

Defining Corporate Health Classes

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$

Data Innovation Lab 29th of July 2020

Content

- 1. Project Overview
- 2. Data Understanding
- 3. Indicators of General Health
- 4. Defining Health Classes
- 5. Achievements

Project Overview



wellabe



Mobile diagnostics

Video consultation

Personalized intervention

Annual retention









The Dataset :







194

. .





Synthetic Data

- Data Privacy
- Generated from original data
- Replica of specific properties of real data



Statistical & Medical Analysis

- Medical understanding of the given features
 - blood sugar -> concentration of glucose present in the blood
- Possible ranges of features
- Known diseases

Normal	Prediabetes	T2 diabetes	Hypoglycemia
70 - 99	100 - 125	>126	<70

- Summary of the data
 -> Mean, Standard deviation
- Distributions of features
 -> Histogram, Normal probability plot
- Correlation between features
 -> Scatter plot, Pearson Correlation Coefficient



50 000 people

- 57.5 % male
- 42.5 % female

Age: 18-65 years

Data Cleaning

Outlier Detection

- Define thresholds
- Relationship between features
- Replace with NaNs



- Estimate NaNs
- Median
- Formulas
- Linear Regression



Indicators for General Health

Review Score

indicator of general health given by doctors

Biological Age

- predicted chronological age
- difference between predicted and real age indicates general health

Regression Methods

Multiple Linear Regression (MLR):

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \ldots + \beta_k x_k$$

- manual feature transformation
- good interpretability

Generalized Additive Model (GAM):

 $g(\mathbb{E}[y|X])) = \beta_0 + f_1(X_1) + f_2(X_2) + \ldots + f_M(X_N)$

- automatic feature transformation via B-splines f
- still good interpretability due to additive structure

Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS):

$$\tilde{f}(X) = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_k h_k(X)$$

- non-linear transformations via hinge functions *h* of the form max(0, *x t*) or max(0, *t x*) with *t* as threshold
- good interpretability

General Setup

Data:

- Cleaned dataset
- Dropped rows with a NaN value within one of the used features



Comparison of Methods:

- Mean Average Error (MAE) for accuracy
- Check relations to other features (indicator of general health)

Results Age Prediction

Method	Baseline	MLR	GAM
MAE	9.38	7.84	7.21

GAM Example Feature Functions:



Feature functions not always linear in normal range

Feature function of creatine



>MLR gives better health indication for some of the features

Age Difference



Age Difference = Biological Age - Chronological Age

Result:

No clear correlation between worse medical values and Age Difference -> not a meaningful indicator of general health

Comparison to Original Dataset





MAE:



> Loss of information in synthetic data

Review Score

The score given by a doctor



Motivation:

- finding features relevant for general health prediction
- additionally, giving a review score automatically

Methods & Results

Results: MAE

baseline	GAM	MARS
1.21	0.85	0.82

Selected by MARS features:

- fatty liver index (FLI)
- blood pressure
- body fat
- visceral fat
- cholesterol

- fatty liver
- hypertension
- overweight, obesity
- high blood lipids



Methodology: Preprocessing

- Feature selection
 - started from the list of features relevant for general health
 - ensured to construct a versatile set
- Estimation of missing values/outliers
- Standardization



Methodology: Clustering

- K-Means
 - roughly same size of clusters
 - \circ no medical interpretation
- Density Clustering (DBSCAN)
 - could not detect more than one cluster
 - possible reason: health is continuous => no distinct clusters
- Hierarchical Clustering
 - hierarchical structure of clusters
 - resulting clusters were most interpretable

Female Clusters

Group 1: young, low fatty liver index (FLI), low BMI, high forced expiratory volume in 1 sec;

Group 2: values in normal range;

Group 3: high body fat (low body water);

Group 4: older, high body fat, elevated blood pressure;

Group 5: high body fat, high FLI, high blood pressure.





Male Clusters

Low risk groups 20.7k (63%)

- Group 1: 3.5k (11%)
 25-35y, healthy with fit body figure and good lung functions
- Group 2: 6.4k (19%)
 30-40y, slightly high risk of fatty liver and obesity
- Group 3: 10.7k (33%)
 >40y, low risk of fatty liver, slightly higher blood pressure

Mainly received high review scores





Male clustering, t-SNE embedding

Male Clusters

High risk groups 12.2k (37%):

- Group 4: 8.2k (25%) >50y, relatively high fatty liver risk
- Group 5: 2.5k (8%)
 40-50y, very high blood lipids (fat)
- Group 6: 1.5k (4%)
 40-50y, high body fat, very high risk of fatty liver and obesity



Consult doctors Control diet and alcohol assumption More physical exercises

Male clustering, t-SNE embedding





Male Clusters



Discussions

- Interpretable groups consistent **with review scores**
 - with **synthetic data**
- Provide **medical interpretation** of each group
- Results consistent with the **high risk diseases** we wanted to detect
- Other common diseases not considered
 - Diabetes (since not fasting results)
 - Osteoporosis (since we only have bone mineral mass instead of density)



Conclusion



- Synthetic data exploration
- Medical understanding
- Outlier handling

Wrap Up

- Biological age prediction
- Review score prediction

- Hierarchical clustering
- Health classes definition

Conclusion and Value of our Work



Define health classes

- Interpretive clusters
- Individual recommendations



Synthetic health data

- Medical domain knowledge
- Limitations and potentials



Thank you for listening!