CANFIS—a computer aided diagnostic tool for cancer detection
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ABSTRACT

In this investigation, an approach using Coactive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (CANFIS) as diagnosis system for breast cancer has been proposed on Wisconsin Breast Cancer Data (WBCD). It is occasionally difficult to attain the ultimate diagnosis even for medical experts due to the complexity and non-linearity of the relationships between the large measured factors, which can be possibly resolved with a human like decision-making process using Artificial Intelligence (AI) algorithms. CANFIS is an AI algorithm which has the advantages of both fuzzy inference system and neural networks and can deal with ambiguous data and learn from the past data by itself. The Multi Layer Perceptron Neural Network (MLPNN), Probabilistic Neural Network (PNN) Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Self Organizing Map (SOM) were also tested and benchmarked for their performance on the classification of the WBCD.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer is the most common tumor-related disease among women throughout the world, and the mortality rate caused by breast cancer is dramatically increasing. The etiologies of breast cancer remain unclear and no single dominant cause has emerged [1]. Preventive way is still a mystery and the only way to help patients to survive is by early detection. If the cancerous cells are detected before spreading to other organs, the survival rate for patient is more than 97% [25] which is the motivation factor to develop this automated diagnostic tool. Again, a major class of problems in medical science involves the diagnosis of disease, based upon several tests performed upon the patient and this has given rise, over the past few decades, to computerized diagnostic tools, intended to aid the physician in making sense out of the confusing data [2].

There have been substantial previous research works with WBCD database to achieve an automatic ultimate diagnostic system. Genetic Algorithm (GA) [2,13], Fuzzy Inference Systems(FIS) [3,4], Neural Networks (NN) [5,12], Adaptive Boosting (AdaBoost) [6,10,11] and Neuro-Fuzzy Hybrid Models [4,8] have been applied to this problem. The performances of each inference system were evaluated by calculating the degree of correctness in predicted results against diagnosed results represented as PPV (Positive Predicted Value). Each system shows the PPV within the range from less than 60% (AdaBoost) up to over 95% (Neuro-Fuzzy Hybrid Models). Among those algorithms, Neuro-Fuzzy Hybrid models provide relatively remarkable performances in diagnosis. Those models are the combination of Neural Networks and Fuzzy Inference Systems encouraging the advantages and resolving the drawbacks of both NNs and FIS models.

For our experiments, after preprocessing and cleaning of clinical data from mammogram, a modified method of using CANFIS [8,9] was applied to attain the ultimate diagnosis as being either benign or malignant. In order to find the neural network model with the highest accuracy for classification of the WBCD, we implemented five types of classifiers: Multi Layer Perceptron Neural Network (MLPNN), Probabilistic Neural Network (PNN), Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Support Vector Machine (SVM) and Self Organizing Map (SOM). To achieve fast training, the weights of these classifiers were initialized with Stern series. In applying CANFIS and other artificial intelligent algorithm, the required system size is changed in proportion to the size.
of the inference system such as the number of inputs, the number of internal nodes and the number of learning iteration. Among those critical factors of the inference system, the number of internal nodes and learning iteration are changeable only in the process of designing the system. Therefore, methods for reducing the number of input factors within range of not losing the accuracy of diagnosis were considered. For this purpose, we used two methods, which are decision tree [14] and the correlation coefficient between the individual inputs and the test diagnosis results. The overall process flow chart is presented in Figure 1.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we briefly describe the WBCD data, data cleaning and feature extraction, dominant input selection methods, a review of the classifiers that are considered and initializing the weight of neural networks with Stern series are presented. In Section 3, we present the diagnostic system using CANFIS. In Section 4, experimental results of the classifiers trained on composite features of the WBCD data is compared in terms of positive predicted value and discussion of the presented results is provided in the light of existing studies in the literature. In Section 5, we highlight the results of the paper and finally, in Section 6, we conclude the paper.

2. METHODS

2.1. Wisconsin Breast Cancer Database

The Wisconsin Breast Cancer Diagnosis (WBCD) database is the result of efforts provided by the University of Wisconsin Hospital based on microscopic examination of breast masses with fine needle aspirate tests. Fine needle aspiration of breast masses is a common non-invasive diagnostic test that obtains information needed to evaluate malignancy [3,15].

Masses often characterize as early breast cancer before it is palpable by a woman or a physician [1]. It has its own characteristics and may be used as a clue to classify them. Masses can be circumscribed, speculated (satellite), lobulated or ill-defined (irregular) and radiologist will need to take a good look at its texture information, statistical descriptions as well as the background tissue from mammography images. Therefore, in order to classify a mass, the characteristics or attributes recorded were used as an input features. There are nine criteria recorded for masses in this dataset represented as a 1-10 integer value. (Table 1).

