Introduction

Heart disease is considered a life-threatening illness because the heart is a vital organ (1). The diagnosis of heart disease is usually based on symptoms, a physical assessment and a medical evaluation, such as the coronary angiographic test (2). Several different organisations have made recommendations regarding the optimal approach for identifying coronary heart disease in a patient in non-emergency settings (3). Several factors, such as smoking, level of cholesterol, obesity, hereditary issues and others, have been reportedly associated with heart disease (4). These factors, however, have different levels of association with heart disease and each is likely to be more pronounced in the angiographic diagnostic process of the patient.

The angiographic test is considered the gold standard for identifying and classifying a heart disease, such as coronary artery disease (5). However, there are side effects and complications associated with this test (6).
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reduced the sample size to 297. The response variable \( y_i = \pm 1 \) is based on the result of the coronary angiographic test performed on each patient, with \( y_i = 1 \) indicating the presence of heart disease and \( y_i = -1 \) indicating the absence of heart disease. The data contained 76 attributes comprised of categorical factors and metrical covariates. In terms of the response category, as classified by the angiographic test, 137 (46.1\%) of the 297 patients were classified as having heart disease while the remaining 160 (53.9\%) did not have the disease. Most literature, such as Latha and Jeeva and, Suresh and Ananda Raj (14–15), recommend using only 14 out of the 75 attributes for prediction but after removing the missing data, there were 13 predictors on the subjects (13). These variables, and their respective categories, are presented in Table 1.

All the predictor variables are labelled as \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_3 \) respectively. Table 2 presents the frequency distribution of the presence or absence of the heart disease based on the angiographic result. Similarly, Table 3 and figure 1 presents some descriptive measures and box plots of the metrical covariate in the data respectively while Table 4 also presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the categorical factors in the data.

**Application of The Proposed Method on Heart Disease Data**

The w-SVM algorithm assigns weights to the predictor variables in the data. As indicated in (11), the weights are first determined by obtaining the correlation between each of the predictor variables and the response variable. This is referred to as the point biserial correlation or association (16):

\[
r_{x'y} = \frac{\bar{X}_{+1} - \bar{X}_{-1}}{S_X} \sqrt{\frac{n p_{+1} p_{-1}}{n - 1}}
\]

where \( \bar{X}_{+1} \) and \( \bar{X}_{-1} \) are the mean values of the predictor variable \( X \) for all data points in groups +1 and -1, respectively; \( p_{+1} \) and \( p_{-1} \) are the proportions of data points in groups +1 and -1, respectively; with \( p_y = \frac{n_y}{n}, y = -1, \) or +1, and in

\[
S_x = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \bar{X})^2}
\]

the sample standard deviation of the \( j^\text{th} \) feature \( X_j \).
Table 1. Description of the variables in the heart disease data

| S/no | Factors     | Description                                | Factor levels                                      |
|------|-------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 1    | Age         | Patient age in years                       | Continuous                                         |
| 2    | Sex         | Patient sex                                | 1 = male<br>0 = female                             |
| 3    | CP          | Chest pain type                            | 1 = typical angina<br>2 = atypical angina<br>3 = non-angina pain<br>4 = asymptomatic |
| 4    | RBP         | Resting blood pressure                     | Continuous                                         |
| 5    | Chol        | Serum cholesterol in mg/dL                 | Continuous                                         |
| 6    | FBS         | Fasting blood sugar in mg/dL               | 1 ≥ 120 mg/dL<br>0 < 120 mg/dL                     |
| 7    | RECGR       | Resting electrocardiographic results       | 0 = normal<br>1 = abnormality<br>2 = left ventricular hypertrophy |
| 8    | MHRA        | Maximum heart rate achieved                | Continuous                                         |
| 9    | EXANG       | Exercise-induced angina                    | 0 = no<br>1 = yes                                  |
| 10   | OLDPK       | Depression induced by exercise relative to rest | Continuous                                      |
| 11   | SLOPE       | Slope of the peak exercise                 | 1 = up sloping<br>2 = flat<br>3 = down sloping     |
| 12   | CA          | Number of major vessels                    | 0 – 3 values                                       |
| 13   | THAL        | Defect type                                | 3 = normal<br>6 = fixed<br>7 = reversible          |

