Van-AI-ML-Project02

February 27, 2021

1 Parkinson's Screening By Voiceprint Analysis

AI-5383 L. Van Warren Assigned: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 Prof. Mariofanna Milanova TA. Imran 'Md' Sarker University of Arkansas, Little Rock

1.1 Introduction - Collection and Analysis of a Parkinson Dataset

This is a review of the paper whose subject is the title, and may be clicked to reference it. Unlike typical reviews this one is a living document, a Python Jupyter notebook, that allows its results and follow-on work to be executed by the reader. It can also be used as a reference template for similar machine learning investigations.

This was an interesting paper for two reasons. It introduces the revolution that a degenerative disease, like Parkinson's, that plagues millions, can be telediagnosed by voiceprint. With later work it developed into an excellent comparative platform for six machine learning algorithms we will run below.

Three of these algorithms had higher than high 95% accuracy we will see in the Results Section below.

Six Standard Models and Results

- XG Boost Classifier 98%
- Logistic Regression 88%
- Gaussian Naive Bayes 69%
- K-Nearest Neighbor 98%
- Support Vector Machine 90%
- Classification and Regression Trees 96%

We will run all six of these below in a moment.

The original work, and paper published from it, only used Support Vector Machines and K-Nearest Neighbors. However, it did not detail or discuss a portion of method, process and technology that enabled it to be so effective. This cleverness took place in two steps, the Speech Parsing Section and the Feature Extraction Section of the Data Collection flow shown here in a diagram, Figure 2, from the paper:



IEEE JOURNAL OF BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH INFORMATICS, VOL. 17, NO. 4, JULY 2013

The speech parsing section was, a presumably manual, extraction of the sound waveforms representing specific utterances like the vowel 'o' and the word 'four' for each of the patients. The next stage feature extraction was much more significant. In order to produce and label the data provided it was necessary for them to transform the time-domain speech data into frequency-domain samples, and then label specific frequency bands in the data according that were most likely to correspond to patients who were negative and positive for the illness. The clue to this is in the waveform diagram, Figure 1 from the paper:



IEEE JOURNAL OF BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH INFORMATICS, VOL. 17, NO. 4, JULY 2013

According to the paper, 'the speech is parsed to be split into voice samples, and time-frequency based features are extracted from the voice samples using Praat acoustic analysis software.' It was this specific feature extraction that enables the algorithm to work, and it may be that that portion of the algorithm is being held back as proprietary, but the high frequencies appearing in the bottom waveform are a clue that there are a cluster of frequencies that are diagnostic for Parkinson's and this is the first place that someone trying to reproduce the full experiment would start. These speech aspects are listed in the paper as telltale features of Parkinson's: - dysphonia (defective use of the voice), - hypophonia (reduced volume), - monotone (reduced pitch range), - dysarthria (difficulty with articulation of sounds or syllables) Three of the four are frequency domain attributes and hypophonia is a time domain attribute that can also be acquired by the amplitude of the frequency domain bin contents. Here is a list of the features extracted in the paper, and this list is quickly examined by plotting a series of histograms from the supplied data to confirm plausible trends.

 TABLE I

 TIME-FREQUENCY-BASED FEATURES EXTRACTED FROM VOICE SAMPLES

Features	Group			
Jitter (local)				
Jitter (local, absolute)	Erecuency			
Jitter (rap)	Frequency			
Jitter (ppq5)	parameters			
Jitter (ddp)				
Number of pulses				
Number of periods	Dulso Donomotors			
Mean period	ruise rarameters			
Standard dev. of period				
Shimmer (local)				
Shimmer (local, dB)				
Shimmer (apq3)	Amplitude			
Shimmer (apq5)	parameters			
Shimmer (apq11)				
Shimmer (dda)				
Fraction of locally unvoiced frames				
Number of voice breaks	Voicing Parameters			
Degree of voice breaks				
Median pitch				
Mean pitch				
Standard deviation	Pitch Parameters			
Minimum pitch				
Maximum pitch				
Autocorrelation	Harmonioity			
Noise-to-Harmonic				
Harmonic -to-Noise	r ai ainetei s			

IEEE JOURNAL OF BIOMEDICAL AND HEALTH INFORMATICS, VOL. 17, NO. 4, JULY 2013

The data collected in the context of this study for the original study included:

- 20 PWP (6 female, 14 male) and
- 20 healthy individuals (10 female, 10 male)

who appealed at the Department of Neurology in Cerrahpaşa School of Medicine, Istanbul University Test group consists of patients who are suffering from PD for 0 to 6 years.