The database (Table 2) itself contains 699 cases, with 65.5% classified as benign and 34.5% as malignant. The diagnostics do not provide any information about the degree of benignity or malignancy. In considering the relationship between the measured values and the diagnostics, there are almost no relationships which stand out. Therefore, there is no convenient and effective method to attain the ultimate diagnostics with this original data even for the specialists.

In addition to that, there may be the possibility that one or more of the measured pieces do not affect the diagnosis result. These are the reasons that artificial intelligent system can be used as an expert to assist the specialist in diagnosing the disease correctly.

2.2. Data Cleaning and Feature Extraction

Preliminary examination on dataset chosen is compulsory before cleaning process takes place. By knowing the relationship between attributes, and how strongly they depend on each other, data quality and evaluation can be found easily. The discovery of data relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Integer Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clump Thickness</td>
<td>$X_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformity of Cell Size</td>
<td>$X_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniformity of Cell Shape</td>
<td>$X_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Adhesion</td>
<td>$X_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Epithelial Cell Size</td>
<td>$X_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare Nuclei</td>
<td>$X_6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bland Chromatin</td>
<td>$X_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Nucleoli</td>
<td>$X_8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitosis</td>
<td>$X_9$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>$X_1$</th>
<th>$X_2$</th>
<th>$X_3$</th>
<th>……..</th>
<th>$X_9$</th>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>……..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>……..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>……..</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>……..</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Malignant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might lead to data cleaning rules, and therefore it can suggest improvements to its constraints. These are carried out by analyzing patterns between the attributes, using statistical tools like bivariate or multivariate analysis.

Therefore, two different cleaning processes have been carried out on the dataset. Dataset named Set A will only eliminate records with missing value and outliers, with the hypothesis that medical data are best not to be tempered or changed. While data in Set B will undergo normal statistical cleaning process where all attributes must be distributed normally. Therefore, data in Set B has been changed many times to fulfill the normal distribution functions.

Using Neural Connection 2.0, 180 simulations was carried out for both dataset to test which data set is the best. As shown in Figure 2, set A gives 100% as the highest accuracy percentage (AP) and the smallest root mean squared (RMS) error is only 0.02751. As compared to set B, the highest AP is only 83.36% with smallest RMS error is 0.21002. It is proven that our hypothesis is true and therefore, set A will be used as an input database.

After data cleaning, the data in the WBCD database was divided into two sets: training and testing datasets. There are 444 benign and 238 malignant cases in the database. The training dataset constitutes 50% of WBCD database taken in order and the remaining is testing dataset. The training dataset was also used to figure out the most effective and dominant inputs of the inference system and the result with dominant inputs using decision tree and correlation coefficient computation was tested for correctness verification of the output.

2.3. Dominant Input Selection Methods

2.3.1. Decision Tree

The input recommender used in our experiment was a decision tree learning algorithm using SAS™ package. The decision tree construction algorithms generate decision trees from a set D of cases. These algorithms partition the data set D into subsets D1, D2, ……DM by a set of tests X with mutually outcomes X1, X2, ……XM, where Dv contains those cases that have outcome Xv. A decision tree (DT) is known as a good classifier of huge data. It classifies input data by partitioning example spaces with entropy calculation. DT is especially useful when dataset is represented by attribute-value pairs and the target function has discrete output value. In our experiment, a binary decision tree was constructed to select dominant inputs. In each node of the tree, the most useful attribute for classifying whole data is selected by calculating the information gain (measure for deciding the relevance of an attribute) G(D, X) of an attribute X,

![Figure 2. Simulations results of data Set A and Set B.](image-url)
relative to a collection of examples $X$, with following formula.

$$Gain(D,X) = Entropy(D) - \sum_{v \in \text{Values}(X)} \frac{|D_v|}{|D|} \cdot Entropy(D_v)$$

and $$Entropy(D) = \sum_{i} -p_i \log p_i$$

where $p_i$ denotes the proportion of classes in D that belong to the $i^{th}$ class, $\text{Values}(X)$ is the set of all possible values for attribute $X$, $D_v$ is a subset of $D$ for which attribute $X$ has a value $v$ and $|D_v|$ represents cardinality of $D_v$ dataset. (i.e., $D_v = \{d \in D \mid X(d) = v\}$). The first term in the equation for Gain is just the entropy of the original collection $D$ and the second term is the expected value of the entropy after $D$ is partitioned using attribute $X$. The expected entropy described by this second term is simply the sum of the entropies of each subset $D_v$, weighted by the fraction of examples $|D_v|/|D|$ that belong to $D_v$. $Gain(D,X)$ is therefore the expected reduction in entropy caused by knowing the value of attribute $X$. Alternatively, $Gain(D,X)$ is the information provided about the target attribute value, given the value of some other attribute $X$.

