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Abstract: The state or disorder where the body cannot effectively use the insulin is called Diabetes. If the insulin levels are not maintained properly, the diabetes is one such disorder where it damages all other body parts. It is estimated that the diabetes is the 7th leading cause of deaths as per World Health Organisation report. Early recognition of diabetes, decreases the risk of serious ailments, which includes, heart diseases, brain stroke, eye related diseases, kidney diseases, nerve related diseases etc. In the present work, pima indians diabetes data set is considered as the best dataset and different models viz., hierarchical clustering with decision tree, hierarchical clustering with support vector machines, hierarchical clustering with logistic regression and k means with logistic regression are developed and implemented for identifying and predicting the diabetes. The accuracies of these prediction models range between 0.90 and 0.946. An Improved Diabetes Prediction Algorithm (IDPA) combining the hierarchical clustering algorithm and Naïve Bayes classification algorithm is developed to identify and predict the Type-II diabetes and has shown an accuracy of 0.96. In this IDPA, firstly, the grouping of data into two groups i.e. diabetes and non-diabetes is done by applying the hierarchical clustering algorithm. Then, the filtering is done by comparing the group value to the class value followed by applying Naïve Bayes classification algorithm for predicting diabetes. The results show that the proposed novel method i.e. IDPA can predict the diabetes with higher accuracy levels (0.96) than the traditional/existing methods and other methods which were implemented. This model can be used to predict diabetes early, thereby reducing the serious complications of diabetes.
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I. INTRODUCTION

There are three types of diabetes Type-I diabetes, Type-II diabetes and gestational diabetes. Type-I diabetes is occurred when pancreas, due to some abnormality, does not produce insulin or produces very little insulin. This is called as juvenile diabetes or insulin-dependent diabetes. The treatment does not cure Type-I diabetes but it aims to control blood sugar levels with insulin, diet and lifestyle to prevent complications. Gestational diabetes occurs in pregnant women where it is observed high sugar levels during pregnancy in them. Later there are chances that gestational diabetes can be converted into Type-II diabetes.

Type-II diabetes also called as diabetes mellitus is a metabolic disorder which causes sugar levels in body to raise up. Unlike Type-I diabetes, Type-II diabetes can be reversible. The treatment can be different from one person to other person. Some need only lifestyle changes like reducing weight, leading healthy lifestyle etc. and doesn’t require taking insulin. While others need to take medical treatment which involves medicines, insulin injections and following good lifestyle to maintain sugar levels. During metabolic activity intake of food is converted to energy. This process requires hormone called insulin which helps in converting sugars to energy. Type-II diabetes is caused when body slowly loses its capacity to absorb insulin, which actually controls the sugar level, thereby sugar levels in body will not be controlled and hence higher sugar values in Type-II diabetes patients. This is also referred as “adult-onset” diabetes as this is developed in later stages of life. This has other name “insulin resistance” as body is showing resistance to absorb insulin. This is more common when compared to other types of diabetes. Statistics show that out of 100 diabetes patients, 90 have Type-II diabetes.

An estimated 1.6 million deaths were directly caused by diabetes. Another 2.2 million deaths because of high glucose in blood. World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that diabetes was the 7th leading cause of deaths [1]. India is in second position with highest number of diabetes patients. With the help of data mining, machine learning techniques and technology the risks for Type-II diabetes can be identified early and with proper treatment Type-II diabetes can be controlled there by reducing negative impacts of diabetes.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Data Mining

Data mining when used with machine learning can discover patterns in large datasets. Data mining is the combination of two different fields’ computer science and statistics and aims to extract patterns and knowledge not just data from large data sets. Knowledge Discovery in Databases (KDD) contains multiple stages. Data mining is one of the stage in multiple stages [2]. Tasks that data mining is useful to do are identification of data errors in the dataset, grouping of data, Classification using existing data, Identifying relationships in the data and many more.

B. Machine Learning

The main purpose of machine learning is to build the system that should learn from previous experiences and complete the tasks by itself without any need of external instruction.
Important part of machine learning is algorithms with which different models can be established. Machine learning models will predict output for a particular given input. The inputs to generate machine learning model are sample dataset and machine learning algorithms are chosen in such a way that they suit the attributes in the sample data. The steps in the process are
1. Training data set (Pima Indian Diabetes Dataset [3]) is given as input.
2. Selected machine learning algorithm is applied on the data. In this stage algorithm learns the patterns in the data.
3. The model is built after algorithm completes the learning of patterns in given data. After the model is ready, whenever new data is given for prediction to the model, the model predicts the output for that particular input.

