

Sample Size in Natural Language Processing within Healthcare Research

Jaya Chaturvedi^{1*}, Diana Shamsutdinova¹, Felix Zimmer^{1,3}, Sumithra Velupillai¹, Daniel Stahl¹, Robert Stewart^{1,2}, Angus Roberts¹

¹Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neurosciences, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

²South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

³Psychological Institute of the University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Objective

Sample size calculation is an essential step in most data-based disciplines. Large enough samples ensure representativeness of the population and determine the precision of estimates. This is true for most quantitative studies, including those that employ machine learning methods, such as natural language processing, where free-text is used to generate predictions and classify instances of text. Within the healthcare domain, the lack of sufficient corpora of previously collected data can be a limiting factor when determining sample sizes for new studies. This paper tries to address the issue by making recommendations on sample sizes for text classification tasks in the healthcare domain.

Materials and Methods

Models trained on the MIMIC-III database of critical care records from Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center were used to classify documents as having or not having Unspecified Essential Hypertension, the most common diagnosis code in the database. Simulations were performed using various classifiers on different sample sizes and class proportions. This was repeated for a comparatively less common diagnosis code within the database of diabetes mellitus without mention of complication.

Results

A table listing the expected performances for different classifiers under varying conditions of sample size and class proportion is presented. Smaller sample sizes resulted in better results when using a K-nearest neighbours classifier, whereas larger sample sizes provided better results with support vector machines and BERT models. Overall, a sample size larger than 1000 was sufficient to provide decent performance metrics.


Conclusion

The simulations conducted within this study provide guidelines that can be used as recommendations for selecting appropriate sample sizes and class proportions, and for predicting expected performance, when building classifiers for textual healthcare data. The methodology used here can be modified for sample size estimates calculations with other datasets.

Keywords

sample size, natural language processing, machine learning

Graphical Abstract



1. Introduction

A sample is a subset of a larger population. The aim of a good sample is for it to be representative of the larger population and provide results approximating what might be found when using the entire population [1]. Knowing whether an appropriate sample size was used is crucial to determine the value of a research project as it gives an insight into whether appropriate considerations were made to ensure the project is ethical and methodologically sound [2].

As with other types of research, appropriate sample size is essential for quantitative research, especially for the generalisability and reproducibility of the findings [3]. Most epidemiological studies focus on relationships between some exposure variables and disease outcomes [4]. In these instances, it is of importance to use a sample that is truly representative of the population of interest, in order to prevent inaccurate deductions from any statistical analyses conducted on these samples. While there are multiple factors that can result in unrepresentative samples, insufficient sample size is a particularly dangerous one. Although random samples are on average unbiased, a small sample will often fail to accurately represent the underlying population, leading to inaccurate observations regarding the relationship between predictors and outcomes. Along with sample size, it is important to use appropriate methods for ascertaining such samples, such as random sampling, in order to avoid magnifying unrepresentativeness within large samples [5]. Despite this being an important step in quantitative research, a study found that 60% of publications on such research do not provide details on sampling methods and approaches, and if they do, then it is very brief and not reproducible [3].

Different research methods demand their own niche sample size calculations. Research methods that utilize natural language processing (NLP) are no exception. NLP is a branch of artificial intelligence within computer science that combines computational linguistics with statistical and machine learning models, enabling the analysis and processing of text data [6]. NLP methods are widely used within healthcare research due to the growing volume of data available from electronic health record (EHR) databases [7]. EHRs within a single hospital could generate about 150,000 pieces of data [7], some of which may be in textual form. Text is often used for ease of capturing fine-grained details or supplemental information which don't fit into any predetermined structured fields, such as patients' medical histories, preliminary diagnoses, medications, and so on [8].

A prerequisite for a good sample size is the availability of sufficient data to represent the larger population and provide adequate precision in output. This can be quite challenging in the healthcare domain due to the scarcity of openly available healthcare datasets, and the privacy regulations surrounding the use of such data from hospitals and primary care. Data scarcity is compounded by the fact that NLP-based supervised machine learning models require large numbers of human-annotated (in the healthcare domain, ideally clinician-annotated) data as a prerequisite, which can be a limitation due to time and cost constraints [9]. Insufficient sample sizes within NLP can lead to algorithms that do not perform adequately. We reviewed 11 papers describing past NLP challenges (spanning from 2006 to 2018) [10–20] widely considered benchmarks in the field of clinical NLP. We found that while sample sizes were described for all training and test sets, a wide range of sample sizes were used (from 288 to 1243), and no justification was provided as to why any of the sample sizes were chosen. This

has been summarised in Table 1. We do not say this as criticism specific to these highly cited and regarded papers, but to illustrate that justifications of sample size are rarely given, even in the best clinical NLP studies. This further highlights the need for recommendations on sample sizes specific to this field, and the need for guidelines on what sample sizes are needed, given limited data, to build machine learning models that perform well.

Year	Challenge	Paper	Sample size mentioned	Justification provided?
2006	Deidentification & Smoking	Identifying Patient Smoking Status from Medical Discharge Records [10]	928	No
2007	Deidentification & Smoking	Evaluating the State-of-the-Art in Automatic De-identification [21]	889	No
2008	Obesity	Recognizing Obesity and Comorbidities in Sparse Data [12]	1237	No
2009	Medication	Extracting medication information from clinical text [13]	1243	No
2010	Relations	2010 i2b2/VA challenge on concepts, assertions, and relations in clinical text [14]	826	No
2011	Coreference	Evaluating the state of the art in coreference resolution for electronic medical records [11]	978	No
2012	Temporal Relations	Evaluating temporal relations in clinical text: 2012 i2b2 Challenge [16]	310	No
2014	Deidentification & Heart Disease	Practical applications for natural language processing in clinical research: The 2014 i2b2/UTHealth shared tasks [17]	600	No
2016	RDoC for Psychiatry	A natural language processing challenge for clinical records: Research Domains Criteria (RDoC) for psychiatry [18]	1000	No
2018	ADE & Medication Extraction	Advancing the state of the art in automatic extraction of adverse drug events from narratives [19]	505	No
2018	Clinical Trial Cohort Selection	New approaches to cohort selection [20]	288	No

Table 1. i2b2/n2c2 challenges - whether justification was provided for the sample sizes used

When referring to machine learning models in general and within NLP, sample size calculations can be used at different stages, such as for training, validation, and testing. Previous work has been conducted to determine sample sizes for validation [9,22] and limited research has been published on general sample sizes for NLP [23]. Sordo et al. (2005) examine the effect of sample size on the accuracy of classification with three classification methods (Naive Bayes, Decision Trees, and Support Vector Machines) using narrative reports from a hospital, classifying the smoking status of patients [23]. They conclude that there is indeed a correlation between the size of the training set and the classification rate, and models show improved performance when they are trained with bigger samples [23]. Using EHR

databases, a recent study by Liu et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of selecting a sample that is unbiased and truly representative of the population in order to ensure high quality research [24]. While the work reported here does not address issues of bias due to the methodologies used to select samples, it does aim to extend previous research and explore the impact of sample sizes as well as class proportions for a binary classification task.

A substantial proportion of clinical decision making is dependent on risk-prediction models for health outcomes, which is why the margin of error for such models should be very low and the performance of such models should be thoroughly validated [25]. Pavlou et al. (2021) investigate the sample size requirements for such validation studies on prediction models [25]. A number of suggestions have been made on the appropriate sample sizes for such validation studies. These include at least 100 events in the validation data [26], or at least 100 events and 100 non-events [27]. However, such rules of thumbs are problematic and do not take into account the model or validation setting [22]. In response to this, Riley et al. (2020) suggest sample size calculations that incorporate other measures of model performance (such as expected c-statistics and calibration slope) which allows for more tailored sample size calculations based on the models of interest [22]. The aims for planning a sample size can vary, such as whether the sample size will be sufficient to reach a particular performance metric, or to detect differences in performance measures and pre-specified values, or both. This simulation focuses on the former, where the focus is on the performance metrics for each sample size and class proportion variation, while Pavlov et al. (2021) focused on the latter [25].

While methods such as power analysis, which are based on strong assumptions, are frequently used in statistical studies (such as prediction modelling) to determine appropriate sample sizes, with the general intention being the larger the sample size the more power associated with the study [28], this approach is not transferable to NLP approaches, and has therefore been underutilised within NLP [29]. This could be because of the nature of NLP data which does not conform to the standard experiment designs that are used in other studies [29–31], as also shown in complex statistical modelling [32]. Determining sample size in NLP applications is also complicated by the common use of the pre-trained models such as BERT [33], which convert text into a numerical representation, vectorising words in an embedding. These pre-trained models are based on large text corpora such as Wikipedia, or texts with specialised vocabularies, and are readily available in NLP software packages. Using embeddings in a local NLP project translates semantic knowledge of a large corpus to the local documents being classified [34], which can alter the required sample size or the choice of an optimal classifier. The recommendations made in this paper aim to complement such measures by providing some form of a standard that can be followed when building NLP models.

The performance indicators commonly used to evaluate and compare different NLP classification algorithms are AUC-ROC, precision, recall, accuracy, and F1-scores [35]. AUC-ROC is independent of specific thresholds or cut-offs [36], whereas metrics like precision, recall and accuracy are not. Therefore, F1-score and AUC-ROC will be the metrics to compare results from the different simulated classification models in this study.

The aim of this paper is to provide guidelines and suggestions on appropriate sample sizes for training NLP-based machine learned classification models. This was achieved by

conducting straightforward simulations on an openly available healthcare dataset, utilising open-source software and widely used libraries, and building classifiers using varying sample sizes and class proportions as training data. Performances of the different models is compared and recommendations on sample sizes made based on this. The purpose is not to compare the different classifiers, but to recommend sample sizes based on their performances. Despite the simulations being straightforward, they yield valuable information. While some recommendations do exist within literature for other broader categories of research such as qualitative and quantitative research [3,4,37,38], and sample size for validation of machine learning models [9,22], predicting sample sizes using learning curve fitting [39–41], to the best of our knowledge, such a simulation has not been reported for recommending sample sizes specific to NLP application development in the healthcare domain. This is of particular importance because NLP in the healthcare domain is often conducted on small datasets. The simulations may easily be extended for other parameters and use cases, to generate further recommendations. While these simulations have been conducted on a hypertension and diabetes diagnosis, the diagnosis is not what is being researched and has been used purely as an example. The objective is to understand how sample sizes and class proportions affect performance. We are not trying to generate any new knowledge on the diagnosis used.

2. Methods

A series of simulations were conducted on free-text healthcare data from the MIMIC-III database [42]. In the simulations, we varied different features of the NLP process, such as amount of training data, type of classifier algorithm, and prevalence of each class.

2.1 Data Source

Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care (MIMIC-III) is an EHR database which was developed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and made available for researchers under a specified governance model [42]. MIMIC-III contains data on over 58,000 hospital admissions for over 45,000 patients, including about 1.2 million de-identified clinical notes, such as nursing and physician notes, discharge summaries, and ECG/radiology reports [42].

MIMIC-III was chosen for this study due to ease of access, thereby making the study reproducible. MIMIC-III is commonly used in healthcare research [43–46].

2.2 Ethics and Data Access

Access to the MIMIC-III database requires that the data be handled with care and respect as it contains detailed information about the clinical care of patients. Access was formally requested and granted through the processes documented on the MIMIC-III website¹. A course protecting human research participants, including HIPAA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) requirements was completed. A data use agreement outlining appropriate data usage and standards of security was submitted.

¹ <https://physionet.org/content/mimiciii/1.4/>

2.3 Data Selection

For the simulations, we designed a simple binary classification task to classify documents within a subset of the database as coming from patients with a particular diagnosis or not. The most common diagnosis code within the database was identified as Unspecified Essential Hypertension, NOS (HTN, ICD-9 code 4019), and made up for 37% of patients within the MIMIC database. The reason for choosing a diagnosis that was so common in the database was so we would have enough data on the cases and non-cases for that diagnosis in order to run the simulation. However, to test the transferability of this approach, a less common diagnosis code was also used, that of diabetes mellitus without mention of complication (diabetes, ICD-9 code 25000), which made up for 15% of patients within the database. These codes were extracted from the "icd9_code" diagnosis column within the "d_icd9_diagnoses" table. None of the other tables within the database contain any diagnosis information. While the admissions table mentions diagnosis, this is not coded i.e., it is mentioned within the free-text and not considered to be the final diagnosis.

The simulated task would therefore be to classify documents as coming from patients diagnosed with HTN or not, and diabetes or not.

A SQL query was run to extract diagnosis, demographics and documents from patients who had the diagnosis of ICD-9 code 4019 (i.e., HTN), along with another subset of patients who did not have the diagnosis of 4019. The initial extraction consisted of 20,000 records from each subset. This is because there were about 20,000 patients with the diagnosis of 4019, and in order to match this, the same number of patients without this diagnosis code were extracted. A random sample of 5000 was selected for each class. The demographic and document distributions were compared for both classes to ensure they were similar to each other. We assume that this similarity, and the fact that they come from the same dataset, would ensure minimal noise in the data. This process was repeated for patients with and without diagnosis of ICD-9 code 25000 (i.e., diabetes) (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Extraction Plan

The majority of the notes within the MIMIC-III database are contained within the 'note-events' table (clinical notes such as nursing and physician notes, ECG reports, radiology reports, and

discharge summaries) [42]. Clinical notes were extracted for both subsets of patients, and the distribution of document lengths calculated and compared.

A typical document within the combined dataset contains information such as dates (admission date, discharge date), history of present illness (explanation of how the patient's current illness developed and any treatment already undertaken), findings from physical examinations, reporting on various tests (scans, blood tests), any diagnosis and treatment plans.