The DT is constructed in a way to reduce the entropy with the attribute which has the highest gain value at each node. Through this way, the final DT model has the most useful measured data on the top node, next useful one on the right node of the top node and so on. The input selection process derived by DT is presented in Figure 3.

2.3.2. Correlation Coefficient Computation

An efficient method for dominant input selecting process is calculating correlation coefficients between each measured input data and the diagnosis results. The Correlation Coefficient is a numerical measure of the degree of the linear relationship between two variables. The value of the correlation coefficient always falls between -1 and 1. A positive correlation coefficient indicates a direct relationship, and a negative correlation coefficient indicates an inverse relationship between two variables. In the calculation, first it is possible to assume that all the correlation coefficients by calculating with data in WBCD should be positive. Then we selected four measured input data from the one which has the highest correlation coefficient for diagnosis system. The correlation coefficient indicates the degree of linear relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient always lies between -1 and +1. -1 indicates perfect linear negative relationship between two variables, +1 indicates perfect positive linear relationship and 0 indicates lack of any linear relationship. The correlation coefficient ($\rho_{ij}$) can be calculated by the following formula.

$$\rho_{ij} = \frac{C_{ij}}{C_i \cdot C_j} = \frac{\text{cov}(X_i,X_j)}{\sigma(X_i) \cdot \sigma(X_j)}\tag{1}$$

where $C_{ij}$ is the covariance of $X_i$ and $X_j$, $\sum X$ is the mean and $\sigma(X_i)$ is the standard deviation of $X_i$ and $\sigma(X_j)$ is the standard deviation of $X_j$.

Each result by the correlation coefficient calculation between each measured input and the correct output indicates the degree of linear relationship between them. In this procedure, the selected input features are possibly said to have more linear relationships so that they affects the results. Therefore, the inputs highly correlated with the output were selected as dominant inputs in our experiment. The result of dominant input selection by the correlation coefficient calculation is given in Figure 4.

![Figure 3. DT dominant input selection.](image-url)
2.4. Brief Review of Different Classifiers

1) Multilayer Perceptron Neural Network

The MLPNNs are the most commonly used neural-network architectures since they have features such as the ability to learn and generalize smaller training-set requirements, fast operation, and ease of implementation. One major property of these networks is their ability to find nonlinear surfaces separating the underlying patterns, which is generally considered as an improvement on conventional methods. The MLPNN is a nonparametric technique for performing a wide variety of detection and estimation tasks [12,17,18,19]. Figure 5 shows the architecture of MLPNN. There is one neuron in the input layer for each predictor variable. In the case of categorical variables, \( N \)-1 neurons are used to represent the \( N \) categories of the variable.

**Input Layer**—A vector of predictor variable values \((x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p)\) is presented to the input layer. The input layer (or preprocessing before the input layer) standardizes these values so that the range of each variable is -1 to 1. The input layer distributes the values to each of the neurons in the hidden layer. In addition to the predictor variables, there is a constant input of 1.0, called the bias that is fed to each of the hidden layers; the bias is multiplied by a weight and added to the sum going into the neuron.

**Hidden Layer**—Arriving at a neuron in the hidden layer, the value from each input neuron is multiplied by a weight \((w_{ij})\), and the resulting weighted values are added together producing a combined value \(u_j\). The weighted sum \((u_j)\) is fed into a transfer function, \(\sigma\), which outputs a value \(y_j\). The \(y\) values are the outputs of the network.

The algorithm for the MLPNN is given below. It requires the units to have thresholding non linear functions that are continuously differentiable, i.e., smooth everywhere. A sigmoid function \(f(\text{net}) = 1/(1+e^{-\text{net}})\), is used, since it has a simple derivative. All training and testing data were normalized.

Initialize weights and thresholds:

- Set all weights and thresholds to small random variable.
- Present input and desired output:
  - Present input: \(X_P = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_p\)
  - Target output: \(Y_P = y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_m\)

where \(p\) is the number of input nodes and \(m\) is the number of output nodes. Set \(w_0\) to be -\(\theta\), the bias, and \(x_1\) to be always 1.