C. Coding Tool
Jupyter notebook is used as an Integrated Development Environment (IDE). It is an open-source programming software, open-measures, and allows multiple programming languages. The Jupyter notebook enables to make and share reports that contain live code, conditions, perceptions and content. This can be used for cleaning data, data transformation, modelling the data, visualization of data etc.

III. DATA MINING METHODS
A. Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering Algorithm
There are two types of Hierarchical clustering algorithms, top-down and bottom-up. In bottom-up approach each and every data point is considered as one cluster and sequentially combine (or agglomerate) clusters based on conditions till all clusters are combined or till required number of clusters are formed which contain all the data points thus the name Agglomerative Hierarchical clustering algorithm. Steps in Agglomerative Hierarchical clustering are (Fig.1)
1. Consider each record in the dataset as one cluster then chose a distance metric from available methods. Distance metric is used to measure the distance between two clusters. In the present study Euclidian affinity and linkage as wards method were used.
2. For every step, two clusters which has smallest distance are combined into one.
3. Step 2 is repeated until desired number of clusters are reached. In this way the required number of clusters can be selected.

B. Naïve Bayes Classification Algorithm
Naïve Bayes algorithm is based on conditional probability, a probability can be defined as the ratio of favourable chances to the total number of chances. Conditional probability is some (X) occurring given that other (Y) has already occurred.

\[ P(X|Y) = \frac{P(X \cap Y)}{P(Y)} \]

Bayes Rule explains that when \( P(X|Y) \) is known from the training dataset it is possible to find \( P(Y|X) \)

\[ P(Y|X)(Known) = \frac{P(X|Y)}{P(Y)} \]
\[ P(Y|X)(Unknown) = \frac{P(X|Y)}{P(Y)} \] (1)

Bayes rule provides formula for finding probability of Y given X. But real time there could be multiple X variables. Naïve assumption is that X’s are independent of each other.

\[ P(Y = k|X) = \frac{P(X|Y=k)*P(Y=k)}{P(X)} \]

It becomes Naïve

\[ P(Y = k|x_1, x_2...x_n) = \frac{P(x_1|Y=k)*P(x_2|Y=k)...P(x_n|Y=k)*P(Y=k)}{P(x_1)*P(x_2)...P(x_n)} \] (5)

The above Equation 5 can be understood as

\[ Probability \ of \ Likelihood \ of \ Evidence \times Prior \]

\[ \frac{Probability \ of \ Evidence}{Posterior \ Probability} \]

There are multiple Naïve Bayes classifiers based on bayes rule where every classifier shares same rule that ”every pair of features being classified is independent of each other”.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW
In this section other researcher’s work which is relevant to the present study are presented.
K.Rajesh et al [4], used Pima Indian Diabetes Dataset (PIDD). The researchers focussed on filtering techniques for feature selection and compared different classification algorithms. It was found that C4.5 is efficient classification algorithm when compared with C-RT, CS-RT, ID3, K-NN, LDA, NAİVE BAYES, PLS-DA, SVM and RND TREE and fishers filtering technique is efficient than runs filtering, relief filtering, step disc filtering techniques.
Abdullah et al [5] study focuses on diabetes in old and young people. Saudi Arabia data set obtained from WHO is used and ODM (oracle data miner) is used for prediction. Regression and SVM were used for prediction of effective treatment and for training respectively. Entire dataset is divided as per age groups.
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The results show that best order of treatments are different for both young and old groups. It is observed that drug treatment is more effective in old group when compared to younger group. Srideivnai Nagarajan et al [6] did a comparison study on algorithms which predicts gestational diabetes. The dataset was obtained from St.Isabella hospital which contains around 600 records. ID3, NaiveBayes, C4.5 and random tree are compared and analysed. Cross validation technique was used and it is observed that random tree is giving better accuracy (0.93) when compared with other algorithms. Aiswarya Iyer et al [7], in the study tried to find solution for predicting disease. PIDD is used and WEKA is used to pre-process data; J48 decision tree and Naïve Bayes were used in the model and results are compared with each other. It is observed that Naïve bayes is performing better with good accuracy and less error rate.