2.4 Classifier

For the binary classification task, the diagnosis codes are considered to be the two classes, where patients with a diagnosis code of "4019" are categorised into class 1, and others without this diagnosis code as "class 0". Similarly, for diabetes, patients with a diagnosis code of "25000" are categorised into class 1, and others without this diagnosis code as "class 0". This approach for the simulation has been chosen in order to avoid the time-consuming task of manual annotation. The diagnosis codes for patients categorised as class 0 were examined to ensure this group did not contain any diagnosis similar to hypertension or diabetes (a list of all diagnosis codes for class 0 is given in appendix B). Thirteen documents within the class 0 of the HTN subset contained hypertension-related diagnosis, such as surgical complication-hypertension (3 patients), malignant hypertension (7 patients), primary pulmonary hypertension (2 patients), and portal hypertension (1 patient). These were removed from the dataset to give the final dataset that was used to run the simulations with varying features as outlined in table 2.

Before building the various classifier models, some pre-processing of the text data was undertaken using the Python NLTK (Natural Language Toolkit) library [47]. All text was converted to lowercase, any trailing whitespaces, markups such as HTML tags and punctuations/symbols were removed. Common stop words were removed. Words were lemmatised and tokenised. The Python library sklearn [48] was used for the non-BERT classifiers, and the Python Huggingface transformers library (version 4.5.0) [49] for the BERT model. The pre-trained BERT_base model was fine-tuned on the simulation data. No steps have been undertaken to balance the data when the class proportions are imbalanced (such as 99/1, 95/5, 90/10, 80/20 class proportions) as the aim was to investigate the effect of this imbalance.

Each sample was split into train/test/validation sets in the proportions of 60/20/20. The class proportions for each set followed the same prevalence as the main sample size. For example, a sample size of 600 with a 50/50 split would contain 300 documents each in both classes. This was replicated within the train, test and validation sets so the classes were evenly distributed. Distribution of words within each class in the sets were also compared to the overall sample to ensure a similar distribution was represented throughout. For the BERT model, training and validation loss were measured to ensure no overfitting of the models.

Variables	Examples
Size of sample	5000, 4000, 3000, 2000, 1000, 800, 600, 500, 400, 200

Type of classifier/algorithm	Logistic Regression (LR) [50], Naive Bayes (NB) [51], Random Forest (RF) [52], Decision Tree (DT) [52], Support Vector Classifier (SVC) [53], Linear Support Vector Classifier (LSVC) [53], Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) [54], K-Nearest Neighbour (KNN) [55], BERT (BERT_base) [33]
Prevalence of each label	99/1, 95/5, 90/10, 80/20, 70/30, 60/40, 50/50

Table 2. Features to be varied

The weighted average of F1-score (and confidence intervals) and AUC score were calculated upon varying different features within this classification task. Sample size recommendations have been made, based on the combination of features that perform best.

The queries and code have been made available on GitHub².

3. Results

3.1 Data Summary

MIMIC-III contains 46,520 patients and 58,976 admission records. HTN (ICD-9 code 4019) makes up for 37% (17,613) of all patients and 53% (24,719) of all admissions within the database. Diabetes (ICD-9 code 25000) makes up for 15% (7,370) of all patients and 24% (11,183) of all admissions within the database.

The demographic and document distributions were compared to ensure they were similar enough to each across both classes in the respective subset groups i.e., HTN and diabetes. The demographic distributions are outlined in Table 4.

Demographic	HTN cohort		Diabetes cohort	
	Class 0	Class 1	Class 0	Class 1
Gender	Male: 55% Female: 45%	Male: 59% Female: 41%	Male: 56% Female: 44%	Male: 62% Female: 38%
Age*	Mean: -61 Min: -169 Max: 221	Mean: -55 Min: -151 Max: 221	Mean: -68 Min: -179 Max: 221	Mean: -58 Min: -138 Max: 220
Ethnicity	White: 66% Unknown: 12% Black: 9% Hispanic/Latino: 4% Multi-race/Other: 4%	White: 68% Unknown: 14% Black: 9% Hispanic/Latino: 4% Multi-race/Other: 3%	White: 67% Unknown: 10% Black: 10% Hispanic/Latino: 6% Multi-race/Other: 3%	White: 60% Unknown: 17% Black: 9% Hispanic/Latino: 7% Multi-race/Other: 3%

² https://github.com/jayachaturvedi/sample_size_in_healthcare_NLP

	Asian: 5%	Asian: 2%	Asian: 4%	Asian: 4%
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Table 4. Demographic distributions for both classes in both cohorts

*Ages within MIMIC-III may be negative. For the purposes of de-identification and keeping in line with the HIPAA regulations, the database providers have shifted any dates within the database (including age) into the future by a random offset for each individual patient. This has been done in a consistent manner so that the intervals between stays and discharge are preserved. However, due to this shift, hospital stays appear to occur between the years 2100 and 2200, leading to calculated ages being negative. For patients with a date of birth over 89, their age within the database appears as being over 100 years old [42].

Some patients within class 1 contained hundreds of documents, and so have been eliminated by the application of a limit to the number of documents per patient, in order to maintain consistency. This limit was set to less than or equal to 50 documents per patient. After applying the threshold of 50 documents, the document distribution is displayed in Figures 3a for HTN and 3b for diabetes cohort.




Figure 3a. Document distribution between the two classes - Hypertension




Figure 3b. Document distribution between the two classes - Diabetes

3.2 Classifier

Effect of variations on Classifier Performance

Figure 4 shows the impact of variations in sample size and classifiers on one class proportion variation (50/50).





Figure 4. F1 for each classifier and different sample sizes at 50/50 class proportion - HTN and diabetes

A table showing the metrics for all the classifiers and sample size/class proportion variations for both the diagnosis subsets is given in Appendix A and C, with the range of AUC and F1 scores for some sample sizes and class proportions of the HTN and Diabetes subsets summarised in Table 5. The best performing classifier given in this table was based on the F1 score. AUC scores lead to a different classifier performance ranking, and can be found in Appendix A.

Range of AUC and F1 scores
(Range of AUC [classifier with highest AUC])

Range of F1 scores [classifier with highest F1 score]					
Hypertension					
Sample Size	Class Proportion				
	90/10	80/20	70/30	60/40	50/50
5000	0.63 - 0.73 [LR]	0.65 - 0.78 [LR]	0.67 - 0.76 [SVC]	0.67 - 0.82 [SVC]	0.69 - 0.83 [SVC]
	0.87 - 0.91 [LSVC]	0.76 - 0.83 [SVC]	0.67 - 0.78 [LR]	0.63 - 0.76 [SVC]	0.66 - 0.76 [SVC]
3000	0.61 - 0.74 [SVC]	0.60 - 0.75 [LR]	0.66 - 0.77 [LSVC]	0.62 - 0.75 [LSVC]	0.63 - 0.77 [SVC]
	0.85 - 0.91 [LSVC]	0.74 - 0.81 [LR]	0.66 - 0.78 [LSVC]	0.59 - 0.71 [BERT]	0.61 - 0.71 [SVC]
1000	0.50 - 0.75 [SVC]	0.54 - 0.72 [SGD]	0.53 - 0.63 [RF]	0.60 - 0.71 [SGD]	0.59 - 0.74 [LR]
	0.79 - 0.88 [BERT]	0.74 - 0.83 [SGD]	0.64 - 0.72 [SVC]	0.58 - 0.67 [SGD]	0.59 - 0.71 [NB]
500	0.43 - 0.61 [KNN]	0.59 - 0.78 [LR]	0.59 - 0.71 [NB]	0.64 - 0.73 [SVC]	0.59 - 0.77 [LR]
	0.85 - 0.94 [KNN]	0.67 - 0.86 [LSVC]	0.72 - 0.76 [LR]	0.58 - 0.71 [LR]	0.62 - 0.72 [DT]
200	0.30 - 0.63 [NB]	0.48 - 0.65 [DT]	0.31 - 0.51 [NB]	0.47 - 0.78 [SVC]	0.34 - 0.68 [SGD]
	0.85 - 0.91 [KNN]	0.58 - 0.84 [KNN]	0.55 - 0.73 [SVC]	0.40 - 0.74 [BERT]	0.35 - 0.62 [NB]
Diabetes					
5000	0.68 - 0.87 [LR]	0.72 - 0.88 [LR]	0.79 - 0.91 [SVC]	0.79 - 0.92 [SVC]	0.81 - 0.93 [SVC]
	0.86 - 0.93 [LSVC]	0.75 - 0.88 [SGD]	0.64 - 0.87 [SVC]	0.64 - 0.86 [SVC]	0.71 - 0.87 [DT]
3000	0.58 - 0.88 [LR]	0.70 - 0.85 [LR]	0.74 - 0.88 [LR]	0.76 - 0.90 [SVC]	0.76 - 0.90 [SVC]
	0.87 - 0.93 [LSVC]	0.75 - 0.87 [SGD]	0.67 - 0.84 [SVC]	0.66 - 0.84 [SVC]	0.72 - 0.83 [SGD]

1000	0.50 - 0.84 [LR]	0.50 - 0.80 [LR]	0.73 - 0.87 [RF]	0.70 - 0.84 [LR]	0.61 - 0.85 [LSVC]
	0.83 - 0.89 [SGD]	0.68 - 0.76 [KNN]	0.71 - 0.81 [KNN]	0.59 - 0.78 [SGD]	0.60 - 0.74 [LSVC]
500	0.50 - 0.79 [RF]	0.59 - 0.83 [RF]	0.52 - 0.86 [LSVC]	0.62 - 0.86 [LR]	0.67 - 0.84 [DT]
	0.72 - 0.88 [SGD]	0.75 - 0.87 [KNN]	0.50 - 0.78 [SGD]	0.62 - 0.80 [SGD]	0.64 - 0.84 [DT]
200	0.45 - 0.79 [NB]	0.50 - 0.83 [LR]	0.50 - 0.89 [RF]	0.59 - 0.84 [LR]	0.47 - 0.87 [RF]
	0.80 - 0.85 [BERT]	0.63 - 0.86 [KNN]	0.45 - 0.84 [LSVC]	0.36 - 0.69 [KNN]	0.47 - 0.75 [LSVC]

Table 5. Range of AUC and F1 scores for each sample size and class proportion

4. Discussion

The simulations conducted in this project are aimed at providing some recommendations on sample sizes that will be useful when building a classifier, based on class proportions and classifier types. As expected, classifiers built with larger sample sizes showed better performance in general. The results showed that larger sample sizes resulted in some classifiers performing better, and others with more balanced classes. For example, smaller samples (800 and below) resulted in better performance by the KNN classifier and more frequently with imbalanced class proportions such as 90/10, 80/20 and 70/30, when compared to larger samples (1000 and above) that generated better performance with the BERT model. This might be because KNN is a distance-based algorithm and is able to calculate distances within small datasets with ease [56]. KNNs are known to not perform well with large datasets due to the curse of dimensionality where the distance functions that are used within KNNs are rendered ineffective due to high dimensionality within larger datasets [57]. Apart from this, the computational costs of calculating distances between new points within the dataset is very high too [56]. For some classifiers, such as SVC and LSVC, larger samples are required in order to obtain good performance results. This is interesting because SVCs are generally not considered ideal for large datasets because they are slow to train when using large datasets that also contain large number of features and variations, making it computationally infeasible [58]. Imbalanced classes performed best most frequently with the BERT model. This could be because the model utilises transfer learning and being pre-trained on a large corpus of language, its architecture produces pre-trained context-dependent embeddings which encode aspects of general language, as shown by the fact that they have proven powerful in solving a multitude of NLP tasks, including handling imbalanced classification tasks without need for any further augmentation or manipulation [59]. Finally, although we compared a number of algorithms, our list is far from being exhaustive, and future work may include a wider range of deep learning and penalised regression models.

As the sample sizes reduce within the simulations, the confidence intervals get wider (reported in Appendix A and C), as expected. Similarly, the AUC scores are lower with the smaller

sample sizes compared to larger ones and often approach on average chance classification (AUC=0.5) i.e., it cannot separate between classes [60]. This is attributed to the accuracy of the classifier rather than the data (sample size and class proportions). Since the accuracy of a classifier is affected by sample size and class proportions, it in turn affects the AUC score.

An important consideration in creation of labelled training data in the real world is the human annotation process, and inter-annotator agreements (IAA). This work does not account for IAA scores, since we are using the diagnosis code as the label, which was potentially assigned by a single coder within the hospital and is being used as the gold standard in our work. An assessment of clinical coding within routinely collected hospital data was conducted by Dixon et al. (1998) which found that inter-coder agreement varied between different medical conditions [61]. While this work has focussed on sample sizes, and not addressed the issues of IAA, they are both important factors that might determine the performance of an NLP classifier.

Lastly, the data heterogeneity within healthcare text is a known challenge when it comes to transferability of results and determining whether the recommendations made in this paper can be applied to data from another healthcare database. Since the results obtained in this paper were from data of a critical care unit based in the United States, there will be differences in the structure and content of the textual data when compared to other sources of health data. Even within the same database, the results might vary when a classification task is conducted on another diagnosis code. However, the vocabulary used within different healthcare datasets would have some overlap due to the common terminologies used, so these results can prove to be a useful guide.

5. Conclusion

This paper provides recommendations on sample size for training data when building classification models. These recommendations are based on simulations that were conducted on the MIMIC-III dataset, using patient documents with the most common diagnosis code (HTN) as class 1 and a similar cohort of patient documents with any other diagnosis code as class 0. The sample sizes were varied incrementally from 200 to 5000 documents, and class proportions varied from a 50/50 split of classes to a 90/10 split. Different classification algorithms were used on these varying sample sizes and class proportions. This simulation was repeated with a less common diagnosis code (diabetes), as a test of the transferability of this approach. The results have been reported briefly in Table 4 and in more detail in Appendix A. The objective is to use these recommendations as guidelines when conducting similar classification tasks within the healthcare domain.

While it is not unusual for reports of clinical NLP to compare results for different parameters and algorithms with respect to specific narrow research questions, to the best of our knowledge this paper is the first to report a reproducible methodology and guidelines using open tools and data, for the purpose of guiding general decisions on sample size across a range of NLP research. The recommendations from this work could be applicable to classification tasks being conducted on other similar datasets within healthcare. One of the limitations of this work is that this was carried out on a critical care unit database which contains specific terminologies and potentially more abbreviations within their notes, which

might not be as transferable to a different kind of dataset, such as health records from other medical specialties, which might contain different styles and complexities of narrative. However, the methodology presented here can be replicated by other researchers for sample size estimations using their own datasets. An understanding of appropriate sample size will enable researchers to better judge both replicability and reproducibility of reported studies, and therefore to understand the limitations of those studies.