But inspection of the dataset showed that this number had grown from 40 subjects to 195. It

is worth noting that in the larger dataset there are about 140 positive patients and 45 negative patients, so the data is unbalanced in that respect. This is noted in the code as well, and be computed exactly if desired. I did not have time to trace the pedigree of the additional data used in the analysis below, but it could be one reason that the accuracy went from 79% and 82% for k-NN and SVM with 40 subjects to 98% and 90% in the 195-subject case.

The Classification methods include:

- Classification with Leave-One-Subject-Out (LOSO)
- Classification with Summarized Leave-One-Out (s-LOO)

Evaluation Metrics: The evaluation metrics are repeated from the paper because they are the bread-and-butter formulas of data science and it never hurts to review them. It also gives the author a chance to practice inserting LaTeX math formulas in Jupyter notebooks and getting them formatted correctly. The figures of merit for classifiers are:

- Accuracy
- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- MCC

Accuracy is the ratio of correctly classified instances to all instances:

$$accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}$$

Where: - TP true positives - TN true negatives - FP false positives - FN false negatives

Sensitivity and specificity are statistical measures of correctly classified positive and negative instances, respectively:

$$sensitivity = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$
$$specificity = \frac{TN}{TN + FP}$$

The Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) plots sensitivity vs. 1-specificity, but we will label the axes as TP vs. TN for brevity. These graphs are provided by real-time computation below.

Mathews Correlation Coefficient (MCC) is a measure that shows the quality of binary classification in machine learning. It is stable even if the class densities are considerably different. MCC is a correlation coefficient between the predicted and observed binary classifications and gets a value between -1 and +1. The formulation of MCC metric is given as follows:

$$MCC = \frac{TP \cdot TN - FP \cdot FN}{\sqrt[2]{(TP + FP)(TP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}}$$

This coefficient gets the value of: -+1 when the classifier makes perfect predictions, --1 when the predictions and actual values totally disagree, and -0 when the classification is no better than a random prediction.

2 Libraries

```
[1]: import math
     import os
     import sys
     import pandas
                              as pd
     import numpy
                              as np
     import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
     import seaborn
                              as sea
     import xgboost
                              as xgb
     from scipy
                                   import interp
     from scipy
                                   import stats
     from cycler
                                   import cycler
     from itertools
                                   import cycle
     from xgboost
                                   import XGBClassifier
     from sklearn
                                   import datasets
     from sklearn
                                   import metrics
     from sklearn.preprocessing
                                   import MinMaxScaler
     from sklearn.preprocessing
                                   import label_binarize
     from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split
     from sklearn.linear model
                                   import LogisticRegression
     from sklearn.metrics
                                   import roc_curve
     from sklearn.metrics
                                   import auc
     from sklearn.metrics
                                   import roc_auc_score
     from sklearn.multiclass
                                   import OneVsRestClassifier
     from sklearn.naive_bayes
                                   import GaussianNB
                                   import KNeighborsClassifier
     from sklearn.neighbors
     from sklearn.svm
                                   import SVC
     from sklearn.tree
                                   import DecisionTreeClassifier
     %matplotlib inline
```

