA Indian Diabetes dataset limits generalizability, and it lacks in-depth algorithm performance comparisons across diverse datasets. The paper provides a comparative table of algorithm performance, including AdaBoost (98.8%), Random Forest (94.10%), XGBoost (88.1%), K-means (78%), Artificial Neural Networks (75.7%), and a combined SVM and K-means (99.64%).

The study [24] explored diabetes mellitus prediction using machine learning, emphasizing the effectiveness of XGBoost for early detection. The research compared XGBoost, SVM, DT, RF and Naïve Bayes across three architectures: diabetes prediction, type 1 vs. type 2 classification, and prediabetes prediction. The methodology involved preprocessing of data. However, concerns regarding XGBoost's potential for overfitting, the interpretability of complex models, and the limited dataset diversity were noted. In Model A (diabetes prediction), XGBoost achieved 92.5% accuracy. In Model B (type 1 vs. type 2 classification), Random Forest reached 89.2% accuracy. In Model C (prediabetes prediction), SVM attained 85.3% accuracy.

In [35] the authors explored machine learning-based diabetes prediction across Bangladesh, India, and Germany, highlighting the significant diabetes burden in Bangladesh. The research utilized nine algorithms, including boosting methods like AdaBoost, CatBoost, Gradient Boost, and XGBoost, and employed ADASYN oversampling to address class imbalance. However, data availability, quality, and dataset size disparities posed challenges. The study lacked detailed feature selection analysis. For the Bangladesh dataset (14,401 records), boosting algorithms achieved near-perfect accuracy (99.9-100%). For the PIMA Indian dataset (768 records), CatBoost performed best with 83.1% accuracy. For the German dataset (2,000 records), AdaBoost and CatBoost achieved 99% accuracy.

In [31] the authors studied ML algorithms to detect diabetes in an early stage using the PIDD. The research employed thorough data preprocessing, including mean imputation for missing values, oversampling for class imbalance, and z-score normalization. A total of eight classifiers were evaluated, with XGBoost achieving the best accuracy of 89.07%. Reliance on only the PIMA dataset proves to be a limitation-along with absence of cross-validation, limited hyperparameter optimization, and lack of comparisons with deep learning methods. LightGBM (88.28%), Random Forest (88.15%), SVM (85.39%), Logistic Regression (84.86%), KNN (84.07%), Naïve Bayes (82.13%), and Decision Tree (80.12%) also demonstrated varying levels of accuracy.

In [41] the authors investigated diabetes prediction in teenagers using ML strategies, focusing on LR, RF, KNN, SVM, and XGBoost. However, interpretation of this complex model and the limited dataset from 150 students at Dayananda Sagar University were

identified as challenges. XGBoost and RF both gained the best accuracy of 96.49%, with similar sensitivity, specificity, F1-score, and AUC values. SVM reached 82% accuracy, Logistic Regression 79%, and KNN 58%.

The researchers of [17] examined various ML approaches applied to diabetic datasets to aid in the nascent recognition and regulation of Diabetes Mellitus. The paper highlighted the use of ML techniques with Big Data Analytics tools such as Hadoop and MapReduce, as well as classifiers like Naïve Bayes, DT, SVM, KNN, RF, and Gradient Boosting. This study also highlighted notable accuracy results from various research, including a highest reported accuracy of 99.04% using a 1-CNN and 97.5% accuracy with Random Forest.

In [26] the authors developed a diabetes prediction method using a combination of ensemble and classification techniques involving Label Encoder, KNN, RF, and train-test split, on PIDD. The research's reliance on just the PIMA dataset along with the complexity of models like Random Forest were noted as limitations. The paper evaluated KNN, Random Forest, Decision Tree, and SVM using different performance metrics. RF achieved 98% accuracy. Decision Tree reached 96% accuracy. KNN showed 76.56%. SVM had 65% accuracy.

Research by [33] demonstrated the use of various ML models for early diabetes diagnosis, including KNN, SVM, Gradient Boosting, Naïve Bayes, and LR. KNN performed best with 75% accuracy, and had proven its usefulness when used with Flask for real-time prediction.

The study [19] focusses on five different ML models namely DT, SVM, LR, KNN, and RF in order to predict diabetes. An accuracy of 92.23% by RF demonstrates its capability to build complex and non-linear relationships

Study [28] focuses on the use genetic-algorithm (GA) based feature selection and classification techniques for diagnosis of diabetes. The authors were successful in handling class imbalance with the help of ADASYN technique which resulted in significant rise in the performance of GA-based feature selection. The authors used two diabetic datasets in which the accuracy increased from 84.5% to 90.3% in Diabetic Dataset-1 (DD-1) and from 94.5% to 97.6% in Diabetic Dataset-2 (DD-2).