In future work, we intend to vary the level of classification (such as sentence or token level vs. document level). This would have to overcome the lack of availability of labelled health record data for some levels, such as tokens. We will also consider the split between train/test/validation sets within a sample, and the type of classification (such as multiclass vs. binary). We plan to run a simulation on a different dataset to test the transferability of our approach. We also plan to expand our simulation approach to investigate if such text features as size of the underlying vocabulary, number of words per document, or similarity of the descriptive words for the positive and negative classes, affect the minimum training sample size required for an NLP model. The methodology proposed here has provided guidelines and recommendations on what sample sizes and class proportions should be used for binary health record document classification. The same methodology could be used for future extensions to this work.

6. Authors' Contributions

The idea was conceived by JC, AR, DS, RS and DSham. JC conducted the simulations and drafted the manuscript. AR, RS, DS, DSham, SV, and FZ provided guidance in the design and interpretation of results. All authors commented on drafts of the manuscript and approved the final version.

7. Funding Statement

AR was part-funded by Health Data Research UK, an initiative funded by UK Research and Innovation, Department of Health and Social Care (England) and the devolved administrations, and leading medical research charities. AR's and RS's salaries were part supported by the UK Prevention Research Partnership (Violence, Health and Society; MR-VO49879/1), an initiative funded by UK Research and Innovation Councils, the Department of Health and Social Care (England) and the UK devolved administrations, and leading health research charities. DS, RS and AR are part-funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. RS is additionally part-funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration South London (NIHR ARC South London) at King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, and by the DATAMIND HDR UK Mental Health Data Hub (MRC grant MR/W014386). FZ was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF grant 188929). JC was supported by the KCL funded Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) in Data-Driven Health. DSh is funded by the King's College London Biostatistics and Health Informatics PhD studentship. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Declaration of Competing Interests

RS declares research support received in the last 3 years from Janssen, GSK and Takeda. AR declares research support received in the last 3 years from Takeda and RSM UK. The other authors have no competing interests to declare.

References

- 1 Ehrenberg ASC. Data Reduction. *Journal of Empirical Generalisations in Marketing Science* 2000;**5**:290–1. <https://www.empgens.com/article/data-reduction/> (accessed 17 May 2021).
- 2 Faber J, Fonseca LM. How sample size influences research outcomes. *Dental Press J Orthod* 2014;**19**:27–9. doi:10.1590/2176-9451.19.4.027-029.ebo
- 3 DeliCe A. The Sampling Issues in Quantitative Research. ;:18.
- 4 Cai J, Zeng D. Sample Size/Power Calculation for Case–Cohort Studies. *Biometrics* 2004;**60**:1015–24. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0006-341X.2004.00257.x>
- 5 Msaouel P. The Big Data Paradox in Clinical Practice. *Cancer Investigation* 2022;**40**:567–76. doi:10.1080/07357907.2022.2084621
- 6 What is Natural Language Processing? 2021. <https://www.ibm.com/cloud/learn/natural-language-processing> (accessed 24 Oct 2022).
- 7 Esteva A, Robicquet A, Ramsundar B, *et al.* A guide to deep learning in healthcare. *Nat Med* 2019;**25**:24–9. doi:10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z
- 8 Ehrenstein V, Kharrazi H, Lehmann H, *et al.* *Obtaining Data From Electronic Health Records*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US) 2019. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK551878/> (accessed 9 Jan 2023).
- 9 Negida A, Fahim NK, Negida Y. Sample Size Calculation Guide - Part 4: How to Calculate the Sample Size for a Diagnostic Test Accuracy Study based on Sensitivity, Specificity, and the Area Under the ROC Curve. *Adv J Emerg Med* 2019;**3**. doi:10.22114/ajem.v0i0.158
- 10 Uzuner Ö, Goldstein I, Luo Y, *et al.* Identifying Patient Smoking Status from Medical Discharge Records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2008;**15**:14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2408>
- 11 Uzuner Ö, Bodnari A, Shen S, *et al.* Evaluating the state of the art in coreference resolution for electronic medical records. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2012;**19**:786–91. <https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000784>
- 12 Uzuner Ö. Recognizing Obesity and Comorbidities in Sparse Data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2009;**16**:561–70. <https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M3115>
- 13 Uzuner Ö, Solti I, Cadag E. Extracting medication information from clinical text. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2010;**17**:514–8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jamia.2010.003947>
- 14 Uzuner Ö, South BR, Shen S, *et al.* 2010 i2b2/VA challenge on concepts, assertions, and relations in clinical text. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2011;**18**:552–6. <https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000203>
- 15 Pradhan S, Elhadad N, South BR, *et al.* Evaluating the state of the art in disorder recognition and normalization of the clinical narrative. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2015;**22**:143–54. <https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2013-002544>
- 16 Sun W, Rumshisky A, Uzuner Ö. Evaluating temporal relations in clinical text: 2012 i2b2 Challenge. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2013;**20**:806–13. <https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2013-001628>
- 17 Uzuner Ö, Stubbs A. Practical applications for natural language processing in clinical research: The 2014 i2b2/UTHealth shared tasks. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*

- 2015;**58**:S1–5.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2015.10.007>
- 18 Uzuner Ö, Stubbs A, Filannino M. A natural language processing challenge for clinical records: Research Domains Criteria (RDoC) for psychiatry. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 2017;**75**:S1–3.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2017.10.005>
 - 19 Uzuner Ö, Stubbs A, Lenert L. Advancing the state of the art in automatic extraction of adverse drug events from narratives. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2020;**27**.<https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz206>
 - 20 Stubbs A, Uzuner Ö. New approaches to cohort selection. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2019;**26**:1161–2.<https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz174>
 - 21 Uzuner Ö, Luo Y, Szolovits P. Evaluating the State-of-the-Art in Automatic De-identification. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2007;**14**:550–63.<https://doi.org/10.1197/jamia.M2444>
 - 22 Riley RD, Ensor J, Snell KIE, *et al.* Calculating the sample size required for developing a clinical prediction model. *BMJ* 2020;:m441. doi:10.1136/bmj.m441
 - 23 Sordo M, Zeng Q. On Sample Size and Classification Accuracy: A Performance Comparison. In: Oliveira JL, Maojo V, Martín-Sánchez F, *et al.*, eds. *Biological and Medical Data Analysis*. Berlin, Heidelberg: : Springer 2005. 193–201. doi:10.1007/11573067_20
 - 24 Liu L, Bustamante R, Earles A, *et al.* A strategy for validation of variables derived from large-scale electronic health record data. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* 2021;**121**:103879. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2021.103879
 - 25 Pavlou M, Qu C, Omar RZ, *et al.* Estimation of required sample size for external validation of risk models for binary outcomes. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2021;**30**:2187–206. doi:10.1177/09622802211007522
 - 26 Harrell FE, Lee KL, Mark DB. Multivariable prognostic models: issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. *Stat Med* 1996;**15**:361–87. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19960229)15:4<361::AID-SIM168>3.0.CO;2-4
 - 27 Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJC, *et al.* Substantial effective sample sizes were required for external validation studies of predictive logistic regression models. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;**58**:475–83. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.06.017
 - 28 Fitzner K, Heckinger E. Sample Size Calculation and Power Analysis: A Quick Review. *Diabetes Educ* 2010;**36**:701–7. doi:10.1177/0145721710380791
 - 29 Card D, Henderson P, Khandelwal U, *et al.* With Little Power Comes Great Responsibility. 2020.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2010.06595> (accessed 30 Aug 2022).
 - 30 Kraemer HC, Blasey C. *How Many Subjects?: Statistical Power Analysis in Research*. 1 Oliver’s Yard, 55 City Road London EC1Y 1SP: : SAGE Publications, Ltd 2016. doi:10.4135/9781483398761
 - 31 Westfall J, Kenny DA, Judd CM. Statistical power and optimal design in experiments in which samples of participants respond to samples of stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 2014;**143**:2020–45. doi:10.1037/xge0000014
 - 32 Landau S, Stahl D. Sample size and power calculations for medical studies by simulation when closed form expressions are not available. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2013;**22**:324–45. doi:10.1177/0962280212439578
 - 33 Devlin J, Chang M-W, Lee K, *et al.* BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: : Association for Computational Linguistics 2019. 4171–86. doi:10.18653/v1/N19-1423
 - 34 Ghannay S, Favre B, Estève Y, *et al.* Word Embedding Evaluation and Combination. In: *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*. Portorož, Slovenia: : European Language Resources Association (ELRA) 2016. 300–5.<https://aclanthology.org/L16-1046> (accessed 25 Nov 2022).
 - 35 Grandini M, Bagli E, Visani G. Metrics for Multi-Class Classification: an Overview. 2020.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.05756> (accessed 4 Aug 2022).

- 36 Tafvizi A, Avci B, Sundararajan M. Attributing AUC-ROC to Analyze Binary Classifier Performance. 2022.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.11781> (accessed 4 Aug 2022).
- 37 Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A framework for assessing research evidence | Advance HE. <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/quality-qualitative-evaluation-framework-assessing-research-evidence> (accessed 6 Jan 2022).
- 38 Vasileiou K, Barnett J, Thorpe S, *et al.* Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2018;**18**:148. doi:10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7
- 39 Figueroa RL, Zeng-Treitler Q, Kandula S, *et al.* Predicting sample size required for classification performance. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making* 2012;**12**:8. doi:10.1186/1472-6947-12-8
- 40 Beleites C, Neugebauer U, Bocklitz T, *et al.* Sample size planning for classification models. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 2013;**760**:25–33. doi:10.1016/j.aca.2012.11.007
- 41 Richter AN, Khoshgoftaar TM. Learning Curve Estimation with Large Imbalanced Datasets. In: *2019 18th IEEE International Conference On Machine Learning And Applications (ICMLA)*. 2019. 763–8. doi:10.1109/ICMLA.2019.00135
- 42 Johnson AEW, Pollard TJ, Shen L, *et al.* MIMIC-III, a freely accessible critical care database. *Scientific Data* 2016;**3**:160035. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.35
- 43 Mayaud L, Lai PS, Clifford GD, *et al.* Dynamic data during hypotensive episode improves mortality predictions among patients with sepsis and hypotension. *Crit Care Med* 2013;**41**:954–62. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182772adb
- 44 Lehman L wei, Saeed M, Long W, *et al.* Risk stratification of ICU patients using topic models inferred from unstructured progress notes. *AMIA . Annual Symposium proceedings / AMIA Symposium AMIA Symposium* 2012;**2012**:505–11.[/pmc/articles/PMC3540429/?report=abstract](http://pmc/articles/PMC3540429/?report=abstract)
- 45 Velupillai S, Mowery D, South BR, *et al.* Recent Advances in Clinical Natural Language Processing in Support of Semantic Analysis. *Yearb Med Inform* 2015;**24**:183–93. doi:10.15265/IY-2015-009
- 46 Abhyankar S, Demner-Fushman D, Callaghan FM, *et al.* Combining structured and unstructured data to identify a cohort of ICU patients who received dialysis. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association* 2014;**21**:801–7. doi:10.1136/amiajnl-2013-001915
- 47 Bird S, Loper E, Klein E. *Natural Language Processing with Python*. O'Reilly Media Inc. 2009.
- 48 Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, *et al.* Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2011;**12**:2825–30.<http://jmlr.org/papers/v12/pedregosa11a.html> (accessed 8 Mar 2022).
- 49 Wolf T, Debut L, Sanh V, *et al.* HuggingFace's Transformers: State-of-the-art Natural Language Processing. 2020.<http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03771> (accessed 11 Jan 2023).
- 50 Sammut C, Webb GI, editors. Logistic Regression. In: *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning*. Boston, MA: : Springer US 2010. 631–631. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-30164-8_493
- 51 Webb GI. Naïve Bayes. In: Sammut C, Webb GI, eds. *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning*. Boston, MA: : Springer US 2010. 713–4. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-30164-8_576
- 52 Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R. Boosting and Additive Trees. In: Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R, eds. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. New York, NY: : Springer 2001. 299–345. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-21606-5_10
- 53 Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R. Support Vector Machines and Flexible Discriminants. In: Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R, eds. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. New York, NY: : Springer 2001. 371–409. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-21606-5_12
- 54 Ben-David S, Shalev-Shwartz S, editors. Stochastic Gradient Descent. In: *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge: : Cambridge

- University Press 2014. 150–66. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107298019.015
- 55 Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R. Prototype Methods and Nearest-Neighbors. In: Hastie T, Friedman J, Tibshirani R, eds. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. New York, NY: : Springer 2001. 411–35. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-21606-5_13
- 56 Uddin S, Haque I, Lu H, *et al.* Comparative performance analysis of K-nearest neighbour (KNN) algorithm and its different variants for disease prediction. *Sci Rep* 2022;**12**:6256. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-10358-x
- 57 Kouiroukidis N, Evangelidis G. The Effects of Dimensionality Curse in High Dimensional kNN Search. In: *2011 15th Panhellenic Conference on Informatics*. 2011. 41–5. doi:10.1109/PCI.2011.45
- 58 HUANG S, CAI N, PACHECO PP, *et al.* Applications of Support Vector Machine (SVM) Learning in Cancer Genomics. *Cancer Genomics Proteomics* 2017;**15**:41–51. doi:10.21873/cgp.20063
- 59 Madabushi HT, Kochkina E, Castelle M. Cost-Sensitive BERT for Generalisable Sentence Classification with Imbalanced Data. 2020.<http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.11563> (accessed 15 Dec 2022).
- 60 Hajian-Tilaki K. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve Analysis for Medical Diagnostic Test Evaluation. *Caspian J Intern Med* 2013;**4**:627–35.<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3755824/> (accessed 15 Dec 2022).
- 61 Dixon J, Sanderson C, Elliott P, *et al.* Assessment of the reproducibility of clinical coding in routinely collected hospital activity data: a study in two hospitals. *Journal of Public Health* 1998;**20**:63–9. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.pubmed.a024721