2.1 Van Graphics Lib

```
def van_defaults(plot, x_size=10, y_size=10):
         # # My canonical graphing style
         # plt.xkcd()
         plot.figure(figsize=(x_size,y_size))
     # plot.rcParams['figure.figsize'] = [10, 10]
        plot.rcParams['figure.facecolor'] = 'FFFFFF'
         plot.rcParams.update({'font.size': 12})
         plot.rcParams['axes.facecolor'] = '#AADDAA'
         plot.rcParams['lines.linewidth'] = 3
         plot.rcParams['lines.color'] = 'red'
         plot.rcParams['axes.prop_cycle'] = cycler('color', van_color_list)
         plot.grid(True)
     def van_labels(plot, x_label, y_label, title):
         plot.xlabel(x_label)
         plot.ylabel(y_label)
         plot.title(title)
     def van_limits(plot, mx, px, my, py):
             plot.xlim((mx, px))
             plot ylim((my, py))
     # hidden by underscore because of singularity removal
     def van_OoX(x):
         \mathbf{y} = 1/\mathbf{x}
         y[y > math.pi] = np.inf # remove singularity
         y[y < -math.pi] = -np.inf</pre>
         return(y)
     def van_TaN(x):
         y = np.tan(x)
         y[y > math.pi] = np.inf # remove singularity
         y[y < -math.pi] = -np.inf</pre>
         return(y)
[3]: van_defaults(plt, 5, 5)
     van_labels (plt, 'x', 'f(x)', 'f(x) vs. x for some common functions')
     van_limits (plt, -math.pi, math.pi, -math.pi, math.pi)
     x = np.arange(-math.pi, math.pi, 0.01)
     function list = [van OoX(x), x*x, stats.norm.pdf(x), np.sin(x), np.cos(x),]
```

```
\Rightarrow van_TaN(x) , x, -x ]
function_name = [ '1/x', 'x<sup>2</sup>', 'pdf(x)', 'sin(x)', 'cos(x)', 

\Rightarrow 'tan(x)', 'x', '-x']
```

```
for y in function_list: plt.plot(x,y)
plt.axhline(0, color='#808080')
plt.axvline(0, color='#808080')
plt.text(0.5,-3,'van2021')
plt.legend(function_name, title=' f(x)', loc=1)
plt.show();
```



3 Data Review

3.1 Read Data

[4]: data = pd.read_csv('data/parkinsons.csv')
predictors = data.drop(['name'], axis = 1)
predictors = predictors.drop(['status'], axis = 1).to_numpy()
target = data['status']
data.shape

[4]: (195, 24)

3.2**Textual Data Review**

- Initially we take a look at the data to make sure the read has worked and that the numbers are plausible.
- We do a data.__head()___ call to look at the first 5 rows, and it also prints the data.___shape___.
- We inspect the *features* by echoing the contents of the variable **target** defined above.

```
[5]: data.head()
```

[5]

:			name	MDVP:	Fo(Hz)	MDVP:Fhi	(Hz)	MDVP:	Flo(Hz)	MDVP:Jit	ter(%)	\
	0	phon_R01_S	301_1	1	L19.992	157	.302		74.997	(0.00784	
	1	phon_R01_S	301_2	1	122.400	148	8.650		113.819	(0.00968	
	2	phon_R01_S	301_3	1	16.682	131	.111		111.555	(0.01050	
	3	phon_R01_S	301_4	1	L16.676	137	.871		111.366	(0.00997	
	4	phon_R01_S	501_5	1	116.014	141	.781		110.655	(0.01284	
		MDVP:Jitte	er(Abs)) MDV	/P:RAP	MDVP:PPQ	Jitt	er:DDF	MDVP:SI	nimmer .		
	0	C	0.0007	70.	.00370	0.00554	0	.01109) 0	.04374 .		
	1	C	0.0008	30.	00465	0.00696	0	.01394	L 0	.06134 .		
	2	C	0.0009	90.	00544	0.00781	0	.01633	3 0	.05233 .		
	3	C	0.0009	90.	00502	0.00698	0	.01505	5 0	.05492 .		
	4	C	0.0001	L 0.	00655	0.00908	0	.01966	6 0	.06425 .	••	
		Shimmer:DI	A	NHR	HNR	status		RPDE	DFA	spread	11 \	
	0	0.0654	45 0.0)2211	21.033	1	0.41	4783	0.815285	-4.81303	31	
	1	0.0940	0.0)1929	19.085	1	0.45	8359	0.819521	-4.07519	92	
	2	0.0827	70 0.0	01309	20.651	1	0.42	9895	0.825288	-4.44317	79	
	3	0.0877	71 0.0	01353	20.644	1	0.43	4969	0.819235	-4.11750	01	
	4	0.1047	70 0.0	01767	19.649	1	0.41	7356	0.823484	-3.74778	37	
		spread2		D2	PPE							
	0	0.266482	2.3014	442 (.284654							
	1	0.335590	2.4868	355 (.368674							
	2	0.311173	2.3422	259 (.332634							
	3	0.334147	2.405	554 (.368975							
	4	0.234513	2.3323	180 0).410335							
	[5	rows x 24	colum	ns]								
:	ta	target # Presumably labels for 'has Parkinsons' vs. doesn't.										