Table 2. Angiographic test result

| Heart disease absent (−) | Heart disease present (+) | Total   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| 160 (53.9%)              | 137 (46.1%)               | 297 (100%) |

Table 3. Clinical characteristics of the continuous variable for the entire 297 heart disease patient

| Minimum | Maximum | Mean (SD)   |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| Age     | 29      | 77          | 55.5 (9.1) |
| Chol    | 126     | 564         | 247.4 (52.0) |
| MHRA    | 71      | 202         | 149.6 (22.9) |
| RBP     | 94      | 200         | 131.7 (17.8) |
| OLDPK   | 0       | 6.2         | 1.1 (1.2)  |
Table 4. Summary of the clinical characteristics of categorical variables for the entire 297 heart disease patient

| Factors | Factor levels | Frequency (Percentage) |
|---------|---------------|------------------------|
| Total number of patient | 297 |
| Sex | Male | 201 (67.7%) |
| | Female | 96 (32.3%) |
| CP | Typical angina | 23 (7.7%) |
| | Atypical angina | 49 (16.5%) |
| | Non-angina pain | 83 (27.9%) |
| | Asymptomatic | 142 (47.8%) |
| FBS | ≥120 mg/dL | 254 (85.5%) |
| | < 120 mg/dL | 43 (14.5%) |
| RECGR | Normal | 147 (49.5%) |
| | Abnormality | 4 (1.3%) |
| | Left ventricular hypertrophy | 146 (49.2%) |
| EXANG | No | 200 (67.3%) |
| | Yes | 97 (32.7%) |
| SLOPE | Up sloping | 139 (46.8%) |
| | Flat | 137 (46.1%) |
| | Down sloping | 21 (7.1%) |
| CA | 0 | 174 (58.6%) |
| | 1 | 65 (21.9%) |
| | 2 | 38 (12.8%) |
| | 3 | 20 (6.7%) |
| THAL | Normal | 164 (55.2%) |
| | Fixed | 18 (6.1%) |
| | Reversible | 115 (38.7%) |
| NUM | Yes (Presence of heart disease) | 137 (46.1%) |
| | No (Absence of heart disease) | 160 (53.9%) |

These correlations determine the weight for each of the predictors. A step-by-step procedure of the w-SVM can be found in (11).

Suppose there are $n$ sample points in the data with the $p$ predictor variable $X$, and each point in $X$ has an attribute in one of the binary classes, $y_i = \pm 1$. The weight for each of the variables, as discussed in (11), is obtained as

$$
\omega = \left( \begin{array}{cccc} 
\omega_{11} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & \omega_{22} & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & \omega_{pp} 
\end{array} \right),
$$

such that $\text{tr} (\omega) = 1$.

Each weight $\omega_j$ in $\omega$ is computed by

$$
\omega_j = \frac{|r_{jY}|}{\sum_{j=1}^{p} |r_{jY}|} \quad \text{for} \ j = 1, 2, \ldots, p
$$

where $r_{jY}$ is the correlation between predictor $X_j$ and the binary response $Y$.

Each of the weights are then multiplied by the respective predictor variables to give the new $n \times p$ data matrix $Z$. The traditional SVM is then applied on the new (weighted) data for the purpose of classification using the Monte-Carlo cross-validation (MCCV) method.

Different percentages of the splitting ratio were also considered for the train and test sets, respectively, as reported in (11). The quadratic programming problem of w-SVM is

$$
\min_{\alpha} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_i \alpha_j y_i y_j z_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \right\},
$$

where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ is the Lagrange multiplier.
As stated earlier, \( Z \) is the updated data, which was derived from the original data matrix \((X)\) and the weight matrix, such that

\[
Z_{n \times p} = X_{n \times p} \cdot \omega_{p \times p}
\]

Therefore,

\[
Z = \begin{pmatrix}
Z_{11} & Z_{12} & \ldots & Z_{1p} \\
Z_{21} & Z_{22} & \ldots & Z_{2p} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
Z_{n1} & Z_{n2} & \ldots & Z_{np}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

with \( z_{ij} = X_{ij} \omega_{jj} \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \) and \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, p \).