Appendix A - HTN

All classifiers, sample sizes, class proportions and scores

Classifier	Sample Size	Class Proportion (class 1/ class 0)	F1-score Weighted avg. (95% CI)	AUC Score
Logistic Regression	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.33
		80/20	0.79 (0.95-0.64)	0.5
		70/30	0.65 (0.84-0.47)	0.38
		60/40	0.58 (0.77-0.39)	0.69
		50/50	0.53 (0.71-0.35)	0.66
	400	90/10	0.89 (0.98-0.79)	0.67
		80/20	0.73 (0.87-0.6)	0.65
		70/30	0.74 (0.87-0.6)	0.62
		60/40	0.61 (0.76-0.46)	0.56
		50/50	0.58 (0.7-0.46)	0.68
	500	90/10	0.93 (0.96-0.9)	0.5
		80/20	0.85 (0.93-0.76)	0.78
		70/30	0.76 (0.86-0.64)	0.66
		60/40	0.71 (0.81-0.58)	0.68

		50/50	0.69 (0.79-0.59)	0.77
	600	90/10	0.8 (0.89-0.7)	0.57
		80/20	0.81 (0.9-0.72)	0.71
		70/30	0.76 (0.86-0.65)	0.71
		60/40	0.64 (0.75-0.55)	0.68
		50/50	0.69 (0.78-0.59)	0.8
		90/10	0.92 (0.97-0.85)	0.65
	800	80/20	0.84 (0.91-0.76)	0.65
		70/30	0.77 (0.85-0.69)	0.71
		60/40	0.65 (0.73-0.57)	0.75
		50/50	0.69 (0.77-0.61)	0.72
		90/10	0.82 (0.89-0.75)	0.72
	1000	80/20	0.82 (0.89-0.74)	0.71
		70/30	0.7 (0.77-0.62)	0.62
		60/40	0.66 (0.74-0.58)	0.68
		50/50	0.67 (0.74-0.6)	0.74
		90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.83)	0.66
	2000	80/20	0.82 (0.87-0.78)	0.74

		70/30	0.76 (0.81-0.71)	0.75
		60/40	0.72 (0.78-0.67)	0.78
		50/50	0.67 (0.72-0.62)	0.74
	3000	90/10	0.91 (0.93-0.87)	0.73
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.77)	0.75
		70/30	0.77 (0.81-0.73)	0.77
		60/40	0.68 (0.73-0.63)	0.75
		50/50	0.69 (0.74-0.65)	0.76
	4000	90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.86)	0.7
		80/20	0.81 (0.84-0.77)	0.76
		70/30	0.77 (0.8-0.74)	0.79
		60/40	0.71 (0.75-0.68)	0.77
		50/50	0.7 (0.73-0.66)	0.78
	5000	90/10	0.91 (0.93-0.89)	0.73
		80/20	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.78
		70/30	0.78 (0.81-0.74)	0.74
60/40		0.75 (0.78-0.72)	0.81	

		50/50	0.73 (0.76-0.7)	0.82
Decision Tree	200	90/10	0.88 (0.98-0.74)	0.47
		80/20	0.82 (0.94-0.67)	0.65
		70/30	0.55 (0.74-0.39)	0.37
		60/40	0.45 (0.65-0.28)	0.47
		50/50	0.53 (0.69-0.35)	0.54
	400	90/10	0.89 (0.97-0.8)	0.58
		80/20	0.73 (0.84-0.62)	0.61
		70/30	0.74 (0.85-0.61)	0.64
		60/40	0.5 (0.63-0.38)	0.47
		50/50	0.49 (0.6-0.37)	0.49
	500	90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.83)	0.51
		80/20	0.72 (0.81-0.62)	0.59
		70/30	0.72 (0.81-0.6)	0.63
		60/40	0.66 (0.77-0.56)	0.64
		50/50	0.72 (0.81-0.63)	0.73
	600	90/10	0.78 (0.87-0.68)	0.49
		80/20	0.75 (0.84-0.65)	0.66

		70/30	0.77 (0.86-0.67)	0.71
		60/40	0.55 (0.64-0.45)	0.54
		50/50	0.66 (0.76-0.56)	0.67
	800	90/10	0.9 (0.95-0.84)	0.68
		80/20	0.8 (0.88-0.72)	0.62
		70/30	0.76 (0.83-0.68)	0.7
		60/40	0.63 (0.71-0.54)	0.62
		50/50	0.66 (0.73-0.58)	0.66
	1000	90/10	0.79 (0.86-0.72)	0.5
		80/20	0.76 (0.82-0.68)	0.62
		70/30	0.64 (0.72-0.56)	0.55
		60/40	0.66 (0.74-0.59)	0.64
		50/50	0.59 (0.68-0.51)	0.59
	2000	90/10	0.84 (0.88-0.8)	0.63
		80/20	0.77 (0.81-0.72)	0.67
		70/30	0.74 (0.79-0.68)	0.66
60/40		0.64 (0.69-0.59)	0.63	

	3000	50/50	0.66 (0.71-0.61)	0.67
		90/10	0.85 (0.88-0.82)	0.61
		80/20	0.74 (0.78-0.69)	0.6
		70/30	0.71 (0.75-0.67)	0.66
		60/40	0.64 (0.68-0.59)	0.62
		50/50	0.64 (0.67-0.59)	0.63
	4000	90/10	0.85 (0.87-0.82)	0.63
		80/20	0.76 (0.79-0.72)	0.64
		70/30	0.7 (0.74-0.67)	0.68
		60/40	0.67 (0.7-0.63)	0.67
		50/50	0.68 (0.71-0.65)	0.68
	5000	90/10	0.87 (0.9-0.85)	0.63
		80/20	0.78 (0.81-0.75)	0.65
		70/30	0.73 (0.76-0.69)	0.67
		60/40	0.72 (0.75-0.69)	0.71
50/50		0.69 (0.72-0.66)	0.69	
K-Nearest Neighbour	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.38
		80/20	0.84 (0.97-0.66)	0.54

		70/30	0.67 (0.84-0.51)	0.37
		60/40	0.54 (0.74-0.37)	0.62
		50/50	0.57 (0.72-0.39)	0.59
	400	90/10	0.9 (0.98-0.81)	0.53
		80/20	0.73 (0.86-0.61)	0.71
		70/30	0.68 (0.81-0.54)	0.45
		60/40	0.56 (0.67-0.44)	0.6
		50/50	0.65 (0.76-0.53)	0.65
	500	90/10	0.94 (0.96-0.91)	0.61
		80/20	0.85 (0.93-0.76)	0.76
		70/30	0.73 (0.84-0.62)	0.59
		60/40	0.66 (0.77-0.54)	0.64
		50/50	0.62 (0.73-0.51)	0.74
	600	90/10	0.82 (0.91-0.72)	0.63
		80/20	0.82 (0.9-0.73)	0.67
		70/30	0.79 (0.87-0.69)	0.73
		60/40	0.6 (0.7-0.5)	0.65
		50/50	0.69 (0.78-0.59)	0.74

	800	90/10	0.88 (0.93-0.81)	0.72
		80/20	0.82 (0.9-0.74)	0.61
		70/30	0.79 (0.87-0.71)	0.64
		60/40	0.64 (0.72-0.57)	0.74
		50/50	0.64 (0.73-0.55)	0.72
	1000	90/10	0.86 (0.92-0.79)	0.6
		80/20	0.81 (0.89-0.74)	0.64
		70/30	0.67 (0.75-0.58)	0.6
		60/40	0.59 (0.67-0.51)	0.61
		50/50	0.67 (0.74-0.6)	0.72
	2000	90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.83)	0.61
		80/20	0.82 (0.87-0.77)	0.65
		70/30	0.74 (0.79-0.68)	0.71
		60/40	0.72 (0.76-0.67)	0.78
		50/50	0.65 (0.7-0.6)	0.73
	3000	90/10	0.9 (0.93-0.87)	0.71
		80/20	0.77 (0.82-0.73)	0.69
		70/30	0.74 (0.78-0.7)	0.71

		60/40	0.68 (0.72-0.64)	0.71	
		50/50	0.66 (0.7-0.61)	0.73	
	4000	90/10	0.85 (0.88-0.82)	0.65	
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.78)	0.71	
		70/30	0.74 (0.77-0.7)	0.76	
		60/40	0.66 (0.7-0.62)	0.73	
		50/50	0.69 (0.73-0.66)	0.77	
	5000	90/10	0.9 (0.93-0.87)	0.7	
		80/20	0.81 (0.84-0.78)	0.72	
		70/30	0.76 (0.79-0.72)	0.73	
		60/40	0.71 (0.74-0.68)	0.77	
		50/50	0.7 (0.73-0.67)	0.79	
	Linear Support Vector Classifier	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.3
			80/20	0.79 (0.94-0.6)	0.48
			70/30	0.64 (0.82-0.44)	0.35
60/40			0.58 (0.78-0.4)	0.7	
50/50			0.49 (0.65-0.32)	0.66	
400		90/10	0.88 (0.98-0.77)	0.72	

		80/20	0.73 (0.86-0.57)	0.64
		70/30	0.73 (0.85-0.59)	0.62
		60/40	0.63 (0.77-0.5)	0.57
		50/50	0.58 (0.71-0.47)	0.68
	500	90/10	0.93 (0.97-0.89)	0.52
		80/20	0.86 (0.94-0.77)	0.76
		70/30	0.76 (0.87-0.65)	0.66
		60/40	0.7 (0.8-0.58)	0.69
		50/50	0.65 (0.76-0.54)	0.76
	600	90/10	0.8 (0.89-0.69)	0.57
		80/20	0.82 (0.9-0.72)	0.69
		70/30	0.76 (0.86-0.64)	0.72
		60/40	0.63 (0.72-0.52)	0.68
		50/50	0.67 (0.76-0.57)	0.8
	800	90/10	0.92 (0.97-0.86)	0.65
		80/20	0.84 (0.9-0.75)	0.64
		70/30	0.78 (0.86-0.69)	0.72
		60/40	0.66 (0.75-0.57)	0.75

		50/50	0.65 (0.73-0.57)	0.71
	1000	90/10	0.84 (0.91-0.77)	0.73
		80/20	0.82 (0.88-0.75)	0.72
		70/30	0.7 (0.77-0.62)	0.62
		60/40	0.65 (0.72-0.58)	0.68
		50/50	0.66 (0.73-0.58)	0.73
		2000	90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.83)
	80/20		0.83 (0.88-0.78)	0.74
	70/30		0.76 (0.81-0.71)	0.75
	60/40		0.73 (0.79-0.68)	0.77
	50/50		0.66 (0.71-0.61)	0.73
	3000	90/10	0.91 (0.94-0.88)	0.72
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.77)	0.74
		70/30	0.78 (0.81-0.74)	0.77
		60/40	0.68 (0.72-0.64)	0.75
		50/50	0.69 (0.73-0.65)	0.76
	4000	90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.86)	0.7

		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.77)	0.75
		70/30	0.78 (0.81-0.74)	0.78
		60/40	0.71 (0.75-0.67)	0.77
		50/50	0.69 (0.73-0.66)	0.78
	5000	90/10	0.91 (0.93-0.89)	0.72
		80/20	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.77
		70/30	0.77 (0.8-0.74)	0.74
		60/40	0.74 (0.77-0.71)	0.81
		50/50	0.73 (0.76-0.69)	0.81
Naive Bayes	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.63
		80/20	0.72 (0.91-0.52)	0.51
		70/30	0.73 (0.91-0.56)	0.51
		60/40	0.61 (0.79-0.41)	0.76
		50/50	0.62 (0.78-0.47)	0.6
	400	90/10	0.88 (0.95-0.77)	0.72
		80/20	0.73 (0.85-0.6)	0.54
		70/30	0.73 (0.86-0.58)	0.73
		60/40	0.62 (0.76-0.46)	0.54

		50/50	0.65 (0.76-0.52)	0.69
	500	90/10	0.94 (0.97-0.9)	0.6
		80/20	0.74 (0.84-0.62)	0.73
		70/30	0.73 (0.85-0.6)	0.71
		60/40	0.67 (0.8-0.54)	0.72
		50/50	0.68 (0.78-0.57)	0.75
		90/10	0.8 (0.9-0.71)	0.52
	600	80/20	0.69 (0.8-0.57)	0.68
		70/30	0.72 (0.83-0.61)	0.69
		60/40	0.62 (0.74-0.51)	0.67
		50/50	0.64 (0.75-0.55)	0.77
		90/10	0.86 (0.93-0.79)	0.66
	800	80/20	0.81 (0.89-0.72)	0.7
		70/30	0.77 (0.85-0.67)	0.7
		60/40	0.62 (0.72-0.52)	0.76
		50/50	0.72 (0.8-0.64)	0.74
		90/10	0.83 (0.9-0.75)	0.74
	1000	80/20	0.77 (0.85-0.69)	0.64

		70/30	0.71 (0.79-0.62)	0.61
		60/40	0.59 (0.68-0.5)	0.67
		50/50	0.71 (0.77-0.63)	0.72
	2000	90/10	0.85 (0.9-0.8)	0.69
		80/20	0.79 (0.85-0.74)	0.75
		70/30	0.76 (0.81-0.7)	0.74
		60/40	0.7 (0.76-0.63)	0.75
		50/50	0.62 (0.68-0.57)	0.71
	3000	90/10	0.86 (0.9-0.82)	0.7
		80/20	0.78 (0.82-0.73)	0.69
		70/30	0.72 (0.77-0.67)	0.71
		60/40	0.64 (0.69-0.58)	0.73
		50/50	0.63 (0.68-0.59)	0.71
	4000	90/10	0.84 (0.88-0.81)	0.67
		80/20	0.8 (0.85-0.76)	0.74
70/30		0.73 (0.77-0.69)	0.74	
60/40		0.62 (0.66-0.57)	0.71	
50/50		0.66 (0.7-0.62)	0.74	