For pattern association, \(X_P\) and \(Y_P\) represent the patterns to be associated. For classification, \(Y_P\) is set to zero except for one element set to 1 that corresponds to the class the \(X_P\) is in.

Calculation of actual output:

- Each layer calculates \(Y_{hu} = f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{w_{li}} w_{hi} X_{pi}\right)\) and passes it as input to the next layer. The final layer outputs values \(O_{pj}\) and passes that as input to the next layer.

Adapt weights (start from control layer, and work backwards):

\[ w_{ij}(t + 1) = w_{ij}(t) + \eta \delta_{pj}O_{pj} \]

where \(w_{ij}(t)\) represents the weights from node \(i\) to node \(j\) at time \(t\), \(\eta\) is a gain term, and \(\delta_{pj}\) is an error term for pattern \(p\) on node \(j\).

- For output units: \(\delta_{pj} = k O_{pj} (1 - O_{pj}) (t_{pj} - O_{pj})\)
- For hidden units: \(\delta_{hj} = k O_{hj} (1 - O_{hj}) \sum_{k} \delta_{pj} w_{jk}\)

where, the sum is over the \(k\) nodes in the layer above node \(j\). The stopping condition may be weight change, number of epochs, and so on.

The main issues involved in designing and training a MLPNN are selecting how many hidden layers to use in the network, deciding how many neurons to use in each hidden layer, finding a globally optimal solution that avoids local minima, converging to an optimal solution in a reasonable period of time and validating the neural network to test for overfitting.

2) Probabilistic Neural Network

The PNN introduced by Specht [20] is essentially based on the well-known Bayesian classifier technique commonly used in many classical pattern-recognition problems. Consider a pattern vector \(x\) with \(m\) dimensions that belongs to one of two categories \(K_1\) and \(K_2\). Let \(F_1(x)\) and \(F_2(x)\) be the probability density functions (pdf) for the classification categories \(K_1\) and \(K_2\), respectively.
Figure 5. Architecture of MLPNN.

Figure 6. Architecture of PNN.

From Bayes’ discriminant decision rule, \( x \) belongs to \( K_1 \) if
\[
\frac{F_1(x)}{F_2(x)} > \frac{L_1}{L_2} \frac{P_2}{P_1}
\]
Conversely, \( x \) belongs to \( K_2 \) if
\[
\frac{F_1(x)}{F_2(x)} < \frac{L_1}{L_2} \frac{P_2}{P_1}
\]
where \( L_1 \) is the loss or cost function associated with misclassifying the vector as belonging to category \( K_1 \), while it belongs to category \( K_2 \), \( L_2 \) is the loss function associated with misclassifying the vector as belonging to category \( K_2 \) while it belongs to category \( K_1 \), \( P_1 \) is the prior probability of occurrence of category \( K_1 \), and \( P_2 \) is the prior probability of occurrence of category \( K_2 \). In many situations, the loss functions and the prior probabilities can be considered equal. Hence the key to using the decision rules given by Eq.3 and 4 is to estimate the probability density functions from the training patterns.

The PNN architecture (Figure 6) is composed of many interconnected processing units or neurons organized in successive layers. The input layer unit does not perform any computation and simply distributes the input to the neurons in the pattern layer. On receiving a pattern \( x \) from the input layer, the neuron \( x_{ij} \) of the pattern layer computes its output using
\[ \varphi_i(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(x-x_i)^T (x-x_i)}{2\sigma^2} \right] \]  

(5)

where \( d \) denotes the dimension of the pattern vector \( x \), \( \sigma \) is the smoothing parameter, and \( x_i \) is the neuron vector \([20,21]\).

For two class problem, if input units is assumed to be \( x_1 \) to \( x_n \). Pattern units be Class A \( (Z_{A1} \text{ to } Z_{Aj}) \) and Class B \( (Z_{B1} \text{ to } Z_{Bi}) \). Summation units be \( f_A \) and \( f_B \) and output unit \( y \), then the training algorithm for the probabilistic neural net is

Step 1: For each training input pattern, \( x(p) \), \( p = 1, \ldots, P \) perform Steps 2-3.
Step 2: Create pattern unit \( Z_p \): Weight vector for unit \( Z_p \): \( w_p = x(p) \) (unit \( Z_p \) is either a \( Z_A \) unit or \( Z_B \) unit)
Step 3: Connect the pattern unit to summation unit. If \( x(p) \) belongs to Class A, connect pattern unit \( Z_p \) to summation unit \( S_A \). Else, connect pattern unit \( Z_p \) to summation unit \( S_B \).