Han Wu et al [8] proposed a model for predicting Type-II diabetes. In this study, Waikato environment and PIDD were used. Improved K-means algorithm along with logistic regression algorithm is used. Performance is measured by K fold cross validation and it is showed that this model has accuracy greater than existing models. Humar Kahramanli et al [9] proposed a hybrid model, consisting of artificial Neural network, fuzzy neural network and back propagation algorithm for training and for prediction of diabetes and heart diseases. At first data is standardised then the data is fuzzified. The fuzzified data is given as input to fuzzy neural network and output is given to artificial neural network to obtain the result. They used cleveland heart diseases and pima diabetes datasets. The model has achieved 84.2% accuracy for diabetes and 86.8% for heart disease prediction. B.M Patil et al [10] proposed a hybrid model using data mining methodologies. The proposed model is developed using K means clustering and C4.5 decision tree algorithm. After applying unsupervised clustering algorithm data is filtered and then decision tree algorithm is applied then accuracy is calculated and it was 92.38%.

V. REQUIREMENT ANALYSIS

A. Data Set Description

For the purpose of this study, Pima Indian Diabetes Dataset (PIDD) is considered as it is the best dataset for the present study. It contains 768 records. Every record has 9 attributes out of those one attribute is class variable. All 9 attributes contains only numeric data. Each record contains information about single patient.

| S.no | Preg | Plas | Pres | Skin | insulin | BMI | pedi | age | class |
|------|------|------|------|------|---------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| 1    | 5    | 109  | 75   | 26   | 0       | 36.0| 0.546| 60  | 0     |
| 2    | 3    | 158  | 76   | 36   | 245     | 31.6| 0.851| 28  | 1     |
| 3    | 6    | 92   | 92   | 0    | 0       | 19.9| 0.188| 28  | 0     |
| 4    | 1    | 89   | 66   | 23   | 94      | 28.1| 0.167| 21  | 0     |
| 5    | 0    | 137  | 40   | 35   | 168     | 43.1| 2.288| 33  | 1     |
| 6    | 5    | 116  | 74   | 0    | 0       | 25.6| 0.201| 30  | 0     |

- PREG: This column indicates how many times a person is pregnant.
- PLAS: This indicates plasma glucose concentration at 2 h in an oral glucose tolerance test.
- PRES: This shows diastolic blood pressure.
- SKIN: This indicates thickness of skin at triceps.
- INSULIN: This demonstrates insulin level.
- BMI: It demonstrates body mass index which is ratio of weight and height.
- PEDI: It demonstrates how much probability a person can inherit diabetes from ancestors.
- Age: It provides or shows age of the person.
- Class: It is a variable which contains only 0 or 1. 1 indicates person having diabetes and 0 indicates person not having diabetes.

VI. PREDICTIVE DATA MINING PROCESS FOR PROPOSED MODEL

A. Problem Definition

Many people does not know that they are suffering from diabetes. When diabetes is not treated it could become life threatening disease. When diabetes is detected early, major complications like heart diseases, brain stroke, eye diseases, limb amputations, kidney failure etc. can be reduced. Technology can help in early identification of people who are prone to diabetes. In the present work a new model called IDPA (Improved Diabetes Prediction Algorithm) is presented that includes a novel approach that can identify the diabetes patients using PIMA data set. This proposed method can predict the diabetes with higher accuracy levels than the traditional methods.

B. Proposed Model Methodology – Improved Diabetes Prediction Algorithm (IDPA)

The proposed model uses double level of algorithms. The algorithms that are used in this model are Hierarchical clustering and Naïve bayes algorithm (Fig.2).

- Step-1: Pima Indian Diabetes Dataset (PIDD) is collected.
- Step-2: All values are normalised except the class variable which contains either “0” or “1”.
- Step-3: After the data set is normalised, the class variable is excluded and Agglomerative hierarchical clustering with Euclidean distance is taken and is applied for remaining data and then the data is divided into two groups. New column (group) is added which contains “0” or “1”.
- Step-4: The value in the group and class value are compared for each record and records which have same value are only considered.
- Step-5: Data from step-4 is split for training and testing (90% for training and 10% for testing).
- Step-6: Applying Naïve bayes algorithm to training data and finding the accuracy of the model from testing data.
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1) Applying Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering

The data set is collected and is scaled and then Agglomerative Hierarchical Clustering which is Unsupervised Clustering algorithm is applied. The data set excluding the class variable are grouped into two groups. Then the records are compared with class value and only those records in data set that are matched are only considered for next process. In the proposed model after clustering, it is compared with class variable and only matched records are taken into consideration. The results of the same are show in Table-II.