	5000	90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.86)	0.67
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.78)	0.7
		70/30	0.75 (0.78-0.71)	0.74
		60/40	0.72 (0.76-0.69)	0.78
		50/50	0.69 (0.73-0.66)	0.78
Random Forest	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.6
		80/20	0.73 (0.91-0.56)	0.5
		70/30	0.71 (0.89-0.54)	0.31
		60/40	0.4 (0.61-0.2)	0.71
		50/50	0.35 (0.55-0.16)	0.57
	400	90/10	0.89 (0.98-0.79)	0.68
		80/20	0.73 (0.85-0.58)	0.61
		70/30	0.67 (0.79-0.53)	0.58
		60/40	0.56 (0.72-0.4)	0.56
		50/50	0.65 (0.77-0.51)	0.68
	500	90/10	0.93 (0.96-0.9)	0.43
		80/20	0.71 (0.82-0.58)	0.68
		70/30	0.71 (0.83-0.6)	0.65

		60/40	0.58 (0.72-0.46)	0.7
		50/50	0.63 (0.73-0.52)	0.72
	600	90/10	0.8 (0.89-0.7)	0.66
		80/20	0.69 (0.79-0.57)	0.71
		70/30	0.62 (0.75-0.5)	0.76
		60/40	0.57 (0.7-0.44)	0.64
		50/50	0.64 (0.74-0.53)	0.74
	800	90/10	0.86 (0.93-0.79)	0.69
		80/20	0.8 (0.88-0.7)	0.61
		70/30	0.71 (0.8-0.61)	0.69
		60/40	0.58 (0.68-0.47)	0.76
		50/50	0.7 (0.78-0.62)	0.76
	1000	90/10	0.83 (0.89-0.75)	0.68
		80/20	0.74 (0.82-0.66)	0.61
		70/30	0.66 (0.75-0.56)	0.63
		60/40	0.58 (0.67-0.48)	0.63
		50/50	0.68 (0.76-0.61)	0.7
	2000	90/10	0.84 (0.89-0.8)	0.65

		80/20	0.73 (0.79-0.67)	0.71
		70/30	0.72 (0.78-0.66)	0.72
		60/40	0.64 (0.7-0.58)	0.74
		50/50	0.61 (0.67-0.56)	0.71
	3000	90/10	0.86 (0.9-0.82)	0.71
		80/20	0.75 (0.79-0.7)	0.64
		70/30	0.66 (0.72-0.6)	0.71
		60/40	0.59 (0.64-0.54)	0.7
		50/50	0.61 (0.66-0.56)	0.67
	4000	90/10	0.84 (0.87-0.81)	0.68
		80/20	0.73 (0.77-0.69)	0.72
		70/30	0.65 (0.69-0.6)	0.7
		60/40	0.55 (0.6-0.5)	0.68
		50/50	0.64 (0.68-0.61)	0.7
	5000	90/10	0.87 (0.9-0.84)	0.72
		80/20	0.76 (0.8-0.72)	0.67
		70/30	0.67 (0.71-0.63)	0.71
		60/40	0.63 (0.67-0.59)	0.75

		50/50	0.66 (0.69-0.63)	0.75
Stochastic Gradient Descent	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.38
		80/20	0.79 (0.93-0.6)	0.52
		70/30	0.65 (0.81-0.47)	0.44
		60/40	0.62 (0.78-0.43)	0.69
		50/50	0.59 (0.74-0.42)	0.68
	400	90/10	0.87 (0.96-0.76)	0.7
		80/20	0.73 (0.86-0.59)	0.62
		70/30	0.73 (0.84-0.61)	0.64
		60/40	0.64 (0.77-0.52)	0.59
		50/50	0.62 (0.75-0.5)	0.66
	500	90/10	0.92 (0.95-0.88)	0.45
		80/20	0.83 (0.91-0.74)	0.71
		70/30	0.72 (0.82-0.62)	0.65
		60/40	0.67 (0.77-0.56)	0.69
		50/50	0.64 (0.75-0.52)	0.76
	600	90/10	0.8 (0.89-0.71)	0.58
		80/20	0.84 (0.92-0.74)	0.65

		70/30	0.74 (0.83-0.65)	0.72
		60/40	0.64 (0.74-0.53)	0.66
		50/50	0.64 (0.73-0.54)	0.76
	800	90/10	0.9 (0.96-0.84)	0.68
		80/20	0.8 (0.88-0.72)	0.63
		70/30	0.76 (0.84-0.68)	0.71
		60/40	0.65 (0.72-0.57)	0.72
		50/50	0.58 (0.67-0.5)	0.65
	1000	90/10	0.83 (0.9-0.76)	0.69
		80/20	0.83 (0.89-0.75)	0.72
		70/30	0.67 (0.75-0.59)	0.61
		60/40	0.67 (0.74-0.59)	0.71
		50/50	0.65 (0.72-0.58)	0.7
	2000	90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.83)	0.64
		80/20	0.83 (0.88-0.78)	0.74
		70/30	0.76 (0.81-0.72)	0.74
60/40		0.72 (0.77-0.67)	0.75	

	3000	50/50	0.64 (0.69-0.59)	0.7
		90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.85)	0.7
		80/20	0.8 (0.85-0.77)	0.74
		70/30	0.77 (0.81-0.73)	0.76
		60/40	0.68 (0.72-0.64)	0.73
		50/50	0.66 (0.7-0.62)	0.74
	4000	90/10	0.88 (0.91-0.85)	0.7
		80/20	0.79 (0.82-0.75)	0.73
		70/30	0.76 (0.79-0.72)	0.77
		60/40	0.7 (0.74-0.67)	0.76
		50/50	0.69 (0.72-0.66)	0.77
	5000	90/10	0.9 (0.92-0.87)	0.72
		80/20	0.82 (0.84-0.79)	0.76
		70/30	0.75 (0.78-0.72)	0.72
		60/40	0.74 (0.76-0.71)	0.8
50/50		0.72 (0.75-0.69)	0.81	
Support Vector Classifier	200	90/10	0.91 (1-0.77)	0.43
		80/20	0.73 (0.91-0.52)	0.49

		70/30	0.73 (0.91-0.56)	0.35
		60/40	0.56 (0.76-0.36)	0.78
		50/50	0.48 (0.68-0.3)	0.34
	400	90/10	0.89 (0.98-0.79)	0.78
		80/20	0.73 (0.86-0.58)	0.59
		70/30	0.73 (0.86-0.6)	0.67
		60/40	0.64 (0.79-0.47)	0.58
		50/50	0.65 (0.77-0.52)	0.69
	500	90/10	0.93 (0.96-0.9)	0.51
		80/20	0.79 (0.89-0.67)	0.75
		70/30	0.75 (0.86-0.63)	0.68
		60/40	0.69 (0.8-0.57)	0.73
		50/50	0.67 (0.77-0.56)	0.76
	600	90/10	0.8 (0.89-0.7)	0.57
		80/20	0.81 (0.9-0.69)	0.7
70/30		0.76 (0.86-0.67)	0.73	
60/40		0.63 (0.74-0.51)	0.67	
50/50		0.63 (0.72-0.53)	0.78	

	800	90/10	0.88 (0.94-0.81)	0.67
		80/20	0.83 (0.9-0.74)	0.66
		70/30	0.77 (0.85-0.67)	0.71
		60/40	0.64 (0.73-0.55)	0.78
		50/50	0.72 (0.79-0.64)	0.76
	1000	90/10	0.83 (0.9-0.76)	0.75
		80/20	0.79 (0.87-0.71)	0.71
		70/30	0.72 (0.8-0.64)	0.6
		60/40	0.59 (0.69-0.49)	0.66
		50/50	0.68 (0.75-0.6)	0.73
	2000	90/10	0.87 (0.92-0.82)	0.7
		80/20	0.82 (0.87-0.77)	0.77
		70/30	0.78 (0.83-0.72)	0.76
		60/40	0.7 (0.75-0.64)	0.77
		50/50	0.66 (0.71-0.6)	0.74
	3000	90/10	0.9 (0.93-0.86)	0.74
		80/20	0.79 (0.84-0.74)	0.74

		70/30	0.77 (0.81-0.72)	0.77	
		60/40	0.69 (0.73-0.64)	0.75	
		50/50	0.71 (0.76-0.67)	0.77	
	4000	90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.86)	0.69	
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.77)	0.75	
		70/30	0.78 (0.81-0.74)	0.77	
		60/40	0.68 (0.71-0.64)	0.78	
		50/50	0.7 (0.74-0.67)	0.78	
	5000	90/10	0.91 (0.93-0.88)	0.72	
		80/20	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.78	
		70/30	0.77 (0.81-0.74)	0.76	
		60/40	0.76 (0.8-0.73)	0.82	
		50/50	0.76 (0.79-0.73)	0.83	
	BERT	200	90/10	0.86 (0.71-0.96)	0.50
			80/20	0.59 (0.42-0.75)	0.50
70/30			0.55 (0.39-0.75)	0.50	
60/40			0.81 (0.67-0.95)	0.77	
50/50			0.53 (0.36-0.68)	0.53	

	400	90/10	0.8 (0.68-0.89)	0.50
		80/20	0.66 (0.53-0.8)	0.50
		70/30	0.53 (0.4-0.68)	0.50
		60/40	0.63 (0.51-0.74)	0.63
		50/50	0.65 (0.54-0.76)	0.68
	500	90/10	0.85 (0.77-0.93)	0.50
		80/20	0.75 (0.65-0.85)	0.60
		70/30	0.71 (0.61-0.81)	0.61
		60/40	0.64 (0.54-0.73)	0.65
		50/50	0.58 (0.48-0.66)	0.59
	600	90/10	0.84 (0.75-0.91)	0.50
		80/20	0.69 (0.58-0.79)	0.50
		70/30	0.62 (0.51-0.73)	0.56
		60/40	0.64 (0.55-0.72)	0.63
		50/50	0.62 (0.53-0.71)	0.62
	800	90/10	0.84 (0.77-0.91)	0.53
		80/20	0.75 (0.66-0.83)	0.62

		70/30	0.69 (0.6-0.78)	0.61
		60/40	0.59 (0.49-0.68)	0.59
		50/50	0.67 (0.59-0.74)	0.66
	1000	90/10	0.86 (0.8-0.91)	0.50
		80/20	0.74 (0.67-0.82)	0.50
		70/30	0.71 (0.64-0.77)	0.60
		60/40	0.61 (0.54-0.68)	0.58
		50/50	0.64 (0.58-0.71)	0.65
	2000	90/10	0.9 (0.86-0.93)	0.61
		80/20	0.8 (0.76-0.84)	0.65
		70/30	0.72 (0.66-0.77)	0.64
		60/40	0.67 (0.63-0.72)	0.65
		50/50	0.63 (0.58-0.68)	0.63
	3000	90/10	0.91 (0.88-0.94)	0.66
		80/20	0.8 (0.76-0.83)	0.62
		70/30	0.75 (0.71-0.79)	0.67
60/40		0.67 (0.63-0.71)	0.66	

		50/50	0.69 (0.65-0.73)	0.69
	4000	90/10	0.91 (0.88-0.93)	0.62
		80/20	0.84 (0.81-0.87)	0.66
		70/30	0.77 (0.74-0.8)	0.68
		60/40	0.7 (0.67-0.74)	0.67
		50/50	0.7 (0.67-0.73)	0.70
		90/10	0.91 (0.89-0.93)	0.64
	5000	80/20	0.83 (0.8-0.85)	0.66
		70/30	0.75 (0.72-0.77)	0.68
		60/40	0.69 (0.66-0.72)	0.67
		50/50	0.71 (0.68-0.73)	0.71

Appendix B

Diagnosis codes within the Non-HTN group - delete: 2,127 words

HTN class includes ICD10 code 4019 i.e. Unspecified essential hypertension

Non-HTN class does not include any ICD10 codes beginning with 401x. The diagnoses included within this class are:

Shigella boydii	Pneumonia, organism NOS	Malignant neo colon NEC
Malign neopl prostate	Chr airway obstruct NEC	TB of limb bones-unspec
Cutaneous mycobacteria	Viral encephalitis NOS	TB limb bones-no exam
Strep sore throat	Postinflam pulm fibrosis	TB of bone NEC-unspec
Septicemia NOS	Erythema infectiosum	Malig neo pancreas NEC
Pneumococcus infect NOS	Hydronephrosis	TB of ureter-exam unkn
Subarachnoid hemorrhage	Trachoma NOS	TB of ureter-micro dx
Intracerebral hemorrhage	Early syph latent relaps	TB of ureter-histo dx
Subac scleros panenceph	TB lung infiltr-micro dx	Mal neo bronch/lung NEC
Bronchopneumonia org NOS	Malig neo tongue NOS	Malign neopl breast NEC
Sec malig neo lg bowel	TB of knee-unspec	Malig neo corpus uteri
Second malig neo liver	Benign neo skin leg	Malign neopl ovary
Sec malig neo urin NEC	Intramural leiomyoma	Malig neo bladder NEC
Sec mal neo brain/spine	Unc behav neo GI NEC	Mal neo parietal lobe
Secondary malig neo bone	Polycythemia vera	Mal neo cereb ventricle
Malignant neoplasm NOS	Hypothyroidism NOS	Malig neo brain NOS
Benign neoplasm lg bowel	Pancreatic disorder NEC	Mal neo lymph-head/neck
Ben neo liver/bile ducts	Neurohypophysis dis NEC	Mal neo lymph intra-abd
Benign neoplasm heart	Adrenal disorder NOS	Secondary malig neo lung
Benign neo skin eyelid	Testicular hypofunc NEC	Sec mal neo mediastinum
Pure hypercholesterolem	Protein-cal malnutr NOS	Second malig neo pleura
Pure hyperglyceridemia	Anemia NOS	Sec malig neo sm bowel
Hyperlipidemia NEC/NOS	Thrombocytopenia NOS	Neuropathy in diabetes
Lipoid metabol dis NOS	Wbc disease NEC	Glaucoma NOS