1

1

1

1

1

[6]

 190
 0

 191
 0

 192
 0

 193
 0

 194
 0

 Name: status, Length: 195, dtype: int64

3.3 Graphical Data Review

- We can spot distribution shapes and trends
- Note in the last graphic we determine that this data is unbalanced with respect to Parkinson's Status!
- We plot first 16 columns, those after status are derivative statistics

```
[7]: def park_plot(a, b, x_title=''):
         data_cols = range(a,b)
         y = [data.iloc[:,i+1] for i in data_cols]
         van_defaults(plt, x_size=6, y_size=4)
         van_labels(plt, x_title, 'Number of Subjects',
                    'Number of Subjects vs ' + x_title)
         plt.text(0.85*np.max(y), 5, 'van2021')
         [plt.hist(y[i], bins=30, alpha=0.50, label='foo') for i in range(0,b-a)]
         plt.legend(data.columns[np.add(data_cols, 1).tolist()],
                    title='Feature', loc=1)
        plt.axhline(0, color='#000000')
     #
        plt.axvline(0, color='#000000')
     #
         plt.grid(False)
         plt.show();
     park_plot(0,3, 'Frequency (Hz)')
     park_plot(3,6, 'Jitter and RAP')
     park_plot(6,8, 'MDVP and Shimmer')
     park_plot(9,10, 'Shimmer (dB)')
     park_plot(10,14, 'Shimmer')
     park_plot(14,16, 'NHR and HNR')
     park_plot(16,17, 'Parkinson\'s Status')
```















4 Analysis Using Six Different Models

4.1 Scale to Unit Interval and Test/Train Data Split

- Every modeling technique uses scaled version of the data
- Imports sklearn.preprocessing MinMaxScaler
- Remember you have both scaled and inverse transforms available for forward and inverse maps

[8]: import warnings

```
warnings.filterwarnings('ignore') # ignore superfluous warning
scaler = MinMaxScaler((-1, 1))
X = scaler.fit_transform(predictors)
Y = target
X_train, X_test, Y_train, Y_test = \
    train_test_split(X, Y,test_size = .25, random_state = 7)
```

4.2 Four Utility Functions

• plot_confusion_matrix: a function's name that tells you what it does saves unnecessary comments!