The application algorithm for classifying is given as

Step 1: Initialize weights from training algorithm.
Step 2: For input pattern to be classified, do Steps 3–5.
Step 3: Patterns units:
   Calculate net input, \( Z_{inj} = x.w_j = x^T w_j \)
   Calculate the output, \( Z = \exp\left[\left[Z_{inj}-1\right]/\sigma^2\right] \)
Step 4: Summation units
   The weights used by the summation unit for Class B is, \( V_B = P_B C_B m_B/P_A C_A m_B \)
Step 5: Output unit:
   It sums the signals from \( f_A \) and \( f_B \). Input vector is classified as Class A if the total input to decision unit is positive.
   The main advantage of PNN compared to MLPNN is:
   - faster to train a PNN network than an MLPNN.
   - more accurate than MLPNN.
   - insensitive to outliers (wild points).
   - generate accurate predicted target probability scores.
   - approach Bayes optimal classification.
   - slower than MLPNN at classifying new cases.
   - require more memory space to store the model.

3) Support Vector Machine

The SVM proposed by Vapnik [22] has been studied extensively for classification, regression, and density estimation. The SVM is a binary classifier and it maps the input patterns into a higher dimensional feature space through some nonlinear mapping chosen \( \text{a priori} \). A linear decision surface is then constructed in this high-dimensional-feature space. Thus, SVM is a linear classifier in the parameter space, but it becomes a nonlinear classifier as a result of the nonlinear mapping of the space of the input patterns into the high-dimensional feature space. Training the SVM is a quadratic-optimization problem. SVM has been shown to provide high generalization ability. A proper kernel function for a certain problem is dependent on the specific data and till now there is no good method on how to choose a kernel function [22,23]. In this paper, the choice of the kernel functions was studied empirically and optimal results were achieved using radial-basis function (RBF) kernel function.

SVMS are free of optimization headaches of neural networks because they present a convex programming problem, and guarantee finding a global solution. They are much faster to evaluate than density estimators, because they make use of only relevant data points, rather than looping over each point regardless of its relevance to the decision boundary.

4) Self Organizing Maps

Self-organizing maps learn to classify input vectors according to how they are grouped in the input space. Feature maps allocate more neurons to recognize parts of the input space where many input vectors occur and allocate fewer neurons to parts of the input space where few input vectors occur. SOM also learn the topology of their input vectors. Neurons next to each other in the network learn to respond to similar vectors. The layer of neurons can be imagined to be a rubber net that is stretched over the regions in the input space where input vectors occur. SOM allow neurons that are neighbors to the winning neuron to output values. Thus the transition of output vectors is much smoother than that obtained with competitive layers, where only one neuron has an output at a time.

Initially, the weight and learning rate are set. The input vectors to be clustered are presented to the network. Once the input vectors are given, based on initial weights, the winner unit is calculated either by Euclidean distance method or sum of products method. An epoch is said to be completed once all the input vectors are presented to the network. By updating the learning rate, several epochs of training may be performed. The training algorithm for SOM is as below

Step 1: Set topological neighborhood parameters
   Set learning rate, initialize weights.
Step 2: While stopping condition is false do Steps 3-9
Step 3: For each input vector \( x \), do Steps 4-6
Step 4: For each \( j \), compute squared Euclidean distance.
   \( D(j) = \sum((W_{ij} - X_i)^2) \) where \( i = 1 \text{ to } n \) and \( j = 1 \text{ to } m \)
Step 5: Find index \( J \), when \( D(j) \) is minimum.
Step 6: For all units \( J \) with the specified neighbourhood of \( J \), for all \( i \), update the weights.
   \( W_{ij(new)} = W_{ij(old)} + \alpha(x_i - W_{ij(old)}) \)
Step 7: Update the learning rate.
Step 8: Reduce the radius of topological neighborhood at specified times.
Step 9: Test the stopping condition.
The map formation occurs in two phases:

a) Initial formation of perfect (correct) order
b) Final convergence.

The second phase takes a longer duration than the first phase and requires a small value of learning rate. The learning rate is a slowly decreasing function of time and the radius of the neighborhood around a cluster unit also decreases as the clustering process goes on. The initial weights are assumed with random values. The learning rate is updated by $\alpha(t+1) = 0.5\alpha(t)$.