Gout NOS	Delirium d/t other cond	E coli septicemia
Hyperosmolality	Transient mental dis NOS	Hearing loss NOS
Hyposmolality	Mental disor NEC oth dis	Mitral insuf/aort stenosis
Acidosis	Bipolar I current NOS	Mitral/aortic val insuff
Alkalosis	Obsessive-compulsive dis	Mitr/aortic mult involv
Hyperpotassemia	Dysthymic disorder	Tricuspid valve disease
Hypopotassemia	Nonpsychotic disord NOS	Mth sus Stph aur els/NOS
Chr blood loss anemia	Tobacco use disorder	Angina pectoris NEC/NOS
Iron defic anemia NOS	Bacterial meningitis NOS	Chr ischemic hrt dis NEC
B12 defic anemia NEC	Obstructiv hydrocephalus	Chr pulmon heart dis NEC
Ac posthemorrhag anemia	Paralysis agitans	Periapical abscess
Helicobacter pylori	Grand mal status	Sialoadenitis
Pericardial disease NOS	Compression of brain	Achalasia & cardiospasm
Mitral valve disorder	Trigeminal neuralgia	Esophageal stricture
Aortic valve disorder	Rupt abd aortic aneurysm	Mallory-weiss syndrome
Prim cardiomyopathy NEC	Abdom aortic aneurysm	Acq pyloric stenosis
Atriovent block complete	Thracabd anurysm wo rupt	Hernia, site NEC w obstr
Parox atrial tachycardia	Periph vascular dis NOS	Umbilical hernia
Parox ventric tachycard	Orthostatic hypotension	Diaphragmatic hernia
Cardiac arrest	Hypotension NOS	Reg enterit sm/lg intest
CHF NOS	Acute uri NOS	Ulceratve colitis unspcf
Cardiomegaly	Acute bronchitis	Allrgic gastro & colitis
Heart disease NOS	Chronic sinusitis NOS	Noninf gastroenterit NEC
Subdural hemorrhage	Vocal cord/larynx polyp	Rubella encephalitis
Intracranial hemorr NOS	Emphysema NEC	Peritoneal adhesions
Trans cereb ischemia NOS	Food/vomit pneumonitis	Rectal prolapse
Nonrupt cerebral aneurysm	Pleural effusion NOS	Alcohol cirrhosis liver
Cerebrovasc disease NEC	Iatrogenic pneumothorax	Cirrhosis of liver NOS
Ruptur thoracic aneurysm	Abscess of lung	Chronic liver dis NEC

Thoracic aortic aneurysm	Pulmonary collapse	Hepatitis NOS
Blood in stool	Acute lung edema NOS	Cholangitis
Gastrointest hemorr NOS	Cervicalgia	Dis of biliary tract NEC
Human herpesvr encph NEC	Sciatica	Chronic pancreatitis
Ac kidney fail, tubr necr	Backache NOS	Pancreat cyst/pseudocyst
Acute kidney failure NOS	Other back symptoms	Hematemesis
End stage renal disease	Myalgia and myositis NOS	Patent ductus arteriosus
Chronic kidney dis NOS	Brain anomaly NEC	Intestinal anomaly NEC
Yatapoxvirus infectn NOS	Accessory auricle	Bladder exstrophy
Tanapox	Tetralogy of fallot	Down's syndrome
Stricture of ureter	Ventricular sept defect	Gonadal dysgenesis
Renal & ureteral dis NOS	Secundum atrial sept def	Hamartoses NEC
Urin tract infection NOS	Septal closure anom NEC	Congenital anomaly NOS
Noninfl dis ova/adnx NEC	Cong tricuspid atres/sten	Abn plac NEC/NOS aff NB
Excessive menstruation	Cong aorta valv insuffic	Oth umbil cord compress
Cellulitis of foot	NB integument cond NEC	Exceptionally large baby
Pilonidal cyst w/o absc	Syncope and collapse	Heavy-for-date infan NEC
Diaper or napkin rash	Headache	Fetal distrs dur lab/del
Lupus erythematosus	Aphasia	NB transitory tachypnea
Other psoriasis	Epistaxis	NB cutaneous hemorrhage
Hpt C acute wo hpat coma	Tachycardia NOS	NB hemolyt dis-abo isoim
Chrnc hpt C wo hpat coma	Cardiac murmurs NEC	Neonat jaund preterm del
Hpt C w/o hepat coma NOS	Resp sys/chest symp NEC	Fetal/neonatal jaund NOS
Skin disorders NEC	Oliguria & anuria	Infant diabet mother syn
Sicca syndrome	Abn blood chemistry NEC	Neonatal dehydration
Rheumatoid arthritis	Abn find-stool contents	Neonatal hypoglycemia
Cerv spondyl w myelopath	Debility NOS	Perinatal intest perfor
Acute syphil meningitis	Fx malar/maxillary-close	NB hypothermia NEC
Contusion of chest wall	Fx malar/maxillary-open	Congenital hydrocele

Foreign body esophagus	Fx orbital floor-closed	Ch myl leuk wo achv rmsn
Injury femoral nerve	Fx orbital floor-open	Hemangioma skin
Pois-arom analgesics NEC	Fx facial bone NEC-close	Hemangioma NEC
Pois-anticonvul NEC/NOS	Fx lumbar vertebra-close	Myelodysplastic synd NOS
Pois-benzodiazepine tran	Fracture of sternum-clos	Tox dif goiter no crisis
Toxic eff ethyl alcohol	Fracture acetabulum-clos	DMII wo cmp nt st uncntr
Oth VD chlm trch unsp st	Traum pneumothorax-close	DMI wo cmp nt st uncntrl
Surg compl-heart	Traum pneumothorax-open	DMII wo cmp uncntrld
Accidental op laceration	Lac eyelid inv lacrm pas	DMII keto nt st uncntrld
Vasc comp med care NEC	Open wound of scalp	DMI keto nt st uncntrld
Second malig neo genital	Open wound of chest	DMII ketoacd uncontrold
Hdgk dis unsp xtrndl org	Open wound hand w tendon	DMI ketoacd uncontrold
Mycs fng unsp xtrndl org	Amputation finger	DMII renl nt st uncntrld
Mult mye w/o achv rmson	Abrasion head	DMII neuro nt st uncntrl
Cardiac dysrhythmias NEC	Abrasion forearm	DMII oth nt st uncntrld
Diastolc hrt failure NOS	Ulcer of heel & midfoot	DMI oth nt st uncntrld
Chr diastolic hrt fail	Osteoarthros NOS-unspec	Acute gouty arthropathy
Ill-defined hrt dis NEC	Joint symptom NEC-pelvis	Dehydration
Ocl crtd art wo infrct	Necrotizing fasciitis	Obesity NOS
Ocl mlt bi art wo infrct	Rhabdomyolysis	Morbid obesity
Crbl emblsm w infrct	Osteoporosis NOS	Anemia in neoplastic dis
Crbl art ocl NOS w infrc	Malunion of fracture	Alcohol withdrawal
Late eff CV dis-aphasia	Bone & cartilage dis NOS	Dementia w/o behav dist
Late ef-spch/lang df NEC	Forearm deformity NOS	Paranoid schizo-unspec
Late ef-hemiplga side NOS	Kyphosis NOS	Schizoaffective dis NOS
Late effect CV dis NEC	Thoracogenic scoliosis	Schizoafftv dis-chr/exac
Dsct of thoracic aorta	Spin bif w hydrceph-cerv	Schizophrenia NOS-unspec
Upper extremity embolism	Spec lacrimal pass anom	Bipol I currnt manic NOS
Bleed esoph var oth dis	Ex ear anm NEC-impr hear	Anxiety state NOS

Iatrogenic hypotension NEC	Ostium primum defect	Conversion disorder
Obs chr bronc w(ac) exac	Cong pulmon valve stenosis	Borderline personality
Ext asthma w status asth	Cong heart anomaly NEC	Ac alcohol intox-contin
Chronic obst asthma NOS	Great vein anomaly NEC	Alcohol dep NEC/NOS-unspec
Asthma NOS	Cerebrovascular anomaly	Alcohol dep NEC/NOS-contin
Asthma NOS w (ac) exac	Spinal vessel anomaly	Opioid dependence-unspec
Acute respiratory failure	Biliary & liver anomaly NEC	Opioid dependence-contin
Other pulmonary insuff	Hypospadias	Drug depend NOS-unspec
Acute & chronic resp fail	Obst def ren plv&urt NEC	Alcohol abuse-unspec
Tracheostomy - mech comp	Congenital anomaly abdominal wall NEC	Alcohol abuse-continuous
Other esophagitis	Congenital skin pigment anomaly	Cocaine abuse-unspec
Ulcer esophagus w/o bleed	Nox sub NEC aff NB/fetus	Amphetamine abuse-unspec
Esophageal reflux	Lt-for-dates 1750-1999g	Drug abuse NEC-unspec
Barrett's esophagus	Lt-for-dates 2000-2499g	Attention deficit w hyperact
Chronic stomach ulcer w hem	Preterm NEC 1750-1999g	Obstructive sleep apnea
Stomach ulcer NOS	Preterm NEC 2000-2499g	Dementia w Lewy bodies
Chronic duodenal ulcer w hem	Preterm NEC 2500+g	Amyotrophic sclerosis
Duodenal ulcer NOS	33-34 completed weeks gestation	Psychomotor epilepsy w/o int epi
Chronic marginal ulcer w perf	35-36 completed weeks gestation	Partial epilepsy w/o int epi
Other superficial gastritis w hmrhg	37+ completed weeks gestation	Epilepsy NOS w/o int epi
Gastritis/duodenitis NOS w/o hmrhg	Injuries to scalp NEC	Other migraine w no ntrc mgrn
Gastritis/duodenitis NOS w hmrhg	Primary apnea of newborn	Migraine unsp w no ntrc mgrn
Duodenitis w/o hmrhg	Cyanotic attack, newborn	Rheumatic heart failure
Gastrointestinal disorder NEC	Respiratory failure of newborn	Hypertensive kidney NOS w cr kid I-IV
Intestinal obstruction NEC	Respiratory problem after birth NEC	Hypertensive kidney NOS w cr kid V
Diverticulitis of colon w/o hmrhg	Bacteremia of newborn	AMI anterior wall, initial
Diverticulitis of colon w hmrhg	Neonatal tachycardia	AMI inferolateral, initial
Constipation NOS	Meconium staining	AMI inferoposterior, initial
Peritonitis (acute) gen	Perinatal condition NEC	AMI inferior wall, initial

Peritonitis NEC	Other alter consciousness	True post infarct, init
Ulceration of intestine	Convulsions NEC	Subendo infarct, initial
Perforation of intestine	Sleep apnea NOS	Subendo infarct, subseq
Angio intes w hmrhg	Cardiogenic shock	AMI NEC, initial
Cholelith w ac cholecyst	Septic shock	AMI NOS, initial
Cholelithiasis NOS	Shock w/o trauma NEC	AMI NOS, subsequent
Gall&bil cal w/oth w obs	Chest pain NOS	Cor ath unsp vs l ntv/gft
Nephritis NOS in oth dis	Nausea with vomiting	Crnry athr scl natve vs sl
Ac pyelonephritis NOS	Diarrhea	Crn ath atlg vn bps grft
Neurogenic bladder NOS	Retention urine NOS	Cor ath artry bypas grft
BPH w/o urinary obs/LUTS	Urinary frequency	Aneurysm coronary vessel
Legal abort w hemorr-inc	Drop, hematocrit, precip	Atrioven block-mobitz ii
Mild/NOS preeclamp-p/p	Abnrml coagulation prfile	Conduction disorder NEC
Anemia-delivered w p/p	Hypoxemia	Atrial fibrillation
CV dis NEC-antepartum	Cl skl vlt fx/cerebr lac	Atrial flutter
Postpa hem NEC-del w p/p	Cl skl base fx/cereb lac	Ventricular fibrillation
P/p coag def-del w p/p	Cl skl base fx/menin hem	Sinoatrial node dysfunct
Peripartum card-postpart	Cl skul base fx w/o coma	Abn react-anastom/graft
Brain lacer NEC w/o coma	Cl skl fx NEC/mening hem	Abn reac-organ rem NEC
Subarach hem-brief coma	Cl skul fx NEC-deep coma	Abn react-surg proc NEC
Subarach hem-deep coma	Cl skl w oth fx-coma NOS	Abn react-cardiac cath
Subarach hem-coma NOS	Fx c2 vertebra-closed	Abn react-radiotherapy
Traumatic subdural hem	Fx mult cervical vert-cl	Abn react-procedure NOS
Subdural hem w/o coma	C5-c7 fx-cl/ant cord syn	Fall on stair/step NEC
Traumatic brain hem NEC	Fracture three ribs-clos	Fall from ladder
Brain hem NEC-coma NOS	Fracture seven ribs-clos	Diving accident
Heart contusion-closed	Fx tibia NOS-closed	Fall-1 level to oth NEC
Lung contusion-closed	Fx tibia w fibula NOS-cl	Fall from slipping NEC
Duodenum injury-closed	Disloc 2nd cerv vert-cl	Fall NOS

Sigmoid colon inj-closed	Sprain of ankle NOS	Resp obstr-food inhal
Liver hematoma/contusion	Brain laceration NEC	FB entering oth orifice
Liver lacerat unspcf cls	Comp-oth vasc dev/graft	Struck by falling object
Liver injury NEC-closed	Hemorrhage complic proc	Woodworking machine acc
Spleen injury NOS-closed	Hematoma complic proc	Machinery accident NEC
Spleen hematoma-closed	Other postop infection	Acc-cutting instrum NEC
Spleen disruption-clos	Non-healing surgcl wound	Hunting rifle accident
Spleen injury NEC-closed	Oth spcf cmplc procd NEC	Adv eff cephalosporin
Open wound of forehead	Mv collision NOS-driver	Adv eff antineoplastic
Open wound of jaw	Mv collision NOS-pasngr	Adv eff opiates
Open wound of face NEC	Mv-oth veh coll-driver	Adv eff analgesic NOS
Poisoning-opiates NEC	Mv coll w ped-ped cycl	Adv eff sedat/hypnot NEC
Pois-propionic acid derv	Mv coll w pedest-pedest	Adv eff coronary vasodil
Severe sepsis	Loss control mv acc-driv	Poison-analgesics
SIRS-noninf w/o ac or ds	Loss control mv acc-psgr	Poison-drug/medicin NEC
Malfunc prosth hrt valve	Traffic acc NOS-driver	Poison-solid/liquid NEC
Periprosthetic osteolysis	Ped cycl acc-ped cyclist	Unarmed fight or brawl
React-int pros devic NEC	Accid in recreation area	Assault-cutting instr
Comp-heart valve prosth	Acc poisn-benzdiaz tranq	Assault-striking w obj
Comp-oth cardiac device	Abn react-artif implant	Assault NOS
Undeter pois-sol/liq NEC	Prsnl hst colonic polyps	Undeterm pois-analgesics
Need prphyl vc vrl hepat	Prsnl hst ot spf dgst ds	Undeterm pois-psychotrop
Asymp hiv infectn status	Trnspl status-pancreas	Heart valve replac NEC
Hx of colonic malignancy	History of tobacco use	Joint replaced hip
Hx-bronchogenic malignan	Family hx-breast malig	Joint replaced knee
Hx of breast malignancy	Fam hx-ischem heart dis	Status cardiac pacemaker
Hx-uterus malignancy NEC	Fam hx-diabetes mellitus	Acq absnce breast/nipple
Hx-prostatic malignancy	NB obsrv suspcct infect	Acquired absence kidney
Hx of bladder malignancy	NB obs genetc/metabl cnd	Acq absence of lung