- summarize_model_fit: calls plot_confusion_matrix()
- plot_ROC: plot the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve of True Positives vs. False Positives
- fit_predict_summarize: do the fit, make the predictions, call summarize_model_fit() to assess the result

```
[9]: def plot_confusion_matrix(CM):
         group_names = ['True Neg', 'False Pos', 'False Neg', 'True Pos']
         group_counts = ['{0:0.0f}'.format(value) \
                         for value in CM.flatten()]
         group_percents = ['{0:.2%}'.format(value) \
                           for value in CM.flatten()/np.sum(CM)]
         labels = [f'{v1}\n{v2}\n{v3}' \
                   for v1, v2, v3 in zip(group_names,group_counts,group_percents)]
         labels = np.asarray(labels).reshape(2,2)
         # plt.figure()
         van_defaults(plt, x_size=4.5, y_size=4.5)
         sea.heatmap(CM, annot=labels, fmt='', cmap='Blues')
         plt.show()
     def summarize_model_fit(title, test, pred):
         print(f'{title} Model Accuracy: \
         {round(metrics.accuracy_score(test, pred)*100,1)}%')
     # print(metrics.classification_report(test, pred))
         print('Confusion Matrix: ')
         plot_confusion_matrix(metrics.confusion_matrix(test, pred))
     def plot_ROC(name, Y_test, y_pred):
         fpr, tpr, threshold = metrics.roc_curve(Y_test, y_pred)
         van_defaults(plt, x_size=3.75, y_size=3.75)
         van_labels(plt, 'False Positive Rate',
                         'True Positive Rate',
                         'Receiver Operating Characteristic')
         plt.plot(fpr,tpr) # ROC curve
         ident = [0.0, 1.0]
         plt.plot(ident,ident)
         auc = np.trapz(tpr,fpr) # compute the area using trapezoidal rule
         plt.legend([round(auc,2)], title='AUC', loc=4)
         plt.text(0.9, -0.30, 'van2021', fontsize=10)
         plt.text(0.1, 0.90 , name, fontsize=12)
         plt.show()
     def fit_predict_summarize(model, name, X_train_, Y_train_, X_test_, Y_test_):
         model.fit(X_train_, Y_train_)
         y_pred_ = model.predict(X_test_)
         summarize_model_fit(name , Y_test_, y_pred_)
         plot_ROC(name, Y_test_, y_pred_)
```

4.3 Six Standard Models and Results

- XG Boost Classifier 98%
- Logistic Regression 88%
- Gaussian Naive Bayes 69%
- K-Nearest Neighbor 98%
- Support Vector Machine 90%
- Classification and Regression Trees 96%

Note that these analyses all take similar form of fit, predict and summarize.

4.4 Use Function Dictionary to Invoke Models

```
[10]: # Note to Self: Use Dictionary as Function Dispatcher, so Pythonic!
model_dict = {
    'XG Boost Classifier' : XGBClassifier(eval_metric='logloss'),
    'Logistic Regression' : LogisticRegression(),
    'Gaussian Naive Bayes' : GaussianNB(),
    'K-Nearest-Neigbhors' : KNeighborsClassifier(),
    'Support Vector Machine' : SVC(),
    'Decision Trees' : DecisionTreeClassifier()
    }
```

4.5 Detailed Results Confusion Matrices and ROC Plots

```
[11]: for name, model in model_dict.items():
    fit_predict_summarize(model, name, X_train, Y_train, X_test, Y_test)
```

XG Boost Classifier Model Accuracy: 98.0% Confusion Matrix:





Logistic Regression Model Accuracy: Confusion Matrix:

y: 87.8%





Gaussian Naive Bayes Model Accuracy: 69.4% Confusion Matrix:

> 25 True Neg 8 False Pos 2 - 20 0 16.33% 4.08% - 15 - 10 False Neg True Pos 13 26 г 26.53% 53.06% - 5 ό i

> > 19



K-Nearest-Neighhors Model Accuracy: 98.0% Confusion Matrix:





Support Vector Machine Model Accuracy: 89.8% Confusion Matrix:





Decision Trees Model Accuracy: 95.9% Confusion Matrix:





4.5.1 References

- Original Parkinson Speech Paper
- Parkinson Data
- Parkinson Data Python
- Parkinson Voice Data
- Python Dictionary Comprehension
- Storing Function in Python Dictionary
- Hide Warnings in Python
- ROC Plots
- Numpy max for list of lists
- Adorn Histogram Text
- Add Two Lists Element-Wise
- Mac pbcopy trick
- Panda Dataframe Column Names
- Python Lists
- More Python Lists
- Pandas Dataframe Row and Column Selection
- Pandas Dataframe First Column
- Dataframe as_matrix Deprecation
- XGBoost Introduction
- K Nearest Neighbors Algorithm
- Logistic Regression
- Logistic Regression Sklearn
- K Nearst Neighbors Classifier
- Print Key Value Dictionary Pairs

4.5.2 Acknowledgements

This project extensively modifies code from a University of Maryland Research Project by: Shlok Khandelwal and Elcin Ergin, Shu Hayakawa, and Timardeep Kaur It utilizes a confusion matrix pretty printer by Dennis T

Code Repository by Shlok Khandelwal on Github