

## HOMEWORK-1 REPORT

### Big Data for Health Informatics

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for alive and dead patients

| <b>Metric</b>              | Deceased patients | Alive patients |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Event Count                |                   |                |
| 1. Average Event Count     | 982.014           | 498.118        |
| 2. Max Event Count         | 8635              | 12627          |
| 3. Min Event Count         | 1                 | 1              |
| <b>Encounter Count</b>     |                   |                |
| 1. Average Encounter Count | 23.038            | 15.452         |
| 2. Max Encounter Count     | 203               | 391            |
| 3. Min Encounter Count     | 1                 | 1              |
| <b>Record Length</b>       |                   |                |
| 1. Average Record Length   | 127.532           | 159.2          |
| 2. Max Record Length       | 1972              | 2914           |
| 3. Min Record Length       | 0                 | 0              |

Table 3: model\_partb.py results (Model Performances on Training Data)

| <b>Model</b>        | <b>Accuracy</b> | <b>AUC</b> | <b>Precision</b> | <b>Recall</b> | <b>F-score</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Logistic Regression | 0.9545          | 0.9454     | 0.9869           | 0.8988        | 0.9408         |
| SVM                 | 0.9952          | 0.9955     | 0.9911           | 0.9970        | 0.9941         |
| Decision Tree       | 0.7763          | 0.7476     | 0.7922           | 0.6012        | 0.6836         |

Table 4: Model performance on test data

| <b>Model</b>        | <b>Accuracy</b> | <b>AUC</b> | <b>Precision</b> | <b>Recall</b> | <b>F-score</b> |
|---------------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Logistic Regression | 0.7381          | 0.7375     | 0.6804           | 0.7333        | 0.7059         |
| SVM                 | 0.7381          | 0.7389     | 0.6768           | 0.7444        | 0.7090         |
| Decision Tree       | 0.6714          | 0.6569     | 0.6329           | 0.5556        | 0.6836         |

We can see significant change in the auc/acc scores from train to test data as expected. Since decision tree with max\_depth of 5 is a weak learner for a dataset with 3190 features. We can notice a low score compared to SVM or Logistic. Prediction can be further improved with feature engineering, and using finely tuned ensemble methods. Please review the improvements mentioned in the last section.

**Table 5: Cross Validation**

| CV Strategy | Accuracy | AUC    |
|-------------|----------|--------|
| K-Fold      | 0.7285   | 0.7115 |
| Randomized  | 0.7357   | 0.7143 |

**My\_Model Performance:**

| my_model   | Accuracy | AUC    |
|------------|----------|--------|
| K-Fold     | 0.7453   | 0.7338 |
| Randomized | 0.7095   | 0.6910 |

**Model Description:**

Step1: Generate X\_test

- I have used ETL functions from etl.py for generating test features as well.

Step2: Feature Selection

- Using LinearSVC and SelectFromModel methods

Step3: Identifying an Ensemble Learner

- I have implemented Random Forest Classifier and Adaboost Classifier

Step4: Grid Search for optimal parameters.

**Feature Selection:**

Since we are dealing with no. of samples much lesser than features and data is very sparse, I have decided to select features with non-zero coefficients using the SelectFromModel function in sklearn.

I have considered LogisticRegression and LinearSVC as both are great algorithm for feature selection in classification problem with sparse data. Based on cross validation LinearSVC performed well for this dataset.

**Predictive Model:**

Since Ensemble Learners are good learners for high dimension data I implemented Adaboost and RandomForest classifiers. Random Forest performed slightly better than Adaboost. RandomForest avoids overfitting inherently so I chose this over the other.

**Tuning Parameters:**

Once after selecting the model tuning is an important part of machine learning process.

Tuned Parameters:

C (from LinearSVC) : 1.5

Threshold(SelectFromModel) : 0.15  
No. estimators (RandomForest): 50

RandomForest with 500 estimators has significant improvement compared to 50 estimators, as suspected it is a case of overfitting as the performance didn't reflect on the test data.

**Results:**

My model gave an AUC 0.74% compared base models when compared against auc scores from cross-validation. Slightly better than the Adaboost classifier, although Adaboost classifier can be tuned in terms of base estimator and learning rate.

**Improvement:**

This model can be further improved by feature engineering.

- Incorporating domain knowledge
  - Ex: event\_id's related to major illness
  - Using un-supervised learning methods such as PCA, to extract statistically significant features.