Hx-lymphatic malign NEC	NB obsrv oth suspct cond	Aortocoronary bypass
Hx-malig skin melanoma	Single lb in-hosp w/o cs	Status-post ptca
Hx-skin malignancy NEC	Single lb in-hosp w cs	Routine circumcision
Hx of brain malignancy	Singl livebrn-before adm	Long-term use anticoagul
Hx of affective disorder	Twin-mate lb-hosp w/o cs	Long-term use of insulin
Personal histry malaria	Twin-mate lb-in hos w cs	Wait adm to oth facility
Hx-ven thrombosis/embols	Twin-mate sb-hosp w cs	No proc/contraindication
Hx-circulatory dis NEC	Oth mult lb-in hosp w cs	No proc/patient decision
Observ-accident NEC	Kidney transplant status	Exam-clinical trial

Appendix C - Diabetes

All classifiers, sample sizes, class proportions and scores

Classifier	Sample Size	Class Proportion (class 1/class 0)	F1-score Weighted avg. (95% CI)	AUC Score
Logistic Regression	200	90/10	0.82 (0.95-0.64)	0.71
		80/20	0.77 (0.91-0.6)	0.83
		70/30	0.83 (0.97-0.67)	0.85
		60/40	0.67 (0.83-0.48)	0.84
		50/50	0.75 (0.88-0.61)	0.78
	400	90/10	0.95 (1-0.88)	0.96
		80/20	0.87 (0.95-0.77)	0.87
		70/30	0.73 (0.85-0.61)	0.78
		60/40	0.69 (0.81-0.57)	0.75
		50/50	0.73 (0.84-0.61)	0.85
	500	90/10	0.84 (0.94-0.74)	0.71
		80/20	0.83 (0.92-0.73)	0.82

		70/30	0.74 (0.84-0.63)	0.85
		60/40	0.76 (0.85-0.66)	0.86
		50/50	0.71 (0.81-0.6)	0.82
	600	90/10	0.9 (0.97-0.82)	0.75
		80/20	0.75 (0.86-0.64)	0.71
		70/30	0.72 (0.81-0.61)	0.78
		60/40	0.72 (0.8-0.63)	0.8
		50/50	0.73 (0.82-0.64)	0.83
	800	90/10	0.9 (0.95-0.83)	0.86
		80/20	0.83 (0.91-0.75)	0.77
		70/30	0.75 (0.83-0.66)	0.79
		60/40	0.72 (0.79-0.65)	0.81
		50/50	0.69 (0.76-0.61)	0.78
	1000	90/10	0.88 (0.93-0.82)	0.84
		80/20	0.76 (0.84-0.69)	0.8
		70/30	0.79 (0.85-0.73)	0.85
		60/40	0.75 (0.81-0.67)	0.84
		50/50	0.74 (0.81-0.67)	0.84
	2000	90/10	0.89 (0.93-0.84)	0.8
		80/20	0.86 (0.9-0.82)	0.84
		70/30	0.79 (0.84-0.75)	0.86
60/40		0.81 (0.85-0.76)	0.88	
50/50		0.76 (0.8-0.71)	0.86	
3000	90/10	0.92 (0.95-0.9)	0.88	
	80/20	0.87 (0.9-0.83)	0.85	
	70/30	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.88	

		60/40	0.8 (0.84-0.77)	0.89	
		50/50	0.8 (0.84-0.77)	0.88	
	4000	90/10	0.93 (0.95-0.9)	0.86	
		80/20	0.87 (0.9-0.84)	0.89	
		70/30	0.86 (0.89-0.83)	0.91	
		60/40	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.9	
		50/50	0.8 (0.83-0.77)	0.89	
		90/10	0.92 (0.94-0.9)	0.87	
	5000	80/20	0.85 (0.88-0.83)	0.88	
		70/30	0.86 (0.88-0.83)	0.9	
		60/40	0.83 (0.86-0.81)	0.92	
		50/50	0.85 (0.87-0.82)	0.92	
		90/10	0.8 (0.95-0.63)	0.48	
	Decision Tree	200	80/20	0.82 (0.94-0.7)	0.76
			70/30	0.73 (0.86-0.58)	0.7
60/40			0.69 (0.84-0.53)	0.69	
50/50			0.47 (0.66-0.31)	0.47	
90/10			0.93 (0.98-0.86)	0.48	
400		80/20	0.78 (0.87-0.68)	0.66	
		70/30	0.68 (0.8-0.56)	0.53	
		60/40	0.76 (0.86-0.64)	0.73	
		50/50	0.71 (0.83-0.59)	0.71	
		90/10	0.85 (0.93-0.76)	0.61	
500		80/20	0.83 (0.91-0.74)	0.69	
		70/30	0.76 (0.85-0.66)	0.73	
		60/40	0.78 (0.86-0.69)	0.78	
		90/10	0.85 (0.93-0.76)	0.61	

		50/50	0.84 (0.91-0.75)	0.84
	600	90/10	0.89 (0.96-0.82)	0.64
		80/20	0.68 (0.79-0.58)	0.51
		70/30	0.66 (0.76-0.56)	0.61
		60/40	0.63 (0.71-0.53)	0.64
		50/50	0.7 (0.78-0.61)	0.71
		800	90/10	0.89 (0.95-0.84)
	80/20		0.78 (0.85-0.7)	0.61
	70/30		0.75 (0.82-0.66)	0.69
	60/40		0.67 (0.76-0.59)	0.66
	50/50		0.68 (0.75-0.6)	0.69
	1000	90/10	0.86 (0.91-0.81)	0.69
		80/20	0.72 (0.79-0.64)	0.6
		70/30	0.8 (0.86-0.73)	0.73
		60/40	0.7 (0.76-0.63)	0.7
		50/50	0.61 (0.69-0.55)	0.61
	2000	90/10	0.88 (0.91-0.84)	0.6
		80/20	0.85 (0.88-0.81)	0.75
		70/30	0.78 (0.83-0.74)	0.74
		60/40	0.8 (0.83-0.75)	0.8
		50/50	0.76 (0.81-0.72)	0.77
	3000	90/10	0.92 (0.95-0.89)	0.79
		80/20	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.76
		70/30	0.77 (0.8-0.74)	0.74
		60/40	0.82 (0.85-0.78)	0.83
		50/50	0.8 (0.83-0.76)	0.8

	4000	90/10	0.9 (0.92-0.88)	0.75
		80/20	0.86 (0.89-0.83)	0.79
		70/30	0.85 (0.87-0.82)	0.84
		60/40	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.83
		50/50	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.82
	5000	90/10	0.9 (0.92-0.88)	0.76
		80/20	0.87 (0.89-0.84)	0.8
		70/30	0.87 (0.89-0.84)	0.86
		60/40	0.85 (0.87-0.83)	0.85
		50/50	0.87 (0.9-0.85)	0.87
K-Nearest Neighbour	200	90/10	0.82 (0.95-0.6)	0.45
		80/20	0.86 (0.97-0.71)	0.81
		70/30	0.81 (0.94-0.66)	0.82
		60/40	0.69 (0.84-0.53)	0.76
		50/50	0.58 (0.75-0.41)	0.71
	400	90/10	0.97 (1-0.92)	0.94
		80/20	0.86 (0.94-0.78)	0.88
		70/30	0.69 (0.8-0.57)	0.73
		60/40	0.71 (0.82-0.59)	0.72
		50/50	0.68 (0.8-0.56)	0.79
	500	90/10	0.84 (0.92-0.75)	0.67
		80/20	0.87 (0.94-0.79)	0.76
		70/30	0.72 (0.82-0.6)	0.81
		60/40	0.73 (0.83-0.63)	0.81
		50/50	0.69 (0.79-0.59)	0.77
	600	90/10	0.89 (0.96-0.81)	0.65

		80/20	0.76 (0.84-0.66)	0.74
		70/30	0.77 (0.86-0.68)	0.75
		60/40	0.68 (0.78-0.59)	0.75
		50/50	0.68 (0.77-0.58)	0.77
	800	90/10	0.92 (0.97-0.85)	0.79
		80/20	0.81 (0.88-0.74)	0.78
		70/30	0.7 (0.79-0.61)	0.74
		60/40	0.71 (0.78-0.64)	0.8
		50/50	0.62 (0.7-0.53)	0.7
	1000	90/10	0.87 (0.92-0.81)	0.73
		80/20	0.76 (0.84-0.68)	0.74
		70/30	0.81 (0.87-0.75)	0.83
		60/40	0.77 (0.83-0.7)	0.82
		50/50	0.7 (0.77-0.63)	0.77
	2000	90/10	0.88 (0.92-0.84)	0.68
		80/20	0.79 (0.84-0.74)	0.73
		70/30	0.74 (0.79-0.68)	0.81
		60/40	0.73 (0.77-0.68)	0.81
		50/50	0.71 (0.77-0.66)	0.79
	3000	90/10	0.9 (0.92-0.87)	0.8
		80/20	0.81 (0.85-0.77)	0.82
		70/30	0.77 (0.8-0.73)	0.81
		60/40	0.77 (0.81-0.73)	0.85
		50/50	0.73 (0.77-0.69)	0.83
4000	90/10	0.92 (0.94-0.89)	0.77	
	80/20	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.82	

		70/30	0.78 (0.82-0.75)	0.82	
		60/40	0.77 (0.8-0.74)	0.85	
		50/50	0.76 (0.8-0.73)	0.84	
	5000	90/10	0.91 (0.93-0.88)	0.8	
		80/20	0.85 (0.88-0.82)	0.82	
		70/30	0.8 (0.83-0.77)	0.85	
		60/40	0.78 (0.8-0.75)	0.87	
		50/50	0.76 (0.79-0.73)	0.85	
	Linear Support Vector Classifier	200	90/10	0.82 (0.95-0.64)	0.67
			80/20	0.81 (0.94-0.67)	0.81
70/30			0.84 (0.97-0.69)	0.83	
60/40			0.65 (0.81-0.47)	0.84	
50/50			0.75 (0.91-0.61)	0.78	
400		90/10	0.95 (1-0.88)	0.96	
		80/20	0.92 (0.98-0.84)	0.88	
		70/30	0.71 (0.84-0.58)	0.79	
		60/40	0.66 (0.77-0.55)	0.75	
		50/50	0.71 (0.82-0.58)	0.85	
500		90/10	0.87 (0.95-0.78)	0.69	
		80/20	0.85 (0.93-0.76)	0.79	
		70/30	0.74 (0.84-0.64)	0.86	
		60/40	0.76 (0.85-0.66)	0.86	
		50/50	0.74 (0.83-0.64)	0.82	
600		90/10	0.91 (0.97-0.82)	0.69	
		80/20	0.75 (0.85-0.63)	0.7	
		70/30	0.71 (0.8-0.61)	0.78	

		60/40	0.7 (0.78-0.6)	0.79
		50/50	0.73 (0.8-0.64)	0.82
	800	90/10	0.89 (0.95-0.82)	0.89
		80/20	0.86 (0.92-0.78)	0.73
		70/30	0.75 (0.83-0.65)	0.78
		60/40	0.72 (0.79-0.63)	0.8
		50/50	0.7 (0.78-0.62)	0.78
	1000	90/10	0.88 (0.94-0.82)	0.8
		80/20	0.76 (0.83-0.67)	0.77
		70/30	0.81 (0.87-0.74)	0.84
		60/40	0.76 (0.83-0.7)	0.84
		50/50	0.74 (0.81-0.66)	0.85
	2000	90/10	0.89 (0.93-0.84)	0.75
		80/20	0.86 (0.9-0.82)	0.83
		70/30	0.81 (0.85-0.76)	0.85
		60/40	0.81 (0.85-0.76)	0.88
		50/50	0.76 (0.81-0.72)	0.87
	3000	90/10	0.93 (0.96-0.9)	0.86
		80/20	0.86 (0.89-0.82)	0.84
70/30		0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.87	
60/40		0.8 (0.84-0.77)	0.89	
50/50		0.8 (0.84-0.77)	0.88	
4000	90/10	0.93 (0.96-0.91)	0.85	
	80/20	0.87 (0.9-0.84)	0.88	
	70/30	0.86 (0.88-0.83)	0.91	
	60/40	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.9	