The data pre-processing and cleaning techniques have been applied to remove noisy and missing values present in the data set, respectively. The MCCV resampling technique is applied to produce balanced training and testing of the data set with different percentages of the splitting ratios and with replicating each split with 1,000 iterations. The w-SVM classification algorithm was developed to predict heart disease and the performance of the algorithm was validated with the test data. Figure 1 shows the overall flow of the prediction algorithm for heart disease.

The performance of the proposed w-SVM algorithm was evaluated via the test data using some performance indices. Given a 2 × 2 confusion matrix as presented in Table 5, where:

i) True positive (TP) is the number of subjects that are positive and are predicted as such

ii) False positive (FP) is the number of subjects that are negative but predicted as positive

iii) False negative (FN) is the number of subjects that are positive but predicted as negative

iv) True negative (TN) is the number of subjects that are negative and are predicted as such, then

\[
N = TP + FP + FN + TN
\]
is the total number of subjects in a test set.

Seven performance indices — Prediction accuracy (\( A_{CC} \)), Misclassification error rate (MER), Sensitivity (\( S_e \)), Specificity (\( S_p \)), Positive predictive value (\( P^+ \)), Negative predictive value (\( P^- \)) and Jaccard index (JI) — were used to assess the performance of the proposed method. The MER was used in comparing the w-SVM method with the three selected machine learning methods. \( A_{CC} \) is the proportion of subjects that are correctly classified by the classifier.
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and it is defined as $A_{cc} = \frac{TP + TN}{N}$; MER is the proportion of subjects in the test set that are misclassified by the classifier/algorithm, defined as $MFR = \frac{FP + FN}{N}$; $S_0$ is the proportion of true positive subjects that are correctly classified, defined as $S_0 = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$; $S_1$ is the proportion of true negative subjects that are correctly classified, defined as $S_1 = \frac{TN}{FP + TN}$; and $P_0$ measures the precision of the classifier. This shows the proportion of the true class ($y = 1$) subjects that are correctly classified into that class among those that were classified as class 1 subjects by the classifier. It is defined as $P_0 = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$. Meanwhile, $P_1$ is the proportion of group ($y = -1$) subjects that are correctly classified into that group among the subjects classified as group $-1$ subjects. It is defined as $P_1 = \frac{TN}{TN + FN}$. Lastly, $JI$ measures the similarity between the classifier and the subjects’ true class grouping, defined as $JI = \frac{TP}{TP + FP + FN}$.

All analyses were performed using R software (http://cran.r-project.org) version 3.4.4 with the e1071 package version 1.7-3.

Results

This section presents the results of a heart disease classification using w-SVM.

### Table 5. A typical $2 \times 2$ confusion matrix for a binary response data

| Predicted Class (P) | True class (T) |  |  |  |
|---------------------|----------------|---|---|---|
|                      | 1              | -1 | Marginal total |
| 1                   | TP             | FP | TP + FP |
| -1                  | FN             | TN | FN + TN |
| Marginal total      | TP + FN        | FP + TN | N |
Discussion

This study has demonstrated an efficient data-mining method for the prediction of heart disease based on the results of an angiographic test. The step of the method of the w-SVM was able to identify the most and least correlated predictor variable with the response variable among the predictor variables considered in this study.

The results of the respective biserial correlations between the response variable and each of the predictor variables and the corresponding weights are presented in Table 6. Table 6 shows that the variable thalassemia (THAL) \( (X_{13}) \) is the most correlated variable with the response variable having a correlation value of 0.5266 and corresponding weight value of 0.1347, while the predictor variable fasting blood sugar (FBS) \( (X_6) \) is the least correlated variable with the response variable, with a correlation value of 0.0032 and a corresponding weight value of 0.0008.