The research paper [8] explored prognosis of diabetes by harnessing Gaussian Naïve Bayes (GNB) and Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), encapsulated by an ensemble model. The research achieved high accuracy through thorough data preprocessing and PCA for dimensionality reduction. The ANN model alone reached 98.7% accuracy, while the ensemble model, combining ANN and GNB via majority voting, achieved 94.1% accuracy with 100% precision. GNB alone achieved 89.6% accuracy.

This study by the authors of [34] proposed an ARIMA-ELMAN-ANN hybrid model for diabetes prediction, achieving 96.31% overall accuracy. The model combined time-series analysis (ARIMA), recurrent neural networks (ELMAN), and nonlinear modelling (ANN), and utilized F-score based feature selection. The research employed robust data preprocessing to handle missing values. However, the study lacked specifics on dataset size, demographic representation, and class imbalance handling. Methodological limitations included insufficient comparison with other models, limited discussion of model interpretability, and absence of external validation. The hybrid model achieved 96.31% overall accuracy, with approximately 96.43% training accuracy after 100 epochs. Model building times were: ANN (19 seconds), ARIMA with feature selection (12 seconds), and the hybrid model (4.2 seconds). The fitness function reached an optimal value of 0.021 after 18 iterations, and training/validation loss showed continuous improvement.

This paper [15] presented a comprehensive overview of machine learning applications in personalized diabetes prediction, covering various algorithms and their

implementations, including traditional and advanced methods. The research included a bibliometric analysis highlighting global research trends and an extensive comparative analysis of algorithm accuracies. Challenges identified included data imbalance, limited data availability, feature selection difficulties, model generalizability, interpretability, privacy concerns, and lack of standardized validation. The paper compiled accuracy metrics from various studies, with the highest reported accuracies of 98.9% (LGBM and Random Forest), 98% (ensemble methods), and 95.83% (RFBWP), and lower range accuracies of 77.37% (SVM) and 80% (Random Forest).

This study [4] developed an XAI framework for diabetes prediction utilizing a stacking classifier on PIDD. This research employed a comprehensive preprocessing pipeline, including KNN imputation, OCSVM for anomaly detection, and SMOTE+ENN for class imbalance. The stacking classifier, combining KNN, SVM, and XGB with Random Forest as a meta-classifier, achieved 98% accuracy. The integration of LIME provided model interpretability, addressing the "black box" problem. The usage of just one dataset along with lack of computational overhead discussion, limited XAI technique exploration, and potential dataset bias were noted as limitations. The model was quite successful as it showed results of 99% precision, 98% accuracy, 99% F1-score, and 98% recall when evaluated.

In [3] the authors developed an ensemble DL model for diabetes discovery, combining LSTM, DNN, and CNN with a soft voting classifier. The challenges faced were related with the interpretation of such complex models. The procedure included preprocessing, training, and assessment using various metrics. The ensemble model achieved almost perfect scores.

This review paper [16] offers an overview of ML and DL strategies for diabetes mellitus screening and management. It analyses traditional methods like SVM and KNN, as well as advanced approaches like ANN and CNN, documenting their performance metrics. The paper notes accuracy ranges from 68% for retinopathy models to 99.78% for diabetes detection using neural networks and SVM. The review evaluates various ML algorithms, highlighting performance scores such as an accuracy of 99.78% using SVM & ANN, 98% using LSTM, 98.07% using KNN, and 96% using RF and Fuzzy NN.

The study [36] utilized LightGBM with SMOTE analysis to classify diabetic patients using the PIDD. The authors employed ANOVA for feature selection and SHAP for model interpretability. The study's focus only on the PIMA dataset and the use of ANOVA for feature selection were noted as limitations. The model demonstrated 72% accuracy, 70% F1-score, 72% recall, and 68% precision.

The authors of [10] utilized a hybrid Grey Wolf and Dipper Throated Optimization (GWDTO) algorithm for feature selection, combined with a Convolutional Autoencoder (Conv-AE) for diabetes outcome evaluation using PIDD. The research employed Min-Max scaling for data preprocessing and achieved 99.10% accuracy, outperforming traditional techniques. The study also lacked analysis of model interpretability and scalability. The GWDTO-ConvAE method achieved the following results: accuracy-99.10%, recall - 97.31%, F1-score - 97.42%, %, specificity - 97.34%, and F1-score - 97.42.