![Fig. 2. Architecture of proposed model](image)

Table II–Result after Clustering and Comparing

| Groups | Count |
|--------|-------|
| 1      | 333   |
| 2      | 175   |

2) Applying Naïve Bayes Classification Algorithm

From the Table-II, it can be understood that out of 768 records, correctly clustered records were 508 and incorrectly clustered records are 260. Only correctly clustered records were considered and Bernouli Naïve Bayes algorithm is applied on those records. It is equally important to validate the result. It won’t be accurate if testing is done on same training data. So the data is split into training data and testing data in 90:10 ratio, where 51 records where used for testing and remaining 457 records were used for training.

3) Performance Evaluation

The proposed model IDPA is compared with other models. The other models include K-means clustering with Logistic regression, Hierarchical Agglomerative clustering with SVM. Hierarchical Agglomerative clustering with Logistic regression, Hierarchical Agglomerative clustering with Decision Tree. After prediction process there were four outcomes.

1. True Positive: How many people are correctly classified as diabetes patients.
2. True Negative: How many people are correctly classified as non-diabetes patients.
3. False Positive: How many people are incorrectly classified as diabetes patients.
4. False Negative: How many people are incorrectly classified as non-diabetes patients.

The confusion matrix is given in Table-III and results of the same are given in Fig.3.

![Table III –Confusion Matrix](image)

Fig.3. Confusion Matrix for IDPA.

In this study, Performance is evaluated based on accuracy, recall or sensitivity, specificity.

**Accuracy:**
Classification accuracy is the ratio of correct predictions to the total number of predictions (Fig.4).

\[
Accuracy = \frac{\text{Number of correct predictions}}{\text{Total number of predictions made}} \times 100
\]

\[
Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN} \times 100
\]

| Actual Negative | Predicted Negative | Predicted Positive |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| TN – True Negative | FN – False Negative | TP – True Positive |

`#Confusion Matrix of IDPA
confusion_matrix(y_test1,preds_idpa)`

`array([[35, 1], [1, 16]], dtype=int64)`

**Fig.4. Accuracy for IDPA.**

**Sensitivity or Recall:**
Sensitivity or recall is the ratio of correct positive predictions to the total number of positive predictions. Or more simply, how sensitive the classifier is for detecting positive instances (Fig.5). This is also called the True Positive Rate.

\[
Recall = \frac{\text{Number of correct positive predictions}}{\text{Total number of positive predictions}} \times 100
\]

\[
Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \times 100
\]

`idparecall=recall_score(y_test1,preds_nb1)
idparecall`

0.9411754705882353

**Fig.5. Recall for IDPA.**

**Specificity:**
Specificity is the ratio of correct negative predictions to the total number of negative predictions. This determines how specific the classifier is in predicting positive instances.(Fig.6)

\[
Specificity = \frac{\text{Number of correct negative predictions}}{\text{Total number of negative predictions}} \times 100
\]

\[
Specificity = \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \times 100
\]
In the IDPA, the proposed model, the data set is loaded in Jupyter notebook. There are 768 records in the dataset. All values in data set except class variable values are normalised using standard scaler function. Hierarchical clustering algorithm is applied to data for all attributes except class value. After applying hierarchical clustering the records are grouped into two clusters or groups “0” or “1”. Comparison is done and for those records where group value and class value are same only those records were taken for consideration. Out of 768 records, correctly matched records were 508 records. Filtered data is split in 90:10 ratio, where 90% of data is used for training and 10% is used for testing. It means 457 records are used for training and 51 are used for testing. Naïve bayes algorithm is applied for the data. Naïve bayes algorithm is trained by using training data. Confusion matrix accuracy recall and specificity are calculated by using testing data. Result for specificity is given in Fig. 6.

\[
\text{idpspecificity} = \frac{TNi}{(TNi + FPi)}
\]

\[
p(\text{idpspecificity}) = 0.970562352941176
\]

**Fig.6. Specificity for IDPA.**

Confusion Matrix = \[
\begin{bmatrix}
33 & 1 \\
1 & 16
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Accuracy = 96.1%
Recall = 94.1%
Specificity = 97.05%

**C. Comparing with other Models**

In this study other models were implemented and a comparison of accuracy, recall and specificity is done among other models and IDPA. The Table-IV shows confusion matrix, accuracy, recall and specificity values for each model. It is observed that out of other models IDPA has shown greater accuracy. Other models include

1) **K-Means with Logistic Regression Model**

This was the other model which was implemented and compared with IDPA. In this k-means clustering was applied on the same PIMA Indians Diabetes Dataset (PIID) and data (excluding class variable) was divided into two groups. The group value and class value are compared and only matched records were considered. Out of 768 records correctly matched records were 250. Data was split for training and testing in ratio of 70:30. Logistic regression algorithm is applied on training data and accuracy and confusion matrix are calculated on testing data.