Table 6. Degree of relationship and weight of each predictor

| Variables in the data | \( r_{ij} \) | \( \omega_i \) | Rank |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|------|
| Age \( (X_1) \)       | 0.2271      | 0.0581       | 9    |
| Sex \( (X_2) \)       | 0.2785      | 0.0712       | 8    |
| CP \( (X_3) \)        | 0.4089      | 0.1046       | 6    |
| RBP \( (X_4) \)       | 0.1535      | 0.0393       | 11   |
| Chol \( (X_5) \)      | 0.0803      | 0.0205       | 12   |
| FBS \( (X_6) \)       | 0.0032      | 0.0008       | 13   |
| RECGR \( (X_7) \)     | 0.1663      | 0.0425       | 10   |
| MHRA \( (X_8) \)      | 0.4238      | 0.1084       | 4    |
| EXANG \( (X_9) \)     | 0.4214      | 0.1078       | 5    |
| OLDPK \( (X_{10}) \)  | 0.4241      | 0.1085       | 3    |
| SLOPE \( (X_{11}) \)  | 0.3331      | 0.0852       | 7    |
| CA \( (X_{12}) \)     | 0.4632      | 0.1185       | 2    |
| THAL \( (X_{13}) \)   | 0.5266      | 0.1347       | 1    |

Figure 2. Flow chart of the w-SVM prediction algorithm for the heart disease data
The proposed method can unravel the importance of each of the predictor variables as they relate to heart disease. For instance, THAL has been reported in literature as a very important factor and even as indicative that the patient has a life-threatening heart disease (24). Similarly, FBS has been reported not to have a significant effect on heart disease (25). The above was rightly justified by the proposed algorithm through the weight of THAL and FBS, respectively, as demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 7 shows the several performance indices that were used to assess the performance of the w-SVM method on the heart disease data, using different percentages of the splitting ratio for the train and test sets. The results indicated that the splitting ratios considered in this study do not significantly affect the performance of w-SVM on the prediction of heart disease as the same results were achieved using different percentages of the splitting ratios. Generally, a rule of thumb in the data-mining technique is to split the data using the splitting ratio 80:20 for train and test data, respectively. Therefore, as observed in Table 6, the 80:20 splitting ratio gave a prediction accuracy of 90.53%, Sensitivity value of 90.99%, Specificity value of 90.72%, Positive predictive value of 87.99%, Negative predictive value of 90.53% and a Jaccard Index of 82.89%. The high value of the performance indices considered in the study testifies to the effectiveness of the w-SVM method in the prediction of heart disease. Throughout the different percentages of the splitting ratio considered, it was observed that the least prediction accuracy yielded of the w-SVM algorithm is 88.62% and was achieved at the splitting ratio 50:50. This splitting ratio is discouraged as it is usually very important to have more training sets than test sets in data-mining techniques. Similarly, the maximum accuracy is 90.60% and was achieved at the splitting ratio of 90:10. This is also not encouraged, because too small a percentage of the test set may lead to overfitting the classification model. A similar pattern of results was also observed for all other performance indices at different percentages of the splitting ratios.

The proposed method performs in a similar pattern for the different splitting ratios considered in this study. As pointed out earlier, the two extreme splitting ratios in this study (95:5 and 50:50) are discouraged. Therefore, it is advisable to use the rule of thumb of 80:20 for the train and test sets, respectively, in the implementation of the proposed algorithm.

Also, the results presented in Figure 3 show the efficient performance of the w-SVM method over the selected three machine learning methods for the different splitting ratios using the MER of each of the methods considered in this study. Observations show that the w-SVM method performs best and is a more efficient data-mining technique — when compared to the three other existing classifiers — for predicting heart disease. This is indicated by the least MER values attained by the w-SVM throughout the splitting ratios considered.

The implication of the proposed method having the least MER is that, while the proposed method will be more efficient in correctly diagnosing a patient with a heart disease in this study, the other three selected methods will be less efficient because of the very high chance of wrongly diagnosing the patient. The other performance indices of the proposed method also justify how good is the proposed method.