In [9] the authors explored machine learning and DL approaches for prediction of diabetes on the PIDD, using AdaBoost, XGBoost, and RNNs. The research incorporated IQR for outlier detection and employed detailed preprocessing, including Min-Max scaling. However, the underperformance of AdaBoost and XGBoost were noted limitations. The RNN model achieved the highest accuracy. IQR with XGBoost resulted in 70.8% accuracy, 58.1% precision, 65.5% recall, 61.5% F1-score, and 76.7% ROC-AUC. IQR with AdaBoost yielded 73.4% accuracy, 62.5% precision, 63.6% recall, 63.1% F1-score, and 78.6% ROC-AUC. IQR with RNN achieved 90.3% accuracy, 88.5%

precision, 83.6% recall, 85.9% F1-score, along with a ROC-AUC of 85%.

The paper [12] explored diabetes prediction using ensemble learning and LIME for interpretability on the Diabetes Prediction Dataset. The research utilized various ML algorithms, like Naïve Bayes, DT, RF SVM, Neural Networks (NN), and K-means clustering, and employed RFE for feature selection. Detailed data preprocessing and EDA were conducted. However, limitations included reliance on a specific dataset, potential class imbalance issues, and limited discussion of real-world implementation. An accuracy of 97.21% was achieved by Neural Network Model. Performance metrics for other models were: Logistic Regression with RFE (95.99% accuracy), SVM with RFE (96.30% accuracy), Random Forest with RFE (97.06% accuracy), Gradient Boosting with RFE (97.25% accuracy), Voting Classifier with RFE (97.13% accuracy), Naive Bayes (92.30% accuracy), Decision Tree (85.56% accuracy), and K-means Clustering (91.44% accuracy).

Technique	Accuracy	Recall	F1 - Score	Precision	Reference
Support Vector Machine (SVM)	0.65 - 0.8539	0.43 - 0.74	0.53 - 0.77	0.63 - 0.77	[5],[11],[12],[13],[15],[16],[17],[18],[19],[20],[24],[25],[26],[27],[30],[31],[32],[33],[37],[39],[40],[41],[43]
Decision Tree (DT)	0.6818 - 0.9662	0.57 - 0.9545	0.62 - 0.9472	0.60 - 0.9402	[2],[7],[11],[12],[17],[19],[20],[22],[24],[26],[27],[31],[37],[39],[44]
Random Forest (RF)	0.71 - 0.9903	0.51 - 0.98	0.59 - 0.98	0.60 - 0.98	[2],[7],[12],[15],[17],[18],[19],[20],[21],[22],[24],[25],[26],[27],[31],[32],[37],[39],[41],[42],[44]
Logistic Regression	0.73 - 0.9616	0.44 - 0.84	0.53 - 0.77	0.67 - 0.77	[2],[7],[13],[17],[18],[19],[21],[27],[30],[31],[32],[39],[41]
Naive Bayes (NB)	0.65 - 0.90	0.616 - 0.8629	0.645 - 0.8674	0.597 - 0.8644	[11],[12],[20],[30],[37],[39],[44]
K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN)	0.58 - 0.882	0.50 - 0.79	0.60 - 0.83	0.52 - 0.888	[11],[16],[17],[18],[19],[20],[26],[30],[31],[33],[41],[44]
AdaBoost	0.73 - 0.97	0.64 - 0.98	0.63 - 0.98	0.63 - 0.98	[1],[35],[37]
XGBoost	0.71 - 0.89	0.615 - 0.905	0.655 - 0.9	0.581 - 0.91	[4],[24],[31],[37],[35],[41]
Artificial Neural Network (ANN)	0.75 - 0.99	0.75 - 0.85	0.75 - 0.86	0.75 - 0.89	[6],[8],[13],[16]
Convolutional Neural Network (CNN)	0.90 - 0.99	0.83	0.86	0.88	[3],[6],[16],[17]
K-means Clustering	0.78 - 0.91	0.74	0.81	0.95	[12],[37]

Table 1: Comparative Performance Analysis of ML Approaches for Diabetes Prediction

4 Conclusion

The literature review conducts an examination of numerous methods by which AI-ML can be used for detection of diabetes. ML has the power to reform the early prognosis of diabetes through various techniques and large amount of dataset. The paper highlights the development of use of different models from in order to detect diabetes. It was found that models like ANN and Ensemble Methods outperformed other models when applied to diabetes dataset. Other models also gave decent performance. However, the development of hybrid models can potentially yield even better results for diabetes prognosis.

