Harvard-MIT Division of Health Sciences and Technology HST.951J: Medical Decision Support, Fall 2005 Instructors: Professor Lucila Ohno-Machado and Professor Staal Vinterbo

### **Overview**

## A Practical Example

 Obtain data, prepare it Staal A. Vinterbo Create, validate and compare classifiers Harvard-MIT Division of Health Science and Technology Determine predictors if possible: hypotheses Decision Systems Group, BWH ► Write report Harvard Medical School Dec 2005: HST 951/MIT 6.873 Class HST 951/MIT 6.873 HST 951/MIT 6.873 Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS) Practical Example 1/13 Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS) Practical Example 2/13 Data format

The data we plan on using:

Data

Molecular Classification of Cancer: Class Discovery and Class Prediction by Gene Expression, T.R. Golub et. al, Science 286:531-537. (1999).

Google: "golub all aml data"

The data comes as:

- Two files: training set and test set
- Each gene on a row
- class in separate file

Need to transform.

## Transform

# **Repeat Original Experiment**

- ► Use Excel to strip away first column.
- Load into R using read.delim
- Filter columns, transpose and attach class labels

- Repeat Classification task of paper
- ► 4 errors on test

Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS)	Practical Example	HST 951/MIT 6.873	5/13	Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS)	Practical Example	HST 951/MIT 6.873	6 / 13
Validate Method	e Method			CV comparison with NN			
8 fold CV				<ul> <li>Compare to ANN using</li> <li>8 fold CV – T-Test</li> <li>5×2 CV (Alpaydin, E. Combined 5x2CV F Test for Comparing Supervised Classification Learning Algorithms Neural Computation, 1999, 11, 1885-1982)</li> </ul>			

 $5 \times 2 \text{ CV}$ 

The 5x2CV *F*-test can be used to quantitatively compare the performance of two classifiers. As its name implies, the test is based on performing five replications of 2-fold CV.

Let  $\Delta_{ij}$  denote the *difference* between the performance measures of the two classifiers on fold  $j \in \{1, 2\}$  of replication  $i \in \{1, ..., 5\}$ . The average difference in performance on replication i is  $\overline{\Delta}_i$  and the estimated variance is  $s_i^2$ .

$$ar{\Delta}_i = rac{(\Delta_{i1}+\Delta_{i2})}{2} 
onumber \ oldsymbol{s}_i^2 = (\Delta_{i1}-ar{\Delta}_i)^2+(\Delta_{i2}-ar{\Delta}_i)^2$$

Practical Example

## $5 \times 2 \text{ CV}$

Let  $H_0$  denote the null hypothesis that the two classifiers perform equally well. Under  $H_0$ ,  $\Delta_{ij}$  can be treated as being  $N(0, \sigma^2)$ distributed, and we have:

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{\Delta_{ij}^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} \sim \chi_{10}^{2}$$
$$B = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{s_{i}^{2}}{\sigma^{2}} \sim \chi_{5}^{2}$$
$$= \frac{A/10}{B/5} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \Delta_{ij}^{2}}{2\sum_{i=1}^{5} s_{i}^{2}} \sim F_{10,5}$$

We then reject  $H_0$  if the statistic *f* is sufficiently large. For 95% confidence, f = 4.74.

Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS)

f

Practical Example

HST 951/MIT 6.873 10 / 13

### Markers?

Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS)

Bioinformatics: Can we suggest markers that discerns between ALL and AML?

#### The report

What we want to tell:

- Fuzzy Classification Trees are worth while
- ► They are interpretable
- ▶ We found a good marker for discerning ALL from AML

#### Support

- Comparison to other classifiers
- Repeat of paper classification task
- Show stability of marker

HST 951/MIT 6.873 9 / 13

The paper parts:

- Introduction:
  - background why is this question important
  - what we did results and significance
- Methods
  - Mathematical preliminaries and definitions
  - Fuzzy Classification Trees
  - Validation methods
- Experiments
  - Data description, and preparation
  - Experimental protocol: hypotheses and what results are needed to confirm
- Results: state the results
- Discussion:
  - Link hypotheses and results and draw conclusion
  - Discuss weaknesses/strengths and items needed to reproduce
  - Hint at further research

Staal A. Vinterbo (HST/DSG/HMS)

Practical Example

HST 951/MIT 6.873 13 / 13