Table 7. Performance measures of w-WSM on the heart disease classification

| Performance index (%) | 95:5 | 90:10 | 80:20 | 75:25 | 50:50 |
|------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Acc                    | 90.00| 90.62 | 90.53 | 90.49 | 88.62 |
| MER                    | 10.00| 9.38  | 9.47  | 9.51  | 11.38 |
| S,                     | 90.68| 90.95 | 90.99 | 90.90 | 89.91 |
| Sp                     | 90.34| 91.02 | 90.72 | 90.78 | 88.50 |
| P,                     | 83.30| 87.41 | 87.99 | 87.34 | 85.29 |
| P,−                    | 89.95| 90.54 | 90.53 | 90.53 | 89.82 |
| JI                     | 81.67| 82.66 | 82.89 | 82.80 | 80.04 |
Figure 3. The graph of MER results of w-SVM, SVM, RF and NB

Table 8. Accuracy of Cleveland heart disease prediction with different classifiers

| Authors               | Year  | Classifier used          | Accuracy (%) |
|-----------------------|-------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Otoom et al. (18)     | 2015  | BayesNet                 | 84.50        |
|                       |       | SVM                      | 85.10        |
|                       |       | Functional trees         | 84.50        |
| Vembandasamy et al. (19)| 2015  | Naïve Bayes              | 86.42        |
| Dwivedi (20)          | 2018  | Naïve Bayes              | 83.00        |
|                       |       | Classification trees      | 77.00        |
|                       |       | K-NN                     | 80.00        |
|                       |       | Logistic regression      | 85.00        |
|                       |       | SVM                      | 82.00        |
|                       |       | ANN                      | 84.00        |
| Deepika et al. (21)   | 2016  | Naïve Bayes              | 93.85        |
|                       |       | Decision tree            | 92.59        |
|                       |       | SVM                      | 95.20        |
|                       |       | ANN                      | 94.27        |
| Zriqat et al. (22)    | 2017  | Decision tree            | 99.01        |
|                       |       | Naïve Bayes              | 78.88        |
|                       |       | Discriminant             | 83.50        |
|                       |       | Random forest            | 93.40        |
|                       |       | SVM                      | 76.57        |
| Rajdhan et al. (23)   | 2020  | Decision tree            | 81.97        |
|                       |       | Logistic regression      | 85.25        |
|                       |       | Random forest            | 90.16        |
|                       |       | Naïve Bayes              | 85.25        |
| Proposed              | 2021  | w-SVM                    | 90.53        |
The results of various performance indices for the classification of heart disease using the w-SVM as employed in this study is quite impressive and better when compared to the three selected existing classifiers. Similarly, the results obtained shows that the proposed method perform well as compared to some past studies using the same heart disease data set. Comparison of accuracy scores in the proposed method with the same Cleveland Heart Disease Data is presented in Table 8. It should be noted that the result of the proposed method is the average over 1,000 runs using MCCV — which make the results obtained more reliable — compared to some studies that have reported their results over a single run.

Finally, although the w-SVM seems to be effective in predicting heart disease by considering the relationship between the presence or otherwise of it and the associated factors (predictors), this study’s weakness is that, even as high as the prediction accuracy of the w-SVM is, there are still chances of misclassifying individuals with the same response to the heart disease when using the associated factors considered in this study. This is justified by the non-zero value of the MER over the different percentages of the splitting ratios. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the clinical importance of this study in order to further validate the results.

Conclusion

This study presents an efficient data-mining algorithm for the classification and prediction of heart disease. The w-SVM algorithm was developed using the degree of association between the dichotomous response variable and each of the predictors to determine the respective weights of each of the predictor variables. The w-SVM provides better and more efficient results that will also assist domain experts with better planning of early diagnosis and treatment of the patient. The results show that the w-SVM algorithm can accurately predict heart disease based on an angiographic test with more than 90% accuracy. Medical practitioners, particularly cardiologists, are advised to further investigate the results of the proposed method for ease and quick medical treatment and intervention relating to heart disease based on an angiogram.
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