5 Future Scope

This comparative analysis along with the advantages and disadvantages of various models may also research other researchers to create a more advanced mechanism that may prove to be a great help in the healthcare industry for detection of diabetes. Further works should focus on working on advance techniques as well as concentrate on diversity of the dataset to remove class imbalance in order to ensure better methods to detect diabetes. Research ahead must address the shortcomings and explore other novel

approaches to improve the detection of diabetes at a nascent stage.

References

- [1] Ali, R., Siddiqi, M. H., Idris, M., Kang, B. H., & Lee, S. (2014). Prediction of diabetes mellitus based on boosting ensemble modeling. In R. Hervás et al. (Eds.), *UCAmI 2014: Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (Vol. 8867, pp. 25–28). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-13102-3_6
- [2] Alghamdi, M., Al-Mallah, M., Keteyian, S., Brawner, C., Ehrman, J., & Sakr, S. (2017). Predicting diabetes mellitus using SMOTE and ensemble machine learning approach: The Henry Ford Exercise Testing (FIT) project. *PLoS ONE*, 12(7), e0179805. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179805>
- [3] Aouamria, S., Boughareb, D., Nemissi, M., Kouahla, Z., & Seridi, H. (2024). International Journal of INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS AND APPLICATIONS IN ENGINEERING An Ensemble Deep Learning Model for Diabetes Disease Prediction. In *Original Research Paper International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering IJISAE* (Vol. 2024, Issue 4). www.ijisae.org
- [4] Aruna Devi, B., & Karthik, N. (2024). Explainable Artificial Intelligence for Prediction of Diabetes using Stacking Classifier. *Proceedings of CONECCT 2024 - 10th IEEE International Conference on Electronics, Computing and Communication Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CONECCT62155.2024.10677165>
- [5] Awoniran, O. M., Oyelami, M. O., Ikono, R. N., Famutimi, R. F., & Famutimi, T. I. (2022). A Machine Learning Technique for Detection of Diabetes Mellitus. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Information Technology for Education and Development: Changing the Narratives Through Building a Secure Society with Disruptive Technologies, ITED 2022*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITED56637.2022.10051439>
- [6] Bhargava, R., & Dinesh, J. (2021). Deep Learning based System Design for Diabetes Prediction. *2021 International Conference on Smart Generation Computing, Communication and Networking, SMART GENCON 2021*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMARTGENCON51891.2021.9645906>
- [7] Buhari, B., & Adewara, A. A. (2022). On the analysis of some machine learning algorithms for the prediction of diabetes. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 13(8), 123-130. <https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2022.0130816>
- [8] Chandra, T. B., Reddy, A. S., Adarsh, A., Jabbar, M. A., & Jyothi, B. N. (2024). Diabetes Prediction Using Gaussian Naive Bayes and Artificial Neural Network. *International Conference on Distributed Computing and Optimization Techniques, ICDCOT 2024*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCOT61034.2024.10516226>
- [9] Chandra Sekhar Reddy, L., Gottipalli, M., Sravanthi, P., Rajanikanth, J., Yalamarthy, G., & Gurrapu, N. (2024). Bridging Horizons in Diabetes Prediction: A Comparative Exploration of Machine Learning and Deep Learning Approaches in PIMA Indian Women. *Proceedings - 2nd International Conference on Advancement in Computation and Computer Technologies, InCACCT 2024*, 386–391. <https://doi.org/10.1109/InCACCT61598.2024.10550977>
- [10] Dattangire, R., Pamulaparthivenkata, S., Mandvikar, S., Balakrishnan, A., & Chintale, P. (2024). AI/ML-Based Diabetes Application using Hybrid Grey Wolf and Dipper Throated Optimization Algorithm. *International Conference on Intelligent Algorithms for Computational Intelligence Systems, IACIS 2024*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IACIS61494.2024.10721678>
- [11] Faruque, M. F., Asaduzzaman, & Sarker, I. H. (2019). Performance analysis of machine learning techniques to predict diabetes mellitus. *2019 International Conference on Electrical, Computer and Communication Engineering (ECCE)*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ECACE.2019.8679365>
- [12] Gilani, S. A. H., Syed, M. H., & Anjum, A. (2024). Effective Diabetes Prediction: Integrating Ensemble Learning with LIME for Robust Results. *2024 International Conference on Frontiers of Information Technology (FIT)*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FIT63703.2024.10838461>
- [13] Joshi, T. N., & Chawan, P. M. (2018). Diabetes Prediction Using Machine Learning