Confusion Matrix = \[
\begin{bmatrix}
42 & 13 \\
1 & 29
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Accuracy = 94.6%
Recall = 96%
Specificity = 93%

2) **Hierarchical with Logistic Regression Model**

This is another model which was implemented and compared with IDPA. In this Agglomerative hierarchical clustering with euclidian and ward linkage was applied on the same PIDD and data (excluding class variable) was divided into two groups. The group value and class value are compared and only matched records were considered. Out of 768 records correctly matched records were 508. Data was split for training and testing in ratio of 90:10. Logistic regression is applied on training data and accuracy and confusion matrix are calculated on testing data.

Confusion Matrix = \[
\begin{bmatrix}
31 & 3 \\
0 & 17
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Accuracy = 94.1%
Recall = 100%
Specificity = 91%

**3) Hierarchical with Decision Tree Model**

This is another model which was implemented and compared with IDPA. In this model clustering and comparison is same as that in second and third models. Decision Tree classifier is applied on training data and performance metrics are calculated on testing data.

Confusion Matrix = \[
\begin{bmatrix}
32 & 2 \\
3 & 14
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Accuracy = 90%
Recall = 82%
Specificity = 94%

A typical comparison of various model with IDPA is given in Table-IV. Also, graphical representation of the accuracy of different models and IDPA is given in Fig.7.

**Table IV-Comparison of different models with IDPA**

|                | IDPA | K-Means with Logistic regression | Hierarchical with Logistic Regression | Hierarchical with SVM | Hierarchical with Decision Tree |
|----------------|------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Confusion Matrix | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
33 & 1 \\
1 & 16
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
42 & 13 \\
1 & 29
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
31 & 3 \\
0 & 17
\end{bmatrix}
\] | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
32 & 2 \\
3 & 14
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| Accuracy        | 96.07% | 94.6% | 94.1% | 94.1% | 90% |
| Recall          | 94.1%  | 96%   | 100%  | 100%  | 82% |
| Specificity     | 97%    | 93%   | 91%   | 91%   | 94% |

**Fig.7. Accuracy of different models vs IDPA**

**D. Comparing with other Researcher’s Experiments**

Also, the proposed model IDPA is compared with the existing literature models and is given in Table-V. From this table, it is clearly understood that the proposed Improved Diabetes Prediction Algorithm (IDPA) showed better accuracy compared to other literature models.
**Table-V: Comparison with literature models**

| Method               | Accuracy | Reference                        |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------------------|
| IDPA                 | 96.07%   | Our Model                        |
| HPM                  | 92.38%   | B.M.Patil [10]                   |
| AMMLP                | 89.93%   | Alexis Marcano-Cedeno [12]       |
| 48 (PRUNED)          | 89.30%   | Aliza Ahmad [11]                 |
| 48 (UNPRUNED)        | 86.60%   | Aliza Ahmad [11]                 |
| Hybrid Model         | 84.50%   | Humar Kahramanli [9]             |

**VI. CONCLUSIONS**

In the present study, the main objective is to find a model that predicts Diabetes Mellitus in people when given inputs and it provides higher accuracy rate than the existing models. In order to compare different models, multiple classification algorithms and clustering algorithms were used and implemented. The models include K-means with logistic regression which has got accuracy 94.6%, Hierarchical clustering with Logistic Regression has got accuracy 94.1%, Hierarchical clustering with SVM has accuracy 94.1, Hierarchical clustering with Decision Tree has accuracy 90% and our proposed model IDPA has got accuracy 96.07%. We can say that IDPA has highest accuracy when compared with other models and other researches models. This model when included in real time applications in healthcare sector can be used to predict diabetes with greater accuracy.

The model can be enhanced by using real time dataset or hospital patient’s data. It would be beneficial if user gets a mobile application which not only predicts diabetes or non-diabetes but also stores the patient information.
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