5) Principal Component Analysis

PCA network combine unsupervised and supervised learning in the same topology. PCA is an unsupervised linear procedure that finds a set of uncorrelated features, principal components, from the input. A MLP is supervised to perform the nonlinear classification from these components. PCA is a technique that finds an orthogonal set of directions in the input space and provides a way to find the projections into these directions in an ordered fashion. The orthogonal directions are called eigen vectors of the correlation matrix of the input vector and the projections of the corresponding eigen values.

a) Ordering of the principal components

PCA must transform the input samples into a new space (the feature space) such that the information about the samples is kept, but the dimensionality is reduced. From the input space, it finds an orthogonal set of $P$ directions where the input data has the largest energy, and extracts $P$ projections from these directions in an ordered fashion. The first principal component is the projection, which has the largest value (think of the projections as the shadow of the data clusters in each direction as in Figure 7), while the $P^\text{th}$ principal component has the smallest value. If the largest projections are extracted, then the most significant information about the input data is kept. This segment of the network computes the eigenvectors of the input's correlation function without ever computing the correlation function itself. The outputs of the PCA layer are therefore related to the eigenvalues and can be used as input features to the supervised segment for classification. Since many of these eigenvalues are usually small, only the $M$ ($M<P$) largest values need to be kept. This speeds up training even more.

The importance of PCA analysis is that the number of inputs for the MLP classifier can be significantly reduced. This results in a reduction of the number of required training patterns and a reduction in the training times of the classifier. Problem with linear PCA networks is evident when the input data contains outliers. Outliers are individual pieces of data that are far removed from the data clusters (i.e., noise). They tend to distort the estimation of the eigenvectors and create skewed data projections.

6) Initializing Neural Networks with Stern Series

A Calkin-Wilf tree is a special type of binary tree obtained by starting with the fraction $1/1$ and iteratively adding $a/(a+b)$ and $(a+b)/b$ below each fraction $a/b$. The Stern-Brocot tree is closely related, putting $b/(a+b)$ below each fraction $a/b$. Both trees generate every rational number. Writing out the terms in sequence gives $1/1, 1/2, 2/1, 1/3, 3/2, 2/3, 3/1, 1/4, 4/3, 3/5, 5/2, 2/5, 5/3, 3/4, 4/1,...$ as shown in Figure 8.

The sequence has the property that each denominator is the next numerator [26] and is known as Stern's diatomic series represented mathematically as

$$a(0) = 0, a(1) = 1; \text{ for } n \geq 0, a(2n) = a(n), a(2n+1) = a(n) + a(n+1).$$

As an array the terms are:

1, 2
1, 3, 2, 3
1, 4, 3, 5, 2, 5, 3, 4
1, 5, 4, 7, 3, 8, 5, 7, 2, 7, 5, 8, 3, 7, 4, 5 and so on.

Finding $1/(a(n)*a(n+1))$ for each row

R=1 \quad 1/2, 1/2
R=2 \quad 1/3, 1/6, 1/6, 1/3
R=3 \quad 1/4, 1/12, 1/15, 1/10, 1/10, 1/15, 1/12, 1/4 and so on.

Depending on the importance of a specific attribute chosen, we can initialize the weight of neural network with stern series for quick training. A tree showing the designed stern series for weight initialization is shown below in Figure 9.

The main impact of initializing the neural network weight with stern series is quick training period. The code for generating Stern series is given below.

\[\text{Figure 7. Ordering of the principal components.}\]

\[\text{Figure 8. Stern-brocot tree.}\]
Figure 9. Weight initialization using stern sequence.

```c
#include<iostream.h>
#include<conio.h>
static int ans=0;                //STERN'S RESULT
void stern(int n)
{
    if(n==0||n==1)         //STERN'S ASSUPTION
        ans+=n;
    else if(n%2==0)              //STERN'S EVEN
    {
        n=n/2;
        if(n>1)
            stern(n);
        else
            ans+=n;
    }
    else
        //STERN'S ODD
        { n=n/2;
            stern(n);
            stern(n+1);
        }
}
void main()
{
    textcolor(WHITE);
    textbackground(BLUE);
    clrscr();
    int n;
    gotoxy(33,3);
    cprintf("STERN'S SERIES\n\n");
    gotoxy(2,5);
    cprintf("VALUE N: ");
    cin>>n;
    cout<<endl;
    for(int i=1;i<=n;i++)
    {   ans=0;
        stern(i);
        gotoxy(2,wherey());
        cprintf("%d\n",ans);
        ans=0;
        stern(i+1);
        cprintf("%d\n",ans);
    }
    getch();
}
```