Techniques. Journal of Engineering Research and Application www.Ijera.Com, 8, 2248–9622.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/9622-0801020913>

- [14] Janaka Karalliedde, Luigi Gnudi, Diabetes mellitus, a complex and heterogeneous disease, and the role of insulin resistance as a determinant of diabetic kidney disease, *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*, Volume 31, Issue 2, February 2016, Pages 206–213, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ndt/gfu405>
- [15] Kaur, I., & Ali, A. (2024). An In-Depth Exploration of Machine Learning Algorithms and Performance Evaluation Approaches for Personalized Diabetes Prediction. *Proceedings - 2024 International Conference on Emerging Innovations and Advanced Computing, INNOCOMP 2024*, 532–538. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INNOCOMP63224.2024.00093>
- [16] Katiyar, N., Thakur, H. K., & Ghatak, A. (2024). Recent advancements using machine learning & deep learning approaches for diabetes detection: a systematic review. *E-Prime - Advances in Electrical Engineering, Electronics and Energy*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prime.2024.100661>
- [17] Krishna Manaswini, T., Nayak, P., Harshitha, V. S., & Barlapudi, S. (2023). Predictions of Diabetic Mellitus using ML Techniques: A Systematic Overview. *International Conference on Sustainable Computing and Smart Systems, ICSCSS 2023 - Proceedings*, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSCSS57650.2023.1016924>
- [18] Kuriakose, S. M., Basa Pati, P., & Singh, T. (2022). Prediction of Diabetes Using Machine Learning: Analysis of 70,000 Clinical Database Patient Record. *2022 13th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies, ICCCNT 2022*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT54827.2022.9984264>
- [19] Kumar, A., Gill, A. S., Singh, J. P., & Ghosh, D. (2024). A Comprehensive and Comparative Examination of Machine Learning Techniques for Diabetes Mellitus Prediction. *2024 15th International Conference on Computing Communication and Networking Technologies, ICCCNT 2024*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCNT61001.2024.10725693>
- [20] Lyngdoh, A. C., Choudhury, N. A., & Moulik, S. (2021). Diabetes Disease Prediction Using Machine Learning Algorithms. *Proceedings - 2020 IEEE EMBS Conference on Biomedical Engineering and Sciences, IECBES 2020*, 517–521. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IECBES48179.2021.9398759>
- [21] Mangal, A., & Jain, V. (2022). Performance analysis of machine learning models for prediction of diabetes. *Proceedings - 2022 2nd International Conference on Innovative Sustainable Computational Technologies, CISCT 2022*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CISCT55310.2022.10046630>
- [22] Mani, S., Chen, Y., Elasy, T., Clayton, W., & Denny, J. (2012). Type 2 diabetes risk forecasting from EMR data using machine learning. *AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings*, 2012, 606–615
- [23] Mhaskar, H. N., Pereverzyev, S. V., & van der Walt, M. D. (2017). A deep learning approach to diabetic blood glucose prediction. *Frontiers in Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 3(14). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fams.2017.00014>
- [24] Omoora, E. S., Altaweil, H. A., Nagem, T., & Bozed, K. A. (2023). Diabetes Mellitus Prediction Based on Machine Learning Techniques. *2023 IEEE 11th International Conference on Systems and Control, ICSC 2023*, 225–231. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSC58660.2023.10449831>
- [25] Pal, M., Parija, S., & Panda, G. (2021, August 5). Improved prediction of diabetes mellitus using machine learning based approach. *2nd International Conference on Range Technology, ICORT 2021*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICORT52730.2021.9581774>
- [26] Parimala, G., Kayalvizhi, R., & Nithiya, S. (2023). Diabetes Prediction using Machine Learning. *2023 International Conference on Computer Communication and Informatics, ICCCI 2023*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCCI56745.2023.10128216>
- [27] Prabhu, P., & Selvabharathi, S. (2019). Deep belief neural network model for prediction of diabetes mellitus. *2019 3rd International Conference on Imaging, Signal Processing and Communication (ICISPC)*, 138–142. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICISPC.2019.8935838>
- [28] Ravi Kiran, T. S., Srisaila, A., Shankar, G. S., Sowjanya, B., & Lakshmanarao, A. (2024). Machine Learning Approach for Diabetes Prediction using Genetic Algorithm based Feature selection. *2024 3rd International Conference for Innovation in Technology, INOCON 2024*.