		50/50	0.81 (0.84-0.78)	0.89
	5000	90/10	0.93 (0.95-0.9)	0.84
		80/20	0.86 (0.88-0.83)	0.87
		70/30	0.86 (0.88-0.83)	0.89
		60/40	0.82 (0.85-0.8)	0.91
		50/50	0.83 (0.86-0.81)	0.92
Naive Bayes	200	90/10	0.82 (0.95-0.64)	0.79
		80/20	0.73 (0.91-0.56)	0.81
		70/30	0.67 (0.85-0.46)	0.8
		60/40	0.48 (0.67-0.27)	0.82
		50/50	0.66 (0.81-0.48)	0.78
	400	90/10	0.95 (1-0.88)	0.91
		80/20	0.83 (0.94-0.71)	0.84
		70/30	0.61 (0.75-0.49)	0.75
		60/40	0.73 (0.86-0.62)	0.81
		50/50	0.62 (0.74-0.5)	0.79
	500	90/10	0.82 (0.93-0.7)	0.63
		80/20	0.75 (0.85-0.63)	0.77
		70/30	0.62 (0.75-0.49)	0.83
		60/40	0.72 (0.82-0.61)	0.83
		50/50	0.64 (0.75-0.53)	0.77
	600	90/10	0.86 (0.94-0.76)	0.53
		80/20	0.71 (0.83-0.59)	0.69
		70/30	0.62 (0.74-0.48)	0.75
		60/40	0.69 (0.78-0.57)	0.8
		50/50	0.73 (0.81-0.64)	0.84

	800	90/10	0.86 (0.93-0.78)	0.85
		80/20	0.74 (0.83-0.64)	0.73
		70/30	0.62 (0.72-0.51)	0.75
		60/40	0.68 (0.77-0.59)	0.84
		50/50	0.68 (0.77-0.6)	0.77
	1000	90/10	0.83 (0.9-0.75)	0.7
		80/20	0.71 (0.79-0.62)	0.68
		70/30	0.73 (0.82-0.64)	0.79
		60/40	0.7 (0.77-0.62)	0.79
		50/50	0.69 (0.77-0.6)	0.76
	2000	90/10	0.87 (0.91-0.82)	0.69
		80/20	0.76 (0.81-0.69)	0.76
		70/30	0.67 (0.74-0.61)	0.77
		60/40	0.69 (0.75-0.63)	0.83
		50/50	0.69 (0.74-0.64)	0.79
	3000	90/10	0.87 (0.91-0.84)	0.76
		80/20	0.77 (0.82-0.72)	0.79
		70/30	0.76 (0.81-0.71)	0.85
		60/40	0.74 (0.78-0.7)	0.83
		50/50	0.74 (0.77-0.7)	0.82
	4000	90/10	0.9 (0.93-0.87)	0.74
		80/20	0.76 (0.8-0.72)	0.78
		70/30	0.73 (0.77-0.69)	0.82
		60/40	0.68 (0.72-0.64)	0.83
		50/50	0.72 (0.75-0.68)	0.82
5000	90/10	0.88 (0.91-0.85)	0.73	

		80/20	0.8 (0.84-0.77)	0.8
		70/30	0.72 (0.76-0.68)	0.83
		60/40	0.7 (0.73-0.66)	0.85
		50/50	0.76 (0.79-0.73)	0.86
Random Forest	200	90/10	0.81 (0.95-0.69)	0.63
		80/20	0.74 (0.95-0.54)	0.78
		70/30	0.77 (0.93-0.59)	0.89
		60/40	0.48 (0.71-0.27)	0.75
		50/50	0.75 (0.88-0.6)	0.87
	400	90/10	0.95 (1-0.88)	0.87
		80/20	0.84 (0.95-0.73)	0.74
		70/30	0.62 (0.75-0.48)	0.76
		60/40	0.71 (0.83-0.59)	0.76
		50/50	0.63 (0.76-0.49)	0.76
	500	90/10	0.82 (0.91-0.71)	0.79
		80/20	0.75 (0.85-0.63)	0.83
		70/30	0.5 (0.63-0.38)	0.76
		60/40	0.72 (0.82-0.6)	0.83
		50/50	0.65 (0.76-0.55)	0.77
	600	90/10	0.86 (0.94-0.77)	0.77
		80/20	0.68 (0.8-0.57)	0.78
		70/30	0.62 (0.74-0.5)	0.69
		60/40	0.61 (0.72-0.5)	0.76
		50/50	0.61 (0.71-0.51)	0.81
	800	90/10	0.86 (0.93-0.78)	0.82
		80/20	0.76 (0.84-0.65)	0.8

		70/30	0.62 (0.72-0.51)	0.76
		60/40	0.65 (0.75-0.56)	0.84
		50/50	0.67 (0.76-0.58)	0.77
	1000	90/10	0.84 (0.91-0.77)	0.8
		80/20	0.68 (0.77-0.6)	0.78
		70/30	0.7 (0.79-0.61)	0.87
		60/40	0.6 (0.69-0.5)	0.81
		50/50	0.6 (0.69-0.52)	0.7
	2000	90/10	0.87 (0.91-0.82)	0.7
		80/20	0.73 (0.8-0.67)	0.76
		70/30	0.65 (0.71-0.59)	0.8
		60/40	0.61 (0.66-0.54)	0.75
		50/50	0.65 (0.7-0.6)	0.74
	3000	90/10	0.88 (0.91-0.84)	0.76
		80/20	0.75 (0.79-0.7)	0.79
		70/30	0.67 (0.72-0.61)	0.8
		60/40	0.66 (0.71-0.61)	0.78
		50/50	0.72 (0.76-0.67)	0.81
	4000	90/10	0.88 (0.91-0.85)	0.76
		80/20	0.74 (0.78-0.69)	0.76
		70/30	0.67 (0.72-0.63)	0.81
60/40		0.6 (0.64-0.56)	0.79	
50/50		0.67 (0.71-0.63)	0.77	
5000	90/10	0.86 (0.89-0.83)	0.84	
	80/20	0.74 (0.79-0.71)	0.8	
	70/30	0.64 (0.68-0.6)	0.81	

		60/40	0.64 (0.69-0.6)	0.79
		50/50	0.71 (0.75-0.68)	0.81
Stochastic Gradient Descent	200	90/10	0.81 (0.95-0.64)	0.69
		80/20	0.85 (0.95-0.7)	0.82
		70/30	0.77 (0.91-0.62)	0.78
		60/40	0.67 (0.84-0.49)	0.76
		50/50	0.69 (0.85-0.53)	0.73
		90/10	0.97 (1-0.92)	0.97
	400	80/20	0.88 (0.95-0.8)	0.9
		70/30	0.67 (0.79-0.53)	0.78
		60/40	0.68 (0.79-0.56)	0.71
		50/50	0.72 (0.83-0.6)	0.83
		90/10	0.88 (0.96-0.79)	0.6
	500	80/20	0.84 (0.92-0.75)	0.74
		70/30	0.78 (0.87-0.68)	0.86
		60/40	0.8 (0.89-0.7)	0.81
		50/50	0.74 (0.83-0.65)	0.78
		90/10	0.91 (0.97-0.84)	0.65
	600	80/20	0.74 (0.84-0.63)	0.64
		70/30	0.72 (0.82-0.63)	0.73
		60/40	0.62 (0.72-0.52)	0.73
		50/50	0.72 (0.81-0.63)	0.79
90/10		0.9 (0.96-0.84)	0.88	
800	80/20	0.84 (0.9-0.75)	0.67	
	70/30	0.78 (0.85-0.7)	0.74	
	60/40	0.7 (0.78-0.62)	0.75	

		50/50	0.68 (0.76-0.6)	0.73
	1000	90/10	0.89 (0.94-0.84)	0.78
		80/20	0.75 (0.82-0.68)	0.7
		70/30	0.78 (0.84-0.7)	0.81
		60/40	0.78 (0.85-0.71)	0.81
		50/50	0.72 (0.79-0.65)	0.82
		2000	90/10	0.89 (0.92-0.84)
	80/20		0.87 (0.91-0.83)	0.83
	70/30		0.79 (0.84-0.75)	0.84
	60/40		0.8 (0.84-0.76)	0.86
	50/50		0.78 (0.82-0.73)	0.86
	3000	90/10	0.92 (0.95-0.9)	0.85
		80/20	0.87 (0.9-0.84)	0.82
		70/30	0.81 (0.85-0.78)	0.85
		60/40	0.81 (0.84-0.77)	0.88
		50/50	0.83 (0.86-0.8)	0.87
	4000	90/10	0.93 (0.95-0.9)	0.83
		80/20	0.88 (0.9-0.85)	0.89
		70/30	0.86 (0.88-0.83)	0.9
		60/40	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.89
		50/50	0.8 (0.83-0.76)	0.88
	5000	90/10	0.9 (0.93-0.88)	0.85
		80/20	0.88 (0.9-0.85)	0.87
		70/30	0.84 (0.87-0.81)	0.89
		60/40	0.82 (0.85-0.79)	0.9
		50/50	0.84 (0.87-0.82)	0.9

Support Vector Classifier	200	90/10	0.82 (0.98-0.64)	0.65
		80/20	0.79 (0.93-0.6)	0.78
		70/30	0.77 (0.93-0.59)	0.82
		60/40	0.37 (0.57-0.18)	0.84
		50/50	0.55 (0.72-0.36)	0.79
	400	90/10	0.95 (1-0.88)	0.95
		80/20	0.84 (0.94-0.72)	0.9
		70/30	0.69 (0.82-0.54)	0.79
		60/40	0.74 (0.86-0.61)	0.76
		50/50	0.61 (0.73-0.48)	0.84
	500	90/10	0.82 (0.91-0.71)	0.7
		80/20	0.77 (0.88-0.65)	0.8
		70/30	0.68 (0.8-0.56)	0.85
		60/40	0.74 (0.83-0.63)	0.83
		50/50	0.71 (0.81-0.61)	0.79
	600	90/10	0.86 (0.94-0.77)	0.64
		80/20	0.73 (0.85-0.61)	0.76
		70/30	0.71 (0.8-0.6)	0.78
		60/40	0.7 (0.8-0.6)	0.77
		50/50	0.73 (0.82-0.65)	0.82
	800	90/10	0.86 (0.93-0.78)	0.89
		80/20	0.81 (0.89-0.72)	0.77
		70/30	0.75 (0.83-0.66)	0.77
		60/40	0.73 (0.81-0.66)	0.79
		50/50	0.71 (0.78-0.63)	0.76
1000	90/10	0.84 (0.91-0.77)	0.8	

		80/20	0.74 (0.82-0.66)	0.74
		70/30	0.81 (0.87-0.74)	0.8
		60/40	0.75 (0.82-0.68)	0.84
		50/50	0.75 (0.81-0.68)	0.83
	2000	90/10	0.89 (0.93-0.84)	0.71
		80/20	0.82 (0.87-0.77)	0.83
		70/30	0.82 (0.87-0.77)	0.86
		60/40	0.83 (0.87-0.78)	0.89
		50/50	0.78 (0.82-0.72)	0.86
	3000	90/10	0.93 (0.95-0.9)	0.83
		80/20	0.86 (0.89-0.82)	0.83
		70/30	0.84 (0.88-0.8)	0.86
		60/40	0.84 (0.87-0.81)	0.9
		50/50	0.83 (0.86-0.79)	0.9
	4000	90/10	0.92 (0.94-0.89)	0.85
		80/20	0.86 (0.89-0.82)	0.87
		70/30	0.86 (0.89-0.83)	0.9
		60/40	0.86 (0.89-0.84)	0.92
		50/50	0.83 (0.85-0.8)	0.91
	5000	90/10	0.92 (0.94-0.89)	0.82
80/20		0.86 (0.89-0.84)	0.85	
70/30		0.87 (0.89-0.85)	0.91	
60/40		0.86 (0.88-0.84)	0.92	
50/50		0.86 (0.89-0.84)	0.93	
BERT	200	90/10	0.85 (0.71-0.96)	0.50
		80/20	0.63 (0.45-0.78)	0.50

		70/30	0.45 (0.28-0.61)	0.50
		60/40	0.61 (0.44-0.76)	0.59
		50/50	0.6 (0.47-0.75)	0.60
	400	90/10	0.82 (0.71-0.91)	0.50
		80/20	0.61 (0.5-0.73)	0.50
		70/30	0.76 (0.65-0.86)	0.64
		60/40	0.68 (0.58-0.78)	0.67
		50/50	0.54 (0.41-0.67)	0.58
	500	90/10	0.72 (0.62-0.83)	0.50
		80/20	0.79 (0.69-0.88)	0.59
		70/30	0.57 (0.46-0.69)	0.52
		60/40	0.62 (0.52-0.71)	0.62
		50/50	0.65 (0.56-0.74)	0.67
	600	90/10	0.81 (0.73-0.89)	0.50
		80/20	0.65 (0.54-0.77)	0.52
		70/30	0.51 (0.4-0.62)	0.51
		60/40	0.67 (0.58-0.76)	0.67
		50/50	0.7 (0.63-0.78)	0.70
	800	90/10	0.82 (0.75-0.89)	0.50
		80/20	0.69 (0.61-0.79)	0.57
		70/30	0.77 (0.71-0.84)	0.69
60/40		0.72 (0.65-0.79)	0.72	
50/50		0.72 (0.65-0.8)	0.73	
1000	90/10	0.86 (0.8-0.91)	0.50	
	80/20	0.74 (0.66-0.81)	0.50	
	70/30	0.79 (0.74-0.85)	0.73	

		60/40	0.74 (0.68-0.8)	0.73
		50/50	0.73 (0.67-0.78)	0.72
	2000	90/10	0.87 (0.83-0.91)	0.59
		80/20	0.83 (0.79-0.87)	0.73
		70/30	0.78 (0.74-0.82)	0.72
		60/40	0.75 (0.7-0.79)	0.74
		50/50	0.78 (0.73-0.82)	0.78
		90/10	0.89 (0.85-0.91)	0.58
	3000	80/20	0.83 (0.8-0.87)	0.70
		70/30	0.8 (0.76-0.83)	0.75
		60/40	0.77 (0.73-0.8)	0.76
		50/50	0.76 (0.73-0.8)	0.76
		90/10	0.88 (0.85-0.9)	0.60
	4000	80/20	0.84 (0.82-0.87)	0.73
		70/30	0.81 (0.78-0.84)	0.79
		60/40	0.81 (0.78-0.83)	0.79
		50/50	0.79 (0.76-0.82)	0.80
		90/10	0.91 (0.89-0.93)	0.68
	5000	80/20	0.85 (0.82-0.87)	0.72
		70/30	0.82 (0.79-0.84)	0.79
60/40		0.8 (0.78-0.83)	0.80	
50/50		0.83 (0.8-0.85)	0.83	