in the classification are the architecture and the training process. The adequate functioning of neural networks depends on the sizes of the training and the testing set. To comparatively evaluate the performance of the classifiers, all the classifiers presented in this paper were trained by the same training data set and tested with the evaluation data set. In order to compare the performance of the different classifiers for the same classification problem, in addition to CANFIS, we also implemented the MLPNN, PNN, PCA, SVM, and SOM. We performed different experiments during implementation of the classifiers and the number of hidden neurons was determined by taking into consideration the classification accuracies. In the hidden layers and the output layers, the activation function used was the sigmoidal function. The sigmoidal function with the range between zero and one introduces two important properties. First, the sigmoid is nonlinear, allowing the network to perform complex mappings of input to output vector spaces, and secondly, it is continuous and differentiable, which allows the gradient of the error to be used in updating the weights. The training algorithm for different classifiers is based on adjusting all the weights between the neurons to minimize the mean square error of all the training patterns. The Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm is used for training the classifiers as it combines the best features of Gauss-Newton technique and steepest-descent algorithm and does not suffer from slow convergence [19].

3. DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEM USING CANFIS

CANFIS combines Classification and Regression Trees (CART) and the Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System (NFIS) in a two step procedure. CART is a tree-based algorithm used to optimize the process of selecting relevant predictors from a large pool of potential predictors. Using the selected predictors, NFIS builds a model for continuous output of the predictand. In this sense, CANFIS migrates various degrees of neuro-fuzzy spectrum between the two extremes: a completely understandable FIS and a black-box NN, which is at the other end of interpretability spectrum. Neuro-fuzzy models can be characterized by neuro-fuzzy spectrum, in light of linguistic transparency and input-output mapping precision.

CANFIS powerful capability stems from pattern-dependent weights between consequent layer and fuzzy association layer. Membership values correspond to those dynamically changeable weights that depend on input patterns. CANFIS bears a close relationship to the computational paradigms of radial basis function (RBF) networks and modular networks.

The fundamental component for CANFIS is a fuzzy neuron that applies membership functions (MFs) to the inputs. Two membership functions commonly used are general Bell and Gaussian. The network also contains a
normalization axon to expand the output into a range of 0 to 1. The second major component in this type of CANFIS is a modular network that applies functional rules to the inputs. The number of modular networks matches the number of network outputs, and the number of processing elements in each network corresponds to the number of MFs. CANFIS also has a combiner axon that applies the MFs outputs to the modular network outputs. Finally, the combined outputs are channeled through a final output layer and the error is back-propagated to both the MFs and the modular networks.

The function of each layer is described as follows. Each node in Layer 1 is the membership grade of a fuzzy set (A, B, C, or D) and specifies the degree to which the given input belongs to one of the fuzzy sets. The fuzzy sets are defined by three membership functions. Layer 2 receives input in the form of the product of all output pairs from the first layer. The third layer has two components. The upper component applies the membership functions to each of the inputs, while the lower component is a representation of the modular network that computes, for each output, the sum of all the firing strengths. The fourth layer calculates the weight normalization of the output of the two components from the third layer and produces the final output of the network. The architecture of CANFIS network is presented in Figure 10.

Figure 10. CANFIS network topology.
One disadvantage of CANFIS is that it should not be used to predict values outside the extreme contained in the learning database. This limitation becomes less relevant with increased database size. Another disadvantage is that sufficient database volume is required to build the model. As such it is not capable of direct prediction for sites which have a lack of archived observations.

4. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The simulations were realized by using MATLAB 6.0 Neural Network Toolbox and Neurosolution software. Six different neural network structure, Multi layer perceptron, Probabilistic neural network, Principal component analysis, Radial basis function, Support vector machine and Self organizing map neural network were applied to WBCD database to show the performance of these neural networks on breast cancer data. To evaluate the correctness of the proposed system, PPV (positive predicted value) was computed in each case.

PPV is computed as:

\[
PPV = \frac{\text{Correct results}}{\text{All results}} \times 100
\]

Table 3 gives the recommended inputs by each input recommenders, Decision tree and Correlation coefficients.

Table 4 gives the results cited in the literature on WBCD dataset and Table 5 gives our results. Figure 11 shows the CANFIS networks learning curve using Neuro Solution software on WBCD database. Figure 12 shows the output vs. desired plot for CANFIS network on WBCD dataset and the obtained Mean Square Error is only 0.020588.

Table 3. Recommended Inputs by each input recommender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X_6</th>
<th>X_3</th>
<th>X_7</th>
<th>X_8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient input</td>
<td>X_2</td>
<td>X_7</td>
<td>X_3</td>
<td>X_6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Experimental results of previous work on WBCD dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>PPV (percent)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy-Genetic</td>
<td>97.07</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILFN</td>
<td>97.23</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy</td>
<td>96.71</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILFN &amp; Fuzzy</td>
<td>98.13</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANFIS</td>
<td>96.07–96.3</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNs</td>
<td>97.95</td>
<td>[24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduced input dataset shows almost the same performances or better performances with the same learning iteration number and shows better/similar performance against the results of previous works. Since the result derived by the reduced input dataset shows better performance and it has significantly higher advantage in computation, it would be a better method to be implemented in real situations. Therefore, the proposed methods-combined algorithm with dominant input recommenders, can be appropriate methods of inference system for the problem of breast cancer diagnosis.

Table 5. Experimental results of our works on WBCD dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiment</th>
<th>All Inputs PPV (%)</th>
<th>Decision Tree PPV (%)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient PPV (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANFIS</td>
<td>98.82</td>
<td>98.53</td>
<td>97.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>98.53</td>
<td>98.24</td>
<td>97.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>97.94</td>
<td>96.77</td>
<td>97.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>97.65</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>95.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNN</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>97.65</td>
<td>97.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>97.65</td>
<td>98.24</td>
<td>97.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 11. CANFIS network learning curve on WBCD database.](image)

![Figure 12. Output vs desired plot for CANFIS on WBCD dataset.](image)
5. DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the present paper, we would like to highlight the following.

1) The high classification accuracies of CANFIS with full data give insights into the nine measures of the WBCD database. This classification accuracy slightly decreases with input recommenders.

2) The classification accuracy of PCA, SOM, PNN and MLP does not change much even after decreasing the inputs with input recommenders.

3) When we initialized the weight of neural network using stern series instead of zero as we usually do, the speed of training was noted to increase.

4) During SVM training, most of the computational effort is spent on solving the quadratic programming problem in order to find the support vectors. The SVM maps the features to higher dimensional space and then uses an optimal hyperplane in the mapped space. This implies that though the original features carry adequate information for good classification, mapping to a higher dimensional feature space could potentially provide better discriminatory clues that are not present in the original feature space. The selection of suitable kernel function appears to be a trial-and-error process. One would not know the suitability of a kernel function and performance of the SVM until one has tried and tested with representative data. For training the SVMs with RBF-kernel functions, one has to predetermine the σ values. The optimal or near optimal σ values can only be ascertained after trying out several, or even many values.

5) The pattern layer of a PNN often consists of all redundant. Including redundant samples can potentially lead to a large network structure, which, in turn, induces two problems. First, it would result in a higher computational overhead simply because the amount of computation necessary to classify an unknown pattern is proportional to the size of the network. Second, a consequence of a large network structure is that the classifier tends to be oversensitive to the training data and is likely to exhibit poor generalization capabilities to the unseen data. However, the smoothing parameter also plays a crucial role in the PNN classifier, and an appropriate smoothing parameter is often data dependent.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, the performance of various neural network structures was investigated for breast cancer diagnosis problem. Initializing Neural network with Stern series was proposed to speed up training. CANFIS is the best trade off between neural networks and fuzzy logic providing smoothness and adaptability. It also gives better classification accuracy in terms of PPV [Table 5] than all other neural classifiers analyzed. The performance of the SVM was not as high as the SOM and PCA. This may be attributed to several factors including the training algorithms, estimation of the network parameters, and the scattered and mixed nature of the features. The results of the present paper demonstrated that the CANFIS and PCA can be used in the classification of the WBCD data by taking into consideration the misclassification rates. This work also indicates that CANFIS can be effectively used for breast cancer diagnosis to help oncologists.
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Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AdaBoost</th>
<th>Adaptive Boosting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Accuracy Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>Computer Aided Diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANFIS</td>
<td>Coactive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CART</td>
<td>Classification and Regression Trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Decision Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIS</td>
<td>Fuzzy Inference Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Genetic Algorithm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPNN</td>
<td>Multi Layer Perceptron Neural Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIS</td>
<td>Neuro-Fuzzy Inference System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Neural Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Principal Component Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNN</td>
<td>Probabilistic Neural Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPV</td>
<td>Positive Predicted Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Root Mean Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>Self Organizing Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>Support Vector Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBCD</td>
<td>Wisconsin Breast Cancer Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>