<https://doi.org/10.1109/INOCON60754.2024.10511558>

- [29] Rubin, G., & M King, K. (2013). A history of diabetes: from antiquity to discovering insulin. *British Journal of Nursing*, *www.magonlinelibrary.com*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.12968/bjon.2003.12.18.11775>
- [30] Samet, S., Laouar, M. R., & Bendib, I. (2021). Diabetes mellitus early stage risk prediction using machine learning algorithms. 5th International Conference on Networking and Advanced Systems, ICNAS 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICNAS53565.2021.9628955>
- [31] Sarkar, P., & Pawar, S. (2023). Machine Learning based Early Predication and Detection of Diabetes Mellitus. International Conference on Artificial Intelligence for Innovations in Healthcare Industries, ICAIHI 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAIHI57871.2023.10489259>
- [32] Saxena, R., Sharma, S. K., & Gupta, M. (2021). Analysis of machine learning algorithms in diabetes mellitus prediction. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1921(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1921/1/012073>
- [33] Sehgal, D., Gautam, B., Kaur, I., Singh, A., Sharma, V., & Kumar, N. (n.d.). AI-Driven Early Diabetes Prediction. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AIC.2024.7>
- [34] Senthil, J., Akbar, S., Akiladevi, N., Praveena, S., Ravindar, K., & Banupriya, V. (2024). Early Prediction of Diabetes and its Risk Factors based on ARIMA-ELMAN ANN Network. 2nd International Conference on Intelligent Data Communication Technologies and Internet of Things, IDCIoT 2024, 1376–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IDCIoT59759.2024.10468045>
- [35] Shampa, S. A., Islam, M. S., & Nesa, A. (2023). Machine Learning-based Diabetes Prediction: A Cross-Country Perspective. 2023 International Conference on Next-Generation Computing, IoT and Machine Learning, NCIM 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1109/NCIM59001.2023.10212596>
- [36] Singh Gill, K., Anand, V., Chauhan, R., & Pokhariya, H. S. (2024). Using Machine Learning-based SMOTE Analysis with the Light GBM Classification Method to Classify Diabetic Patients. 2024 3rd International Conference for Innovation in Technology, INOCON 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INOCON60754.2024.10511914>
- [37] Sivaraman, M., & Sumitha, J. (2022). Diabetes Prediction based on Supervised and Unsupervised Learning Techniques - A Review. 3rd International Conference on Smart Electronics and Communication, ICOSEC 2022 - Proceedings, 1292–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICOSEC54921.2022.9952107>
- [38] Tabish SA. Is Diabetes Becoming the Biggest Epidemic of the Twenty-first Century? *Int J Health Sci (Qassim)*. 2007 Jul;1(2): V-VIII. PMID: 21475425; PMCID: PMC3068646.
- [39] Thabit, Q. Q., Fahad, T. O., & Dawood, A. I. (2022). Detecting Diabetes Using Machine Learning Algorithms. 2022 Iraqi International Conference on Communication and Information Technologies, IICCIT 2022, 131–136. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IICCIT55816.2022.10010408>
- [40] Vijayan, V. V., & Anjali, C. (2016). Prediction and diagnosis of diabetes mellitus - A machine learning approach. 2015 IEEE Recent Advances in Intelligent Computational Systems, RAICS 2015, 122–127. <https://doi.org/10.1109/RAICS.2015.7488400>
- [41] Vrindavanam, J., Haarika, R., MG, S., & Kumar, K. S. (2023). Diabetes prediction in teenagers using machine learning algorithms. 2023 10th International Conference on Computing for Sustainable Global Development (INDIACom), New Delhi, India, 343-347. IEEE.
- [42] Xu, X., Huang, X., Ma, J., & Luo, X. (2021). Prediction of Diabetes with its Symptoms Based on Machine Learning. 2021 IEEE International Conference on Computer Science, Artificial Intelligence and Electronic Engineering, CSAIEE 2021, 147–156. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CSAIEE54046.2021.9543343>
- [43] Yu, W., Liu, T., Valdez, R., Gwinn, M., & Khoury, M. J. (2010). Application of support vector machine modeling for prediction of common diseases: The case of diabetes and pre-diabetes. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 10(16). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6947-10-16>
- [44] Zaman, S. M. T., Paul, S. K., Paul, R. R., & Hamid, M. E. (2021). Detecting diabetes in human body using different machine learning techniques. 2021 International Conference on Computer, Communication, Chemical, Materials and Electronic Engineering (IC4ME2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IC4ME253898.